

Chief Veterinary Officer; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 12783. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in February 1968, to commemorate American Heart Month and the national fight against the cardiovascular diseases; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL (for himself and Mr. MAYNE):

H.R. 12784. A bill to supplement the purposes of the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 479), by authorizing agreements and leases with respect to certain properties in the District of Columbia, for the purpose of a national visitor center, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H.R. 12785. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SLACK:

H.R. 12786. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TUCK:

H.R. 12787. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VANDER JAGT:

H.R. 12788. A bill to establish a Small Tax Division within the Tax Court of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VIGORITO:

H.R. 12789. A bill to provide for the control of the alewife and other fish and aquatic animals in the waters of the Great Lakes which affect adversely the ecological balance of the Great Lakes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WALKER:

H.R. 12790. A bill to provide incentives for the establishment of new or expanded job-producing industrial and commercial establishments in areas having high proportions of persons with low incomes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BETTS:

H.R. 12791. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the temporary rate of duty for color television picture tubes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 12792. A bill to authorize the support of Casa Loma College, a vocational college of applied science and arts, to stimulate its development and operation, to further define its corporate powers and provide such support as necessary to fulfill its purposes of providing vocational education and manpower training programs within a 4-year collegiate institution in such a way as to preserve human dignity and worth of the socially, economically, and culturally deprived; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts:

H.R. 12793. A bill to remove the authority of the Secretary of the Treasury to prohibit, curtail, or regulate the melting or treating of coins of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 12794. A bill to amend section 312 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to exempt certain additional persons from the requirements as to understanding the English language before their naturalization as citizens of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 12795. A bill to safeguard the consumer in connection with the utilization of credit by requiring full disclosure of the terms and conditions of finance charges in credit transactions or in offers to extend credit; by establishing maximum rates of finance charges in credit transactions; by authorizing the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to issue regulations dealing with the excessive use of credit for

the purpose of trading in commodity futures contracts affecting consumer prices; by establishing machinery for the use during periods of national emergency of temporary controls over credit to prevent inflationary spirals; by prohibiting the garnishment of wages; by creating the National Commission on Consumer Finance to study and make recommendations on the need for further regulation of the consumer finance industry; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 12796. A bill to protect the civilian employees of the executive branch of the U.S. Government in the enjoyment of their constitutional rights and to prevent unwarranted governmental invasions of their privacy; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 12797. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide optional annual physical examinations for Government employees enrolled under health benefits plans; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RANDALL:

H.R. 12798. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 12799. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H.R. 12800. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 12801. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to establish in the Veterans' Administration a national cemetery system consisting of all cemeteries of the United States in which veterans of any war or conflict or of service in the Armed Forces are or may be buried, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HATHAWAY (for himself, Mr. CULVER, and Mr. MORRIS):

H.R. 12802. A bill to develop business and employment opportunities in smaller cities and areas of unemployment and underemployment by providing certain preferences for prospective Government contractors in such cities and areas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MINK:

H.J. Res. 813. Joint resolution providing that an environmental health center that may hereafter be established in the Public Health Service shall be known as Rachel Carson Memorial Research Center for Environmental Health; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.J. Res. 814. Joint resolution in honor of Amelia Earhart and Joan Merriam Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABO:

H.R. 12803. A bill for the relief of Bartolomeo DiNatale; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 12804. A bill for the relief of Fall-citas B. Burgonio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12805. A bill for the relief of Emerita Dinglas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12806. A bill for the relief of Amelia Garcia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12807. A bill for the relief of Virginia O. Olympia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12808. A bill for the relief of Leonor Valmore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 12809. A bill for the relief of Rosa Vasile; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 12810. A bill for the relief of Rosaria Meo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of Illinois:

H.R. 12811. A bill for the relief of Paolina, Luciano, and Paolo Evangelisti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 12812. A bill for the relief of Go Kieng Slong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 12813. A bill for the relief of Zenaida I. Biroq; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12814. A bill for the relief of Angelina Cappa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 12815. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anna Frank; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 12816. A bill for the relief of Christopher Sloane (Bosmos); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 12817. A bill for the relief of Dr. Leding Yap; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHWEIKER:

H.R. 12818. A bill for the relief of Lt. Cmdr. Anthony A. Mitchell, U.S. Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

150. By the SPEAKER: Petition of William Netschert, Daytona Beach, Fla., relative to relief from dilution of efficacy of vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

151. Also, petition of Elmer L. Evans, Wanaque, N.J., relative to subverting the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

152. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., relative to enactment of House Resolution 904; to the Committee on Rules.

SENATE

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 11, 1967

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

Rev. W. Wilson Rasco, D.D., executive of United Presbyterian Church, Seattle, Wash., offered the following prayer:

God of the nations, Lord of our hearts: Gratefully we acknowledge Thy goodness to us; humbly we confess our need of Thee.

On this day that Thou has given us, help us to attempt great things for Thee and for our country.

Today we pray for our country and for all who are working in the interests of righteousness, freedom, and good will.

Lift us above our obsession for the insignificant. Help us to gear our efforts into things that bring meaning and fulfillment to the lives of all people everywhere.

Give us strength and patience that we may not become weary in well-doing.

Today we pray for peace for our world.

We pray for those who are paying the price of peace.

We need wisdom greater than our own. So lead us and use us that in our world and in our time all men may come to call each other "brother" and call Thee "Father."

Bless the Members of this Senate in their personal and private as well as political affairs. Be with their families and loved ones today.

May Thy grace, mercy, and love be with us all. Amen.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9547) to amend the Inter-American Development Bank Act to authorize the United States to participate in an increase in the resources of the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. PATMAN, Mr. MULTER, Mr. BARRETT, Mrs. SULLIVAN, Mr. REUSS, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. WIDNALL, Mr. HALPERN, and Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills:

S. 906. An act for the relief of Luis Tapia Davila;

S. 1448. An act for the relief of Roy A. Parker; and

H.R. 9837. An act to amend the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1959, as it relates to transportation expenses of Members of the House of Representatives, and for other purposes.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, August 31, 1967, be dispensed with.

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

WAIVER OF CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar, under rules VII and VIII, be dispensed with.

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

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in relation to the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

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

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR MORSE

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] be recognized at 1 o'clock today for a period of 1 hour.

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

MISS AMERICA: DEBRA DENE BARNES OF KANSAS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, for the second time in 3 years, the Miss America contest has recognized the beauty and talent of Kansas girls by selecting Miss Debra Dene Barnes of Moran, Kans., as Miss America.

For some, the selection of Miss Debra may have been a surprise. Kansans, however, were not surprised. From the moment in Pratt, Kans., when she won the Junior-Chamber-of-Commerce-sponsored Miss Kansas title. Kansans have known she would be Miss America.

A junior at Kansas State College at Pittsburg, Debra is studying to be a professor of music. Other than the marvelous talent on the piano she demonstrated before the nationwide television audience Saturday night, Debra also plays the organ, the trumpet, and the French horn. Her ambition is to earn her doctor's degree in piano pedagogy.

But talent is not enough to win the Miss America contest. Beauty is the real measure, and Miss Debra was the clear winner of this test, having won first place in the preliminary swimsuit division.

Kansas has long been known as the "Wheatheart" of the United States. Now we can add the title of "Sweetheart" of the United States to our long list of assets and accomplishments. Geographically we are the center of the United States, and we are also the beauty center. Added to the many other beauty titles won by Kansas girls in the past few years, it tends to prove what I have long known—that no State surpasses Kansas for beautiful and talented women.

I congratulate Mr. and Mrs. Dwight Barnes for the wonderful girl they have given. Mrs. Barnes is seriously ill with multiple sclerosis and may not yet know that her daughter is Miss America, but I

know that she has long been proud of her daughter.

Congratulations, Miss Debra. We are all very proud of you.

A TRIBUTE TO MISS AMERICA

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I rise to call the attention of Members of the Senate and to congratulate Miss Debra Dene Barnes of Moran, Kans., who was named Miss America of 1968, Saturday night at Atlantic City, N.J. It was indeed exciting for me to watch this event on television Saturday night and be able to see a Kansan named Miss America for the second time in the last 3 years.

Debbie Barnes is a delightful young lady who was born and reared in a small Kansas community of 550 people. I am indeed proud of her parents and the citizens of Moran who have contributed in various ways to the outstanding talents which Debbie possesses.

Debra is majoring in music at Kansas State College in Pittsburg, Kans., and her ambition after finishing her education is to teach piano at the college level and write music. With the talents she exhibited Saturday night at her disposal there is no question but that she can look forward to an outstanding career.

I am personally very proud, as is the entire State of Kansas, of the new Miss America.

DEATH OF HARRY H. WOODRING

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, Kansas and the Nation lost a distinguished citizen in the death of the Honorable Harry H. Woodring.

Harry Woodring served as Assistant Secretary of War under the administration of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, having been appointed in April 1933. Later, in 1936, President Roosevelt appointed him Secretary of War, which position he held for 4 years.

He served as Governor of Kansas from 1931 to 1933. Following his service as Secretary of War, President Roosevelt offered him the Governorship of Puerto Rico, but Secretary Woodring declined, as he wanted to return to Kansas.

Secretary Woodring was one of the early supporters of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt for the Democratic presidential nomination and made one of the seconding speeches for him at the Democratic National Convention in 1932.

Secretary Woodring was born at Elk City, Kans., May 31, 1890. He started a banking career at the age of 17 in Neodesha, Kans. He rose to the vice presidency and then the ownership of the First National Bank in Neodesha.

He enlisted as a private in the army in 1918 and was soon commissioned a second lieutenant. He was discharged on December 12, 1918.

Secretary Woodring considered this greatest service to the Nation to be his recommendation of Gen. George C. Marshall for appointment as Army Chief of Staff, a post Marshall held through the critical years of World War II.

He was married to Helen Coolidge, daughter of Senator Marcus A. Coolidge of Massachusetts, whom many Members of this body will remember.

Harry H. Woodring was widely known and highly regarded not only in Kansas, but all over the Nation.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, by reason of official business, I be excused from attendance at the sessions of the Senate from Monday, September 18, to and including Monday, October 2, 1967.

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

FASCIST GREECE

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the King of Greece is in the Capital of our country today. He might as well remain in the United States permanently unless he stiffens his backbone, returns to his country, and demonstrates he is a real ruler instead of a mere puppet.

Within the past 20 years, \$4 billion of American taxpayers' money has been paid over to Greece, much of it in military aid.

(At this point a disturbance occurred in the visitors' galleries.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The galleries will be in order. The Sergeant at Arms will please remove the demonstrators. The Senator from Ohio will suspend until the galleries are in order.

RECESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. 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 12 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The Senate reassembled at 12 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m., when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. HARRIS in the chair.)

FASCIST GREECE

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the King of Greece is in the Capital of our country today. He might as well remain in the United States permanently unless he stiffens his backbone, returns to his country, and demonstrates he is a real ruler instead of a mere puppet.

If he is in Washington to confer with our President merely as an errand boy for the colonels who forcibly took over the rule of his unhappy country, his request that the United States grant military aid to Greece should be rejected offhand.

Within the past 20 years, \$4 billion of American taxpayers' money has been paid over to Greece, much of it in military aid.

In large part much of this aid to Greece was to save that country from a takeover by the Communists. Yet, now the colonels govern by decree the same as do Communist rulers. They have seized power by force. They have imprisoned more than 3,000 men and women without trial. They

even have the effrontery to revoke Greek citizenship and seize real estate and bank accounts of native born Greeks simply by decree.

This Greek King does not deserve to remain a king unless he returns to his country and defies the military dictatorship there. Surely American citizens regard a Fascist dictatorship as ignoble and indefensible as would be a Communist dictatorship.

Mr. President, Greece, the cradle of democracy, is a nation which has been our friend and ally over the years. It was President Truman's Marshall plan that saved Greece from going behind the Iron Curtain.

Unfortunately, the duly elected Government of Greece was overthrown by Fascist-minded generals and colonels of the Greek Army. King Constantine is now merely a puppet. The military junta governs by decree.

Melina Mercouri, the stage and screen star, criticized this new Government. Immediately the fascist chairman by decree seized apartment buildings and other property she owned in Athens and revoked her citizenship. Much to her credit, she responded angrily, "I was born a Greek; I will die a Greek. General Patakos was born a Fascist and he will die a Fascist."

Unfortunately our State Department immediately recognized the military junta in Athens. Had a ragtag group of leftwingers, instead of Mussolini-like Fascists, taken over, it would be interesting to note whether our striped-pants boys at the State Department would have closed our Embassy and President Johnson and Secretary Rusk immediately sent in our planes and paratroopers to "protect American citizens."

President Johnson and Secretary of State Rusk should tell King Constantine who is now visiting Washington to answer these questions or demand that the generals and colonels ruling Greece by decree answer for him.

King Constantine will be in the Capitol Building this afternoon. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. FULBRIGHT] has invited me to attend a meeting with him at 3:30 this afternoon. I expect to be there. There are some questions that should be asked of the King of Greece.

I ask now: When are the 3,000, or more, political prisoners to be freed? If they are not freed immediately what reason can he give for jailing them by decree without trial? When will the King restore freedom of the press and other civil liberties to his people? When may a Greek citizen have more than five persons in his home without a police permit? When will there be free elections in Greece? When will Andreas Papan-dreu be tried or released? Also, by whose authority and under what law and for what has he been in prison these many weeks?

Furthermore, President Johnson and Secretary of State Rusk should make it crystal clear to King Constantine that the present embargo on military assistance to Greece will be maintained until democratic institutions have been reinstated in Greece through the restoration

of a legitimate constitutional government.

Mr. President, on September 5, 1967, there appeared in the New York Times an excellent editorial entitled, "Ill Winds From Greece." This editorial clearly and concisely describes the nature of the Fascist clique that has seized control in Greece and the need for an immediate return to constitutional government in that unfortunate land. I commend this editorial to my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks.

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

ILL WINDS FROM GREECE

"The creative wind toward reform and progress that has swept the country and the Government in Greece since the April revolution . . ." So begins a Greek Embassy press handout about the National Tourist Organization. The truth in Greece, four months after the seizure of power by a clique of Army officers, is somewhat different.

Item: More than 2,300 of the 6,000 alleged leftists rounded up by coup leaders are still held on a desolate Aegean island, without charge, without trial. "We'll let you visit them as soon as they become better Greeks," the brigadier serving as Interior Minister told newsmen.

Item: Thirty-four persons, most of them members of the Center Union party that won an unprecedented majority in the last election, are being tried *en masse* by a military tribunal for "defiance of orders of the military authority." The charges are that they printed and distributed anti-regime leaflets, insulted the coup leaders and spread "false information."

Item: Pervasive press censorship continues, including a blackout of news about the trial of the 34. Not one step has been taken to ease it despite the promise a month ago by a new Under Secretary that press freedom would be "restored shortly."

It is painfully evident that, apart from copying fascist trappings, a facade of Victorian-era morality and a few Madison Avenue publicity techniques, the Greek colonels and brigadiers have no ideas on what to do with the country. They know how to suppress and censor, how to spy and conduct kangaroo courts—they are skilled at trapping and jailing citizens for playing the forbidden music of Mikis Theodorakis—but they are barren of plans for bringing the promised political reconstruction and the restoration of parliamentary democracy.

The crucial questions, then, are: What kind of new Constitution will a working group of twenty distinguished Greek jurists produce? And, if it is a genuinely democratic document, will the military junta accept it as promised?

This draft is supposed to be finished toward the end of the year. In the meantime, the United States Government should bend over backward to avoid giving even a hint of approval or a sign of respectability to the present regime. There is no pressing need for resuming military aid to Greece and the political cost to Washington would be high.

After the jurists have reported and the junta has indicated its attitude toward the draft Constitution there will be opportunity to determine the next phase of American relations with Greece.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

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

THE SOUTH VIETNAMESE YEARN FOR PEACE AND REPUDIATED KY

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, more than two-thirds of the voters of Vietnam repudiated the military regime of Thieu and Ky in the election on September 3. By a tremendous margin they clearly and convincingly demonstrated that the people of South Vietnam desire a cessation of bombing of North Vietnam, an end to the civil war raging there and the commencement of peace talks with the Vietcong and with the Hanoi regime.

There is clear and convincing evidence that in the United States President Johnson no longer commands the support of a majority of the American people in turning the Vietnamese civil war into an American ground war. The Vietnam involvement has become the most unpopular war in American history; even more unpopular than the war with Mexico nearly a century and a quarter ago. A Congressman from Illinois, Abraham Lincoln, voted against that declaration of war. Now, the people in South Vietnam have clearly shown that they do not desire the continuation of this war.

The result of the election places an obligation upon our President to unconditionally halt the bombing of North Vietnam and to make greater efforts to seek an armistice and cease-fire. The election returns give us an opportunity to extricate ourselves from a well-nigh impossible situation. We should disengage our forces from combat in Vietnam and retire to our own coastal bases and seek an armistice such as was achieved in Korea.

Thieu was elected President by less than 35 percent of the total vote. All opposition candidates favored peace. The most outspoken peace candidate, Truong Dinh Dzu, a Saigon lawyer, who had never held public office, campaigned with a white dove of peace as his ballot symbol. He proposed in his final radio talk and in his campaign literature immediate conferences with the Vietcong, or the National Liberation Front, to bring peace to Vietnam. He called for unconditional cessation of bombing of North Vietnam. Dzu obtained 17 percent of the total vote, running second in a field of nine, and afterward declared:

If there had been honest elections, I would have won. I represent the need of the people for peace.

Whether or not the claim of Dzu that Ky rigged the elections against him has substantial basis is unknown at this time. Unfortunately, the result of this much heralded election left the same military junta in power. Nothing has really changed in Saigon. It is to be remembered that Ky arbitrarily barred from voting all Buddhists, Communists, and all men and women he termed neutralists. Men and women alleged to come within such category were denied ballots. Furthermore, he barred the most prominent of all peace candidates, "Big" Minh, the former Prime Minister violently removed from office by Ky and the 10 gen-

erals in their coup of June 1965. This former Prime Minister, an exile in Thailand, was termed a subversive by Ky and denied a place on the ballot.

Mr. President, the elections proved one thing only. It is evident that the Vietnamese, by an overwhelming margin, voted a lack of confidence in the Saigon military junta and demonstrated a strong popular demand for peace.

DEMONSTRATION IN THE GALLERIES

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I have a duty, I believe, to detain the Senate for a moment. As a Senator, I wish to denounce what I consider to be a reprehensible and illegal demonstration a few minutes ago by some people who were guests of the Senate in their attempt to throw down from the gallery leaflets setting forth their views on certain public questions.

That is not the way in this country to attempt to influence with honor and integrity the decisions which the people's representatives make.

Many times, in my State of California, I have spoken about the duty of the citizen to his country when it is free—as ours is. His duty is far greater than that of the citizen in a controlled, closed, or Communist country.

Here, every American citizen can luxuriate in his right of free speech—although a wise government has set limits of what free speech consists of.

Here, an American citizen can peacefully enjoy his right to petition the Government as that right is laid down in the Constitution of our country.

Here, we have orderly process, and respect for law and order, only when the individual American accepts the responsibilities of citizenship which go along with his freedom.

There was, therefore, a perversion of the orderly processes of the American Government in this Chamber a few moments ago. There was, I take it, a mild, mini-attempt at intimidation.

Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent to have a copy of the leaflet which was showered down upon the Senate a few moments ago printed in the RECORD.

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

SEPTEMBER 11, 1967.

To all U.S. Congressmen:

Your first order of business this session should be a general declaration of peace—followed by immediate withdrawal of U.S. troops from Vietnam, an end to conscription, and an end to the suppression of black Americans.

Until you meet these emergencies there will be sustained disruptions of the government apparatus.

NATIONAL MOBILIZATION COMMITTEE
DIRECT ACTION PROJECT.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, you will observe, as you read it, that in part those who were responsible for this ugly moment go on to state—addressing you, Mr. President, as well as your colleagues:

Until you meet these emergencies there will be sustained disruptions of the government apparatus.

I hope not. I believe not. A great majority of the people of this country wish to accept their responsibilities. What we saw a few moments ago was simply a handful of American citizens abusing their right to their precious freedom.

I repeat that I denounce it, and I do not want it to happen again.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from California for the comments he has just made about the episode which took place about 20 minutes ago, when one side of the Chamber was peppered with leaflets dropped by non-Americans—and I say that advisedly.

I am disturbed by the significance of what happened. It demonstrates that spreading throughout the country is an ever-increasing belief that, by intimidation and coercion, objectives, whether desired or not desired by the majority of our people, can be attained.

The miniature demonstration which took place reflects the general attitude of certain groups who hope that, by intimidation and coercion, public officials will abandon the obligations which they assumed in taking oath of office to serve the United States of America faithfully and honestly, to the end that our Nation shall be preserved.

I repeat a part of the contents of the leaflet:

Until you meet these emergencies there will be sustained disruptions of the Government apparatus.

Mr. President, the question arises, Is there really existent among a goodly number of our citizens—although I probably should not designate them in that way—a belief that their ends will be achieved through a disruption of the Government processes?

Every law-abiding citizen should become alarmed at the threat of sustained disruptions of the Government apparatus. While applicable merely to the dropping of leaflets, it represents, nevertheless, what certain groups believe they can attain through disruption, violence, sit-ins, or mob demonstrations, causing the Government to cease operating normally as contemplated by the Constitution.

Mr. President, this is a tragic situation. It is also an insult to every public official in the country when such groups impliedly express "You will bow to our demands or we will cause you annoyance and disruption wherever you go."

What do they hope to achieve?

What would be the end result of the destruction of our democratic processes? What would happen if, by coercion and intimidation, such groups were able to achieve what they want?

What would be the result if their opponents began to exercise the same kind of intimidation and coercion against them?

Millions of citizens are abiding by our democratic concept of government. They work every day. They take care of their homes. They try to take care of their families. But groups of the type that were in the Senate Chamber this morning do not belong in that category. In the main, although they are a minority, they believe that by their demonstrations, sit-

ins, and annoyances, we will finally yield to their demands.

My expectation is that a time will come within this country—and soon—when the good citizens in mass protest will demand that their rights be considered and that the propagators of violence, riots, and demonstrations be stopped.

I do not know what will happen to the group which dropped the leaflets. Probably there is no law to deal with them. However, I grieve and sorrow frequently when I find our Government either unwilling or so inept as to allow riots, demonstrations, and sit-ins to go unchecked and unpunished.

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

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. I merely wish to commend my able colleague from Ohio, who has a long and illustrious record as a public servant, for the comments he has just made.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of August 30, 1967,

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported favorably, without amendment, on September 8, 1967, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 40) authorizing the printing of the report of the proceedings of the 43d biennial meeting of the Convention of American Instructors of the Deaf as a Senate document, and submitted a report (No. 562) thereon, which was printed.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REPORTS ON NUMBER OF OFFICERS ON DUTY WITH HEADQUARTERS, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY, AND ARMY GENERAL STAFF

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on the number of officers on duty with Headquarters, Department of the Army, and the Army General Staff, as of June 30, 1967 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON EXPORT CONTROL

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Eightieth Quarterly Report covering the second quarter of 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

OIL EMERGENCY

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior transmitting, pursuant to law, a chronology of actions in regard to the oil emergency (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 5, United States Code, Government, Organization and Employees, to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to place positions in the government of the District of Columbia in grades GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18, and, with the approval of the President, other positions

at levels IV and V of the Executive Schedule, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954

A letter from Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations, Department of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the treatment of income from the operation of a communications satellite system (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

PROPOSED HIGHWAY, AIRWAY, AND WATERWAY USER ACTS OF 1967

A letter from Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide additional revenues for the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on savings from more economical use of communication facilities between Alaska and the U.S. mainland, Department of the Air Force, Alaska Communication System, dated August 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of Federal participation in the cost of airport projects involving donated land, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, dated August 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on procurement of nuclear submarine propulsion equipment under Public Law 87-653, Department of the Navy, dated August 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

TUMALO IRRIGATION DISTRICT

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, determination relating to deferment of 1967, 1968, and 1969 construction charge installments due to the United States from the Tumalo Irrigation District, Crescent Lake Dam Project, Oreg.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

FLORIDA PROJECT

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior transmitting, pursuant to law, findings on contract (RO Draft 3-23-67) for the performance of minor construction work on the Florida Project, a participating project of the Colorado River Storage Project (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION WITHDRAWING FEDERAL SUPERVISION OVER PROPERTY AND AFFAIRS OF SENECA NATION

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for complete withdrawal of Federal supervision over the property and affairs of the Seneca Nation and its members (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIM PAID BY PEACE CORPS

A letter from the Director, Peace Corps, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on a tort claim paid by the Peace Corps, during fiscal year 1967 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMERICAN SYMPHONY ORCHESTRA LEAGUE, INC., AUDIT REPORT

A letter from George H. Jones, Jr., certified public accountant, McLean, Va., transmit-

ting, pursuant to law, an audit report for the American Symphony Orchestra League, Inc., for the fiscal year ended May 31, 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON CLAIMS PAID UNDER THE MILITARY PERSONNEL AND CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES' CLAIMS ACT OF 1964

A letter from the Deputy General Manager, United States Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on claims paid under the Military Personnel and Civilian Employees' Claims Act of 1964, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN DEFECTOR ALIENS

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

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law pertaining to each alien, and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

COST-OF-LIVING ALLOWANCES FOR CERTAIN EMPLOYEES

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide cost-of-living allowances for judicial employees stationed outside the continental United States or in Alaska or Hawaii, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE 37, UNITED STATES CODE

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 37, United States Code, to authorize the nontemporary storage of household effects of members in a missing status (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

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

THIRD PREFERENCE AND SIXTH PREFERENCE CLASSIFICATIONS FOR CERTAIN ALIENS

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

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A letter from the secretary, Group of American Citizens, New York City, N.Y., in the nature of a petition, praying for a re-

dress of grievances relating to properties in Bulgaria; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted at the Regional Conference of Elected Officials, Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation relating to Federal assistance to urban areas; to the Committee on Government Operations.

Resolution adopted at the Conference of Chief Justices, Honolulu, Hawaii, relating to review of decisions of State Supreme Courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter, in the nature of a petition, from George Bennett, of Detroit, Mich., remonstrating against the proposed appointment of Lawrence Gubow as federal judge for the eastern district of Michigan, southern division; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A petition from Elmer L. Evans, of Wanaque, N.J., praying for a redress of grievances (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter from the executive assistant to the Governor, State of Ohio, advising that house bill No. 103, of the State of Ohio, has previously been transmitted to the Congress, and that, therefore, no copy would be sent by his office; to the Committee on Public Works.

A statement by the Governor, State of Connecticut, relating to Stay-in-School Month, September 1967; ordered to lie on the table.

A proclamation by the Governor, State of Indiana, relating to Stay-in-School Month, September 1967; ordered to lie on the table.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 2380. A bill for the relief of Dr. Juan Jose Villa-Campos; and

S. 2381. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jesus Adalberto Quevedo-Avila; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 2382. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jose R. Sanchez;

S. 2383. A bill for the relief of Dr. Francisco J. Menendez;

S. 2384. A bill for the relief of Mr. Jorge A. Marrero;

S. 2385. A bill for the relief of Mr. Jorge L. Machado; and

S. 2386. A bill for the relief of Dr. Luis F. Rodriguez Iznaga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. INOUE:

S. 2387. A bill for the relief of Yan Kam Yeung, Mui Kwun Tong, Man Wong, Fat Li, Fat Loi, Foo Lum, and King Hung Chu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

PROPOSED SUBMISSION BY THE PRESIDENT OF A RESOLUTION TO THE UNITED NATIONS FOR FINAL AND BINDING IMPROVEMENT OF PEACE IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

Mr. MORSE submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 44) providing that it is the sense of the Congress that the President should submit a resolution to the United Nations for final and binding improvement of peace in Southeast Asia in accordance with the appropriate article of the United Nations Charter, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

INDEPENDENT OFFICES AND DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1968—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 301

Mr. BREWSTER submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 9960) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commission, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENT TO INDEPENDENT OFFICES AND DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1968

AMENDMENT NO. 302

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia (for Mr. MAGNUSON) submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the pose of proposing to the bill (H.R. 9960) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: On page 24, after line 19, insert the following:

"Any officer who has served with the Selective Service System in the position of a State Director of Selective Service or comparable executive position on the Staff of the Director of Selective Service for a period of fifteen (15) years will, upon retirement from active duty, be advanced in rank on the retired list to the next highest pay grade and be entitled to the retired pay of that grade as computed under appropriate provisions of law applicable to such person."

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia (for Mr. MAGNUSON) also submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 9960, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

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

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. TOWER, Mr. President, on August 30, I introduced a bill (S. 2376) to amend chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, to provide relief for certain veterans purchasing homes with assistance under such chapter who have been recalled to active duty. I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the names of my colleagues the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] be added as cosponsors of the bill.

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

Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] be added as a co-

sponsor of the bill (S. 1400) to improve the statistics of the United States by providing for a census in the years 1968, 1975, and every 10 years thereafter.

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

Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the names of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONROE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIER], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] be added as cosponsors of the bill (S. 1484) to establish a Small Business Crime Protection Insurance Corporation, and for other purposes.

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

NOTICE OF HEARINGS BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE ON SEPARATION OF POWERS

Mr. ERVIN, Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Separation of Powers of the Committee on the Judiciary, I wish to announce that the subcommittee will hold open hearings on Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday, September 13, 14, and 15. The hearings will be held in room 457 of the Old Senate Office Building, and will begin at 10 o'clock a.m. each day.

The subject of the hearings is one of utmost importance to the Congress—the function of legislative oversight of the administration of the laws. The Constitution assigns to Congress two interrelated functions: First, the determination of governmental policies and programs and the formulation of laws to carry those policies and programs into effect; and second, the oversight of administration in order to see to it that the laws are faithfully executed and to hold the executive branch to the standards and objectives enunciated by Congress. Most Members of Congress view their positions strictly in terms of the lawmaking function, either neglecting the oversight

function altogether or performing it in a sporadic, inefficient manner. This is especially unfortunate in recent times because the increasing scope and complexity of Government and the resulting press of business have lessened significantly the detailed delineation of policy objectives that Congress is able to incorporate in its legislation. The result has been that large amounts of discretionary authority have been delegated to the executive branch, in many cases without clear and precise standards to guide administrative decision-making. In this context, the adequacy of the oversight devices of Congress and the awareness of Congress of the importance of the oversight function are more important than ever before.

The subcommittee will give special attention to one form of legislative oversight, the so-called committee veto, a statutory device under which certain administrative decisions must be submitted to and approved by designated congressional committees before being implemented. In addition, the subcommittee will hear discussion of the various alternative methods of legislative oversight and will consider suggestions for legislative proposals or organizational reforms directed toward strengthening the Congress and enabling it to perform its oversight function more effectively without impinging upon prerogatives of the executive branch.

Finally, the subcommittee will hear testimony on several other aspects of separation of powers, including particularly the role of Congress in formulating foreign policy.

The witnesses scheduled to appear before the subcommittee include: Senator VANCE HARTKE; Representative PAUL FINDLEY; Representative JAMES C. WRIGHT; Assistant Attorney General Frank M. Wozencraft, U.S. Department of Justice; Prof. Alfred de Grazia, New York University; Prof. Alexander M. Bickel, Yale Law School; and Prof. Arthur A. Maass, Harvard University.

DEATH OF JUDGE CARL D. FRIEBOLIN

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, not only the city of Cleveland, and its environs, but the whole Nation has suffered the loss of a distinguished patriot of the United States and a vigorous exponent of the cause of liberty in the death of Judge Carl D. Friebolin on September 4, 1967.

His great trait was the willingness to speak the truth without regard to the group or economic class upon which the implications of his fearless statements fell. He was a true exponent of the courses of action that free citizens should take in the exercise of the freedoms vested in them by the Constitution of the United States.

He was a vigorous advocate of the objective contemplated by our Constitution of giving to every citizen a full enjoyment of his constitutional rights—no more, no less.

He died at the age of 89. Throughout his whole life he struck devastatingly at all groups—rich or poor, strong or weak—that attempted either through economic power or through demagoguery

to usurp rights which did not belong to them.

On September 7, 1967, at the Amasa Stone Mather Chapel of Western Reserve University of Cleveland, Ohio, the Honorable Philip W. Porter eulogized the character and works of Judge Carl D. Friebolin. His presentation was superb and worthy of being placed in the RECORD. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that it be so printed.

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

REMARKS BY PHILIP W. PORTER AT MEMORIAL SERVICE FOR CARL D. FRIEBOLIN, AMASA STONE MATHER CHAPEL, WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY, SEPTEMBER 7, 1967

Carl Friebolin was as young in mind and spirit the day he died last week—89 years old—as the day he first entered the civic life of Cleveland nearly 60 years ago, when the great Tom L. Johnson was mayor. Like so many other eager young men who became Johnson's disciples and proteges, and who later distinguished themselves on their own—Newton D. Baker, Peter Witt, Burr Gongwer, William Stinchcomb, Alfred A. Benesch, to name a few—Carl Friebolin caught fire from the Johnson magic and pursued those high political ideals all the rest of his long and useful life.

Friebolin too became a great man. A really unique man, whom it is almost impossible to describe fully. A man who became a legend in his own time. A man who commanded such respect in this community that, though he held no exalted public office nor directed any vast industrial or commercial empire, though he accumulated no millions of dollars nor employed thousands of men, could accurately be described as Cleveland's No. 1 Citizen. His counsel was sought, his friendship cherished, his scorn feared. His brilliant wit and willingness to use it for good causes certainly shamed many public men into better performance. He has left his mark on his chosen community and it is a high mark, a good mark.

Carl served only briefly in elective public office, two terms in the Ohio legislature, beginning in 1911. In his second term, he was the close friend and political lieutenant of Gov. James M. Cox, one of Ohio's greatest, and whipped through Cox's program of 55 bills, to implement the new constitution adopted in 1912. Cox thought so highly of him that he appointed him common pleas judge in July 1914. He was just right for the job.

But here Carl met his first big disappointment and it may have disillusioned him about the justice of the electoral process. He ran, as required, in November for election to the unexpired term, and was defeated by a much lesser man with a more euphonious name, something that happens all too often in elections for judge. It cured him of running ever again. But it did not send him back to private life. Soon afterward, he was appointed referee in bankruptcy for the federal court, and in that office, secure from elective storms, he served for 50 years. Later, he was offered other judgeships, both federal and local, but he declined. Once was enough; besides, he enjoyed the intricate complications of bankruptcy law.

From here on, Carl became involved—deeply involved—in an incredible number of unpaid civic activities. Today we live in a selfish era where many people go to great lengths to avoid becoming involved in anything but their own personal problems. Friebolin did the opposite; he involved himself to the full extent that his restless energy demanded, for he could never be idle for even part of a day. He was one of the founders and an early president of the City Club. He started writing the satirical Anvil

Revues. He became president of the Citizens League, the Adult Education Association, the Law Library, the Citizens Bureau, the Adelbert College Alumni Association. He was permanent chairman of a citizens committee to draft competent people to run for the Cleveland school board. He was a member of the school board sinking fund commission, a director of the Chamber of Commerce, a trustee of Western Reserve University, a trustee of Kent State University.

Of all these, the City Club was his greatest love, and the fact that the Cleveland City Club is still flourishing today, after more than 50 years, is largely due to the determination of Carl Friebolin in making certain that it endured as a forum for free speech, vigorous dissent and independence of thought. Carl recognized it early not merely as a good place to argue with your friends during lunch, but as a living institution which would air all sides of public controversy and also to provide a stage to kid public figures about their pretensions and posturings. This stage was the annual Anvil Revue.

Carl rightly regarded the forum as the keystone of the club. It represented to him a practical demonstration of what he considered the principal freedom in the American bill of rights—the freedom to pop off, to debate, then be forced to answer questions. It was totally different from the stacked political meeting. It was the moment of truth, which made or broke. So the Forum soon became a Cleveland institution, and in the days before radio and TV, would often draw crowds of 1,500 people. Despite this, the club had a narrow squeak during the Big Depression and almost went broke as the membership declined. Bills went unpaid for months. So plans had to be made to keep the forum perpetually in existence through establishment of a foundation to endow the expense. Friebolin was delighted to accept the presidency of the foundation, which he held for 27 years. The Foundation grew and is still growing. So Cleveland, which first became renowned for political independence and idealism in the Tom Johnson administration, will continue to be so known because of Friebolin's beloved forum.

Carl was the guiding light of the City Club. No important decisions for 50 years were ever made by the directors without clearing them with "The Judge". He saw to it that nominating committees always produced several men competent to be president. Though he encouraged the flaming radicals of the Soviet Table to pop off daily, he also saw to it that the board was balanced with plenty of conservatives, to manage the money problems. Through his wisdom, such diverse and strong individualists as Jim Lincoln and Cyrus Eaton were persuaded at different times to sit on the board.

The Anvil Revue, however, was Carl's personal baby. It gave him a chance each year to pay his respects to hokum and political idioy in city, county and state government. He had exceptional talent as a script writer and a strong sense of the right theatrical timing. So under Carl's laser beam, swelled heads shrivelled and stuffed shirts deflated. And he did the job up brown by inviting those he satirized to sit in boxes and watch themselves fry. His debunking was as sharp as a surgical operation. Audiences roared at the discomfiture of those who considered themselves great men and took themselves so seriously.

No one was immune. Senators, governors, congressmen, mayors, councilmen, county commissioners, sheriffs, political bosses—and even presidents—caught it. So did editors, bank presidents, chairmen of industry, heads of Chambers of Commerce. Politics, government and big business, under Friebolin's scalpel, became amusing and often downright ridiculous. And he never

ran short of material, for the human comedy of errors renewed itself year after year and big shots continued to make fools of themselves. For 48 years Carl never let them forget it. And as the years went on, his carefully prepared "extemperate" curtain became sharper and sharper, until it was worth traveling hundreds of miles to hear. He began by saying "This is the last time" but everyone, including himself knew that, too, was the bunk. The last time really didn't come until 1965, just before his first serious illness made him quit mowing them down.

In the 30s, as World War II was approaching, he branched out into international politics, for the dictators were becoming especially ridiculous and obnoxious to us Americans. His skits about Hitler, Mussolini and Stalin were classics. And finally, he evolved one of his finest characters—Ben Sapp, the citizen in ordinary and taxpayer extraordinary, the confused little guy who always got over the fence last. Carl sensed, long before it actually came true in this age of computers, welfare statism and malignant bureaucracy, that pretty soon the whole world might be full of Ben Sapps, always behind the 8 ball and never quite understanding why. He wrote all his shows for the last 20 years around Ben Sapp, and really cherished him. Toward the end, he even had Ben Sapp in outer space.

This was a great gift that Carl Friebolin gave our city, the gift of laughter at ourselves and our own futility in solving our social and political problems. We could use more of it in these grim times of violence, name-calling, dirty words, soiled images and canned laughter on the boob tube. Truly we will miss the irreverent little man who made us laugh at the pompous, the pretenders and the phonies.

Yet, despite the accuracy of his barbs, Carl did it in a kindly way, never bitter. After every Anvil Revue, he entertained the big shots he had just finished barbecuing with a party at his home or the University Club, where the goats joined with the author and the cast in singing and drinking and realizing it was all in good clean fun. Many of his most regular targets were lunching with him soon after the surgery or playing tennis with him at his country cottage at Vermillion.

Carl's shows became more and more professional as the years went on. They were funnier than the famous Gridiron Dinners in Washington. He got Joe Newman to write lyrics for the music, and Barclay Leatham to direct, and Eleanor Frampton to teach the chorus to dance, instead of having two left feet. Not only did Carl sit up night after night in January and February each year, often till 3 a.m., writing the skits, but he sweated out the rehearsals every night for a month before the show opened. He knew what was correct, for he was a theater bug. He went to every first night at the Hanna, and to New York every winter to see the new shows on Broadway. He could have made it as a playwright on Broadway, had he chosen that league. But he preferred his home base in Cleveland. Bill McDermott, the celebrated Plain Dealer critic and columnist and Carl's good friend, called him the local Aristophanes.

The personal Carl Friebolin was also a rare bird. He refused to drive a car. He rode the Cleveland Transit buses regularly to work, and took taxis when he was in a big hurry or coming home late at night. He made the bumpy bus ride to Vermillion even after he was 85. He cared nothing for wealth or show and wanted only enough earnings to live comfortably on. He lived in the same house on E. 89th Street for 50 years, and though the neighborhood is not what it used to be, it was his home when he died. His lakefront cottage at Vermillion was his summer haven for 50 years and he personally

planted the old trees which now tower over it. The tennis court there was his pride and joy and he rolled it and lined it personally; in fact had just finished rolling it when his first heart attack struck him two years ago. Tennis was a tradition with Carl, and every guest either had to play with him and his brothers George and Arthur, or his son, Bill, or else pretend he could play.

He cared little for baseball or football, but tried golf once; even became president of a golf club at Vermillion. But he gave it up. Took too much time to play, and time was something Carl Friebolin never wasted. He was always in a hurry, walked fast, talked fast, thought fast. He regularly worked 18 hours a day and 6 days a week, and some on Sunday. He was an unbelievably omnivorous reader of newspapers and always had a brief case stuffed with the latest magazines and books, which he read quickly but thoroughly.

He slept little, and lightly, but took frequent naps. I've seen him fall asleep with a long cigar in his mouth, and he never let it go even after he dozed. He was a cigar chewer, rather than a smoker. But they had to be good Havanas. He drank little, and seemed to exist without food. No breakfast, a light lunch, a medium dinner. Seldom ate much desert, but he doted on coffee ice cream.

He was as delightful a conversationalist as this town has ever known. An addict of puns, which he didn't believe were the lowest form of wit. A pixie, a leprechaun, whose bright eyes twinkled in his poker face when he wise-cracked. He chuckled often, but never guffawed, for he was a quiet man, who spoke in low tones and never lost his temper. He was completely irreverent and took nothing seriously, including himself.

And his handwriting, ah, that handwriting! Hardly anyone could decipher it. No one could really read all of it at first glance. Yet he scribbled notes constantly, and mailed them. When friends gave up and complained, he started printing them. But his printing was even worse.

Carl had an affinity for newspapermen, judges, Phi Gam fraternity brothers and Anvil Revue actors. Paul Bellamy, the great editor of the Plain Dealer, was his closest friend. He liked nothing better than once a summer to invite Bellamy and a group of like-minded souls to a weekend to play tennis, swim, eat, drink, play poker and the piano, sit up till 4 a.m. and sing hymns, barbershop quartets, and "Hooray for Captain Spalding, the African Explorer." These parties became a tradition and he sent out invitations as if they were subpoenas.

Carl simply never thought about growing old. He just kept on at the same headlong pace in his 70s and 80s until one day, before he was 78, some of his pals thought they ought to honor him with a birthday party. Why at 78? Carl himself said it was probably because they thought he wouldn't make it to 80. When he reached 85, they threw another party, which he thought was unnecessary. He didn't enjoy the fact that the years had caught up with him. "85 is too darned old for anyone to live," he said. And when he reached 88, and was interviewed on his birthday, he said, "Yes, I admit I've been breathing for 88 years. That's a devil of a thing to be noted for."

After his heart began to falter two years ago, and people began to help him on with his coat and open doors for him, he grumbled about the deference to him. He scoffed at the label of Senior Citizen and said the phrase "the Golden Years" ought to be demonized. He made fun of his unwelcome infirmity, and joked about it when he was asked to make a little speech. One of his favorite recent anecdotes, which he applied to himself, was about the old fellow who, as time went on, had to give up smoking and drinking and chasing girls, and finally as a last resort, took to chewing toothpicks. "And he finally

died of the Dutch Elm disease," said Carl, chuckling heartily.

There never was a Carl Friebolin before in this town, and there never will be another. Had he lived in the colonies in the 1700s, he would have been proscribed as a rebel like Patrick Henry, and would have signed the Declaration of Independence (maybe even written it) like Thomas Jefferson. Had he served on the United States Supreme Court, he would have been a match for Justice Holmes. These patriots had his kind of rare intelligence and independence.

Carl used to say he was born old. He was kidding, and knew it. He was forever young. It took lots of years—89 of them—to wear down his wiry little body, but they never wore down his brilliant mind. That remained keen as ever, down to the end. He made his exit laughing. No one who knew him will ever forget him.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I desire to associate myself with the fine remarks made by my colleague, the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE,] regarding the life and works of the late Carl D. Friebolin of Cleveland. Former Judge Friebolin was my personal friend for 54 years. I first knew him as a State senator, later as a common pleas judge and also in the private practice of law, and more recently as referee in bankruptcy. He was a truly fine citizen and established a great record in public and private life. Carl Friebolin will be greatly missed not only by his legions of friends but by all Ohioans.

VIETNAM ELECTIONS A SIGNIFICANT EVENT

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I think the people of South Vietnam deserve the admiration and respect of all Americans for braving a murderous Vietcong terror campaign and achieving a remarkable voter turnout in the recent elections.

It is amazing that 83 percent of the eligible Vietnamese voters participated in the recent election. Such a voter turnout would be remarkable in any country, under any circumstances—much less in the midst of war and sabotage.

This turnout, as the Philadelphia Inquirer noted in a recent editorial, "is, by any standard, a remarkable achievement."

As the Inquirer also points out:

The horrible measures taken by the Communists to obstruct the election are indicative of how they feel about democratic processes.

All in all, I believe this election is a tribute to the sincere desire of the people of South Vietnam to choose freely their own future. And it is also a tribute to the determination of President Johnson to help South Vietnam strengthen its political institutions so that this future may be assured.

I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD this excellent editorial from the Philadelphia Inquirer.

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

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Sept. 5, 1967]

THE ELECTION RESULTS

Despite the murderous campaign of terror conducted by the Communist Vietcong, in

an effort to frighten potential voters and keep them away from the polls, the election in South Vietnam took place on schedule and attracted a turnout of some 83 percent of the eligible electorate.

This is, by any standard, a remarkable achievement.

Chronic critics of the fight for freedom in South Vietnam will point out, of course, that about 25 percent of the people in that war-torn country were not eligible to vote because they live in areas under Communist control. However, this does not detract from the validity of the elections.

South Vietnamese in the Red-occupied sectors are Communist controlled. There is no evidence that any substantial number of them are Communists. They are, rather, the hostages and the captives of the Communists.

The horrible measures taken by the Communists to obstruct the election are indicative of how they feel about democratic processes.

As for the election returns, the easy victory of the Thieu-Ky ticket had been widely predicted. The failure of this ruling military junta to win a majority of the total vote may have caused surprise in some quarters. Several of the ten opposition tickets made good showings.

To attempt to evaluate the election returns in terms of votes cast for peace or war can be deceptive. All of the candidates, including the military regime that won the election, campaigned to some extent on a peace platform. The differences among them were on how best to achieve peace. There were "hawks" and there were "doves" and there were hybrids in between.

The fact that the ticket finishing in second place was the one most sharply critical of the Thieu-Ky regime is an indication that the South Vietnamese, as are their American Allies, are divided on the basic question of how to end the war.

New peace bids from South Vietnam are almost certain to be one consequence of the election. The United States unquestionably will support and encourage genuine moves toward a peaceful settlement.

Whether the Communists will be any more receptive to peace offers now, than they have been in the past, continues to be the overriding question. The Red waves of terrorism unleashed against the election are symptomatic of Communist bitterness and fanaticism. They also are revelations of Communists frustration and failure.

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I commend the Senator from Alabama on the statement he has just made. I was alarmed, during the last month, by the frequent statements made on the floor of the Senate, stamping the forthcoming election, in advance, as fraudulent and improper. Some Senators called for a postponement of the election.

The results of the election, as reflected by the number of people who voted, are a tremendous tribute to the election processes as conducted in South Vietnam by a people who are wholly inexperienced in holding elections.

When we speak of fraud and impropriety, let us not forget what has happened in some of our own elections in the United States only recently, without thinking of elections of years past. More shocking is the fact that the very words of condemnation uttered on the floor of the Senate were against our friends and in favor of our enemies. The Communists practiced terrorism, taking the lives of

innocent citizens, thus hoping to disorganize the elections.

However, in spite of the guerrilla efforts to disorganize the election processes, not a word was uttered against them by those who were constantly crying in advance that the elections would be improper and fraudulent.

The winner received 45 percent of the votes. As I recall, the candidate next to him received 17 percent. That is a tremendous vote for the winner in face of the fact that 10 or 11 candidates were in the field.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I thank the Senator for his comments.

MILWAUKEE JOURNAL PRAISES L. B. J. MONETARY REFORM ACHIEVEMENT

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, recently the Milwaukee Journal wrote a most perceptive analysis of the great achievement by President Johnson and Secretary Fowler in winning international monetary reform.

This is as accurate and competent an appraisal of this complex achievement as I have seen—certainly as I have seen in a relatively brief 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:

MONETARY REFORM

After four years of debate and study, finance ministers of 10 industrial nations agreed over the weekend on a plan to renovate the creaky international monetary machinery. The reform, which still must be approved by 106 member nations of the International Monetary Fund (IMF), marks, in the opinion of Treasury Secretary Fowler, "one of the great days in the history of international financial co-operation."

Even on paper the reform looks impressive. Certainly it is a far more important development than the finance ministers seemed willing to approve just a few months ago. And when one considers that almost any improvement in this area is bound to affect in some measure the livelihood of literally hundreds of millions of people, it is indeed significant.

What the experts agreed on basically was to allow nations greater access to the pool of hard currencies in the IMF to help tide them over during times of financial distress. There are many qualifications but the net effect will be to help increase world liquidity (gold, dollars, pounds, all forms of international credit) and thus help stave off what many economists contend could be a damaging future contraction of world trade.

This scheme strikes at the most prominent flaw in the complex monetary network established at Bretton Woods in 1944: that there is not enough money to finance the growing volume of world trade. In the last decade, for instance, total monetary reserves of IMF countries have slipped from about 60% of total world imports to about 37%. One reason for this is the meager supply of newly mined gold.

This deficiency has meant that the dollar has provided the chief means of expanding the supply of international money since 1950; in other words, the dollar is almost universally accepted as a means of settling transactions among nations. But this has also meant that the United States pays out more money than it takes in. This chronic deficit in our balance of payments cannot continue indefinitely without impairing the dollar's strength. Unfortunately, under the

existing monetary system, the only way we can significantly reduce the deficit, aside from drastically cutting our overseas economic and military commitments, is to deflate the domestic economy, to deliberately slow down growth and risk rising unemployment.

This is an intolerable burden for any industrial nation. It is why the international monetary system has long needed reform. It is why Secretary Fowler is so exuberant. Now let's hope it works.

REPRESENTATIVE LEONOR SULLIVAN, CHAMPION OF TRUTH-IN-LENDING BILL

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, recently the Washington Star carried a fine article on Representative LEONOR SULLIVAN.

Mrs. SULLIVAN has achieved one of the finest records in either branch of the Congress of the United States. Just before the recess, the Housing Subcommittee of the Senate Banking Committee had been devoting several sessions marking up the omnibus housing bill. Again and again we were reminded that the best new law to provide housing for persons with low income was the Sullivan law, enacted thanks to the driving force of Mrs. SULLIVAN. Of course, this was only one of many Sullivan achievements, that have been cascading in recent years.

Lately she has been holding hearings on the truth-in-lending bill, and from reports in the press, she has been doing a superlative job.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Star be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Sunday Star, Sept. 3, 1967]

Mrs. SULLIVAN, CHAMPION OF TRUTH-IN-LENDING BILL

(By Robert K. Walsh)

Even her political opponents would hardly compare Missouri's first and only woman in the House with the Old Man River that just keeps rolling along but tunelessly does and says nothing.

Yet the congressional career (and parenthetical name) of Rep. Leonor K. (Mrs. John B.) Sullivan show a continuity, variety and determination reminiscent of the impressive but sometimes turbulent and unpredictable Mississippi that flows by her St. Louis district.

And surely some snags, sandbars and swirls beset the current excursion of this personable, witty but intensely serious Congresswoman into legislation on truth-in-lending.

Almost 15 years of House seniority—she is third ranking Democrat on the 33-member Banking and Currency Committee—entitled Mrs. Sullivan to head the subcommittee examining proposals for detailed disclosure of credit terms and charges as a means of safeguarding buyers who seldom beware of evasive or obscure offers by sellers.

Persistence and specialization in consumer problems caused her sponsorship of the most controversial bill at the present hearings. She wants legislation not only considerably stronger than the unanimously-approved Senate bill on the subject but also broader than the Johnson administration suggested.

PRaised BY DOUGLAS

For her "courage" in demanding such a comprehensive consumer protection bill she earned the praise of former Sen. Paul Douglas, D-Ill., the truth-in-lending legis-

lative pioneer. He admitted that in 1960 he did not dare advocate requirements of the scope contained in her 1967 bill.

She has been long enough in Congress to appreciate the Douglas advice against overloading the measure with controversial "cargo" that could sink it. But she gives no indication of exercising a woman's prerogative to change her mind to the extent of scuttling basic elements of the bill.

Admittedly in a hard fight and making no claim that the bill will go through unscathed, she explains in characteristic Missouri fashion that she has to be shown whether her version might do more harm than good. She insists on only two things at the hearings—the right to dissent and the duty to discuss every proposal fully and fairly.

As a Democrat she is a liberal who usually votes for Johnson administration programs and House Democratic leadership moves. Her party popularity and solidarity are evident in her election as secretary of the House Democratic membership caucus since 1963 and as the first woman to serve on the House Democratic Steering Committee. In 1960 she was cochairman of the Symington-for-President campaign organization.

Those partisan status symbols nevertheless have not prevented her from doing battle with the establishment both in the House and in the White House or in criticizing the handling of some housing, anti-poverty and other administration programs she favors. She voted, for instance, to trim the administration's budget request for space exploration.

In House debate last June she accused the powerful Agriculture Committee Chairman W. R. Poage, D-Texas, of "conspiring" to cripple her cherished food stamp program for the needy. In the House at least she succeeded in saving a key financial section of the bill presently bogged down in a Senate-House conference committee.

Canals and rivers, slum clearance, housing and rent subsidies, FHA mortgage insurance, small business investments, food stamps, food and drug chemical additives and inspections, food marketing—those and a myriad of other issues of particular concern to Mrs. Sullivan do not sound very glamorous, or perhaps even womanly.

WOMEN AND POLITICS

Mrs. Sullivan declares that she does not go for the glamorous idea but she is all for women in Congress being women.

"I believe that a woman should be in politics and in public life but I also firmly believe that this should come only after her first responsibility to her husband and children. Then, in today's world, she has a real responsibility to help make a better place for all of us."

Women, she says, can make a positive and practical contribution in Congress not merely by sharing in the work common to all legislators and meeting all major issues, but also by presenting ideas, needs and problems relating especially to women and families.

"Those things thus can be brought into the picture along with the sometimes different viewpoints of men. I do not find discrimination against women members in Congress. The consideration of different viewpoints can lead to effective legislation."

One of 11 women in the House for the 90th Congress and third ranking among them in continuous service, she shies away from the glamor type of news story that generally greets women newly-arrived on the congressional scene. While such a prediction is inevitable, Mrs. Sullivan counsels a congresswoman, even more than a congressman, to rely on years of parliamentary and political experience, painstaking performance of official responsibilities, and unremitting hard work and study.

In the opinion of her fellow legislators,

Mrs. Sullivan has done well in practicing what she preaches. They regard her as a good speaker who speaks in the House only when she has something to say, an attractive woman who tries not to attract too much attention, and a realistic rather than starry-eyed liberal.

HER OFFICIAL NAME

And with it all the "Mrs. John B." still stays in the Congressional Directory and other places where the name Rep. Leonor K. Sullivan officially appears. (The spelling of "Leonor," by the way was arranged by her father who chose an Edgar Allen Poe rime rather than a Beethoven overture for her name.) Except on formal or official occasions she is called "Lee."

John B. Sullivan, a St. Louis lawyer and prominent Missouri Democrat who served in the House for three terms, died suddenly as he was beginning his fourth term in 1951. He and Leonor Kretzer, then a director of a business training school in St. Louis, had been married in 1941. She came to Washington as his administrative assistant and set something of a precedent, at least for helpmates of Missouri public office holders, by accompanying him practically everywhere he campaigned.

On the perennial question of employment of wives or congressional nepotism or congressional nepotism in general, Mrs. Sullivan recalls that she worked for her husband without pay for four years. She nevertheless defended the employment of a wife or relative in cases where the staff employe really worked and could be a beneficial advisor or confidant of the congressman.

Following her husband's death she remained here on the office staff of former Rep. Leonard Irving; D-Mo. In 1952 she decided to run for Congress. She defeated a Democratic organization candidate in the primary and went on to win over the then Rep. Claude Bakewell, R-Mo.

By a special ruling from the Missouri Attorney General allowing her to be listed on the ballot as Mrs. John B. Sullivan, she made a timely and successful use of "what's in a name."

IN EIGHTH TERM

"I won on the strength of John's name and reputation," she told interviewers at her first swearing-in. "John Sullivan had a program I wanted to carry out. He believed in good government and that you had to fight to get it. In time I hope to build a reputation of my own. Then I can run as Leonor Sullivan."

Now in her eighth House term representing a district within the St. Louis city limits she has been re-elected by a 71 percent or better average every two years. She attributed her 1952 victory largely to support of organized labor. Today she attributes her good fortune to "just the people" of her district which includes the diverse population of central, western and south St. Louis.

One of nine children of a St. Louis merchant tailor, she attended public and private schools in St. Louis and took special courses at Washington University there. She taught accounting and mathematics at the business school of which she became director.

That, more than being a woman, accounted for her assignment to the Banking and Currency Committee. Her keenest competitor and one of her best friends on that committee is another veteran member, Rep. Florence Dwyer, R-N.J.

As soon as she entered Congress Mrs. Sullivan demonstrated one of her prime interests by helping to sponsor a bipartisan resolution to set up a House-Senate committee to protect the interests of consumers.

She soon branched out into other fields and activities such as boiling over in a protest to the late Secretary of State Dulles against the high price of a cup of coffee

from Brazil and cautioning women to be careful in applying lipsticks, mudpacks and other cosmetics suspected of having skin-deep dangers.

Her legislative work throughout the years has expanded into sponsorship or active support of a vast variety of bills ranging from assistance to retarded children to increased social security benefits for women, housing for the elderly and numerous facets of consumer protection. Her statements on foreign policy indicate she is neither a hawk nor a dove on Vietnam but hopes for an honorable end to the war.

Her legislative list just keeps rolling along but, unlike the song about Old Man River, it is doing something.

AMERICAN WOMEN ARE JUSTIFIABLY UPSET BY A.B.A. OPPOSITION TO POLITICAL RIGHTS OF WOMEN CONVENTION—CXXXIII

Mr. PROXMIER, Mr. President, of all the Human Rights Conventions which have been submitted to the Senate for its advice and consent the Convention on Political Rights of Women has been far and away the least controversial.

While it is true that some criticism has been raised against certain provisions of the Genocide Convention and the Forced Labor Convention, the Political Rights of Women Convention has been almost totally immune from the usual nit-picking and carping.

But the American Bar Association, in an action which has upset many American women and mystified observers of both genders at its recent annual convention in Honolulu, went on record against U.S. ratification of the Political Rights of Women Convention. The rights established by this convention are really minimal by American standards.

Article I provides that women shall be entitled to vote in all elections, on equal terms with men, without any discrimination.

Article II provides that women shall be eligible for election to all publicly elected bodies established by national law, on equal terms with men, without any discrimination.

Article III provides that women shall be entitled to hold public office and exercise all public functions, established by national law, on equal terms with men without any discrimination.

Certainly our own national experience has resoundingly proved the wisdom of the full political equality of women.

This body, itself, has been graced and enlightened by outstanding women Members. The distinguished senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] is a perfect example.

The 19th amendment to our Constitution states the principle unequivocally:

The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any state on account of sex.

While political equality of women is securely and constitutionally established in our own country, there are a number of nations—in various stages of development—where a wide gulf still exists between the political rights of men and women.

The United States has led the universal struggle for human rights for almost two

centuries by example. In the question of political rights of women, our example is particularly outstanding.

Now we can complement that leadership by participation in a worldwide effort to utilize all human resources, to extend the full franchise to half the human family. The Senate can do this by giving its advice and consent to the Convention on the Political Rights of Women, without any further delay.

NEW YORK TIMES PROTESTS ACKLEY PROPAGANDA

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this morning's New York Times carries an editorial nailing to the mast the propaganda claims of the Council of Economic Advisers that all recent economic information supports a bullish outlook for the economy, and therefore for a tax increase.

The Times sensibly calls for a more balanced and accurate statement of the economic situation from the administration's principal economic experts.

In debating this troublesome, complex, perplexing issue, Chairman Ackley does not serve the public interest or even his own cause well by adopting such a one-sided polemicist approach.

There is a case with considerable merit for a tax increase, although this Senator believes the case against it is much stronger. Certainly the public interest can be best served by acknowledging facts that buttress both sides in the argument, rather than assuming that one side represents the angels of light, the other of darkness.

I ask unanimous consent that the New York Times editorial of today, entitled "Mr. Ackley's Propaganda," be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

MR. ACKLEY'S PROPAGANDA

If the only test of a Presidential adviser were his loyalty to his superior's policies and his willingness to make propaganda for them, then Gardner Ackley would have passed with flying colors the other day when he presented his economic report to the Cabinet. There is apparently no question of the wisdom of the Administration's tax increase proposal in Mr. Ackley's mind. He believes "every recent piece of economic information" supports the forecast of a strong economic expansion now under way. Even the possibility of an automobile strike, since realized at Ford, did not weaken his conviction that the basic problem is to prevent demand from rising "more rapidly than production can keep up."

It was a curious performance. Mr. Ackley, after all, is a distinguished economist as well as chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers. It is difficult to believe, for example, that he is unaware of the full damaging potentialities the auto strike poses before the economy. Predictions are rife that the Ford stoppage may last one or two months or longer. There is enough restiveness among unionized workers at General Motors and Chrysler so that it cannot be taken for granted that the strike will not spread to one or both of these other companies even before there is a Ford settlement. In the historic showdown between auto management and auto labor that has now begun, even a complete halt to all American automobile production in the next few weeks is not beyond

the bounds of possibility. What would happen then to the strong expansion Mr. Ackley predicts so blithely?

Even more curious is the claim that all recent economic information supports a bullish forecast. This summer the stock market reached its peak in early August, then it retreated and has not yet recovered fully. Last month's improvement in the unemployment situation was very slight, and suggested more a halting of the disturbing deterioration evident last June than any major breakthrough toward really full employment. A Wall Street Journal survey finds that many American businessmen plan to continue cutting inventories, while retailers are making Christmas buying schedules in a mood of extreme caution. Other similar evidence could be cited.

Once again, in short, a spokesman for Administration economic policy has shown something less than full candor in stating the case for the tax increase. In a society where intelligent people can look at the evidence and think for themselves, this is bad propaganda as well as bad economics.

TAX INCREASE COULD BE MONUMENTAL BLUNDER

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Milwaukee Journal has once again in recent days called attention to the dangers involved in a tax increase.

In its closing paragraphs in a recent editorial the Journal writes:

To be sure, the American economy is one of mankind's most complex creations, defying precise prediction. Inflation could become a danger in months ahead. But right now the statistics do not point to overheating.

If this is so, a tax increase this fall could be monumentally mistimed, sapping the economy at the very moment it may need all its life.

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

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

CASE FOR TAX INCREASE STILL FAR FROM CONVINCING

President Johnson's case for a tax increase comes to this: The economy, despite some soft spots, is going to rebound robustly the rest of the year and a tax hike is needed to offset a huge budget deficit and thwart a surge in inflation.

The argument remains unconvincing. Although some omens of serious inflation can be cited, the preponderance of the evidence is not on his side. Unemployment is too high, business investment too weak and corporate profit too lean.

Other significant barometers are not favoring the President these days either. New orders received by factories in July turned downward for the first time in six months. Rail freight shipments, which have consistently trailed 1966 figures, have slumped even further in the third quarter. Nor can the rail situation be attributed to loss of business to truckers. Railroads have been holding their share of the intercity freight market in recent years. Moreover, truckers are reporting a business sluggishness similar to that experienced by railroads. The Ford strike may drag the economy down substantially before it ends.

These developments do not establish an immutable trend but they should help to stay the hand of congress on increasing taxes. In the past, rail freight has been an economic weather vane particularly worth watching because railroads move most of in-

dustry's raw materials as well as many of its finished products.

To be sure, the American economy is one of mankind's most complex creations, defying precise prediction. Inflation could become a danger in months ahead. But right now the statistics do not point to overheating.

If this is so, a tax increase this fall could be monumentally mistimed, sapping the economy at the very moment it may need all of its energy.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. 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.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR PROXMIRE

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the treaty vote today, which will occur at 2 o'clock, the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] be recognized for 10 minutes.

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. 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.

SENATOR MANSFIELD'S SPEECH TO THE MISSOURI BAR

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, my distinguished colleague from Montana, the majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD], is on an inspection tour of the Orient. I know that all of us look forward to hearing his report and comments after he returns to the Senate Chamber next week.

Last week, in Kansas City, Mo., Senator MANSFIELD addressed the Missouri Bar Association. A nonlawyer, but the leader of one of the world's greatest law-making bodies, the U.S. Senate, Senator MANSFIELD discussed mutual problems with Missouri's lawyers. His speech dealt with Vietnam, including the efforts to get the issue before the Security Council of the United Nations. It dealt also with domestic problems and especially the problems of the cities.

I commend his remarks to the Senate and ask unanimous consent that his speech, entitled "Troubled Times," be printed in the RECORD.

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

TROUBLED TIMES

(Remarks of Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat, of Montana, before the Missouri Bar, Kansas City, Mo., September 7, 1967)

There are, I am advised, about a thousand lawyers at this conference. A lot of lawyers.

But if my calculations are correct, this large gathering forms only .003% of the legal profession in the United States.

To a non-lawyer who happens to be a lawmaker, the thought of 300,000 lawyers gives rise to a most uncomfortable question. How can we, in the Congress, who are so few generate so much business for so many? I find even more appalling the possibility that the necessity for so many lawyers may be related to the quality of the product of the law-makers.

Be that as it may, I do know that lawmakers and lawyers share a common endeavor and a common hope. We work to strengthen the nation and the freedom and well-being of its people within a framework of law.

This joint effort is confronted in 1967 with a challenge whose character is peculiarly of our own times even if it has been of many times in the making. We are living through a long night of violence both at home and abroad. A harsh antiphony of hostility is heard throughout the nation. It rises out of the ordeal of Viet Nam and is echoed in the turbulence of the nation's cities.

The sound of violence does not set well with me or with you who are trained to seek peaceful and orderly solutions to disputes. Nevertheless, as a nation we have become so jaded by the continuous violence of our times that the sense of indignation appears dulled except at moments of fierce fury when a great city goes up in flames.

It takes a Detroit to arouse the nation. But Detroit took a toll of 43 dead and brought injury to more than 1,000 people, many of whom were peaceful bystanders. For 5 days the over-all casualties in Detroit ran at a higher rate than those which, of late, have been suffered by American forces in Viet Nam.

While Detroit burned, it was not uncommon to hear expressed as a remedy for rioting, less coddling and more cudgeling. That remedy on a massive scale is thought by some also to provide a way out of the difficulty in Viet Nam.

Experience has demonstrated, however, that it would be as futile as it is dangerous to yield to any easy indulgence of that kind at home or abroad. In the urban areas of the nation no less than in Viet Nam an abject reliance on force is a formula not so much for solutions as for stretching a summer of seething disorder into an autumn of simmering discontent and so on, from season to season and year to year.

The cure of urban ills involves something more than force, even as force is essential in the restoration of an order which has broken down. On that subject, let me say that for too long, we have expected too much for too little from the police of the nation. The police are more often than not underpaid, underprivileged, over-used and over-abused. Indeed, it is not unusual to hear the cry of "police brutality" while a policeman is being hit over the head.

A well-trained and disciplined police and the availability of a graduated supplement of force is an essential characteristic of every orderly society in the world. Anyone who makes light of the dangerous and difficult work of the police makes light of his own life and of civilized survival.

The safety and order of the community is the first responsibility of organized government. On that score, there can be no uncertain trumpet and, insofar as the federal government is concerned, there is no uncertain trumpet. President Johnson has made perfectly clear that riots will not be tolerated and rioters will not be rewarded. I want to say that insofar as the recent crises in the cities are concerned, the President has acted, in my judgment, with a blend of a firm resolve in the face of violence and a wise understanding of the plight of the urban areas.

Riots have been suppressed; they will con-

tinue to be suppressed. Rioters have not been rewarded; they will not be rewarded.

But I would hope that we would all keep our perspective as the President has kept his. We do not reward rioters when we improve the diet, the education, and the health of little children. We do not reward rioters when we stimulate the building of the kind of housing and neighborhoods in which people can live decently and safely. We do not reward rioters when we try to curb air pollution and assure a plentiful supply of pure water in metropolitan areas. We do not reward rioters when we seek to protect infants from rats.

It is one thing to reject rioting. It is another, however, to turn our backs on the difficulties of the urban areas because riots have occurred in them. Those difficulties were there before the riots. They were there during the riots. They are there now. The nation's responsibility for confronting these difficulties existed before the riots. It existed during the riots. It exists now.

It is my good fortune to come from a State where the standard ills of pollution, delinquency, ghettos and the like are not yet fixed institutions. Yet, the serious decay of urban America is of deep concern to me as I am sure it is to you and I hope that it is to all Americans wherever they may live.

The time is past, if it ever existed, when one part of the American community could ignore with impunity to itself, serious problems in the others. The fact is that distinctions of rural and urban are fast losing significance in this nation. Americans are moving in increasing numbers into and around the cities of the nation. By the year 2000, 150 million Americans will have been added to the population of the United States and it is anticipated that most of the increase will be housed in great metropolitan complexes.

That is but one relevant statistic. There is no end to other statistics which will tell us what we already know about the urban problem. They will tell of the disintegration of the physical environment by pollution of air and water. They will tell of the trek of the impoverished into the central cities and the flight out of those with means. They will tell of the grim discontent that stalks the streets of the slums, of the lack of employment opportunities therein and of the accumulation of the permanently unemployed. They will tell of the massive breakdown of family life, inadequate schools and poor recreation facilities. They will tell of miserable housing, hunger, and rats. Statistics will tell, in sum, in modern mathematical idiom, an ancient story of human poverty, neglect and degradation.

There has indeed been a long night of violence in the cities of the nation. There has also been a long night of neglect of the needs of the cities.

That is not to say that an effort has not been made, in a paraphrase of the words of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, "to get the cities moving again." We owe a great deal to him for his efforts in this direction. We owe a great deal to Lyndon B. Johnson in continuing and expanding the effort and, also, to his insistence that the effort be realistic in a financial sense. Under his leadership, and in cooperation with Congress, many federal stimulants have been applied boldly and broadly in an effort to revive the urban centers.

These efforts have cost a great deal of money. They are going to cost more. We are properly concerned with these costs and with the effectiveness of the efforts. We can properly inquire into the great number of programs which have been put into operation in the last few years. May I say that I have advocated for several years a more vigorous exercise of legislative review by the Congress in this connection. And various Senate

committees are proceeding with the job of evaluating, adjusting and improving this vast body of legislation.

It will help to keep a perspective in this process, however, if we note that the cost of the federal programs which are directed heavily at the urban and other social ills of the nation run to billions a year less than the cost of the Viet Nam war and are but a fraction of the budget of the Department of Defense which now reaches an over-all annual figure of about \$70 billion. As we have been prepared to make the effort for security of others abroad and particularly the security of Viet Nam, we must also be prepared to act for the inner security and stability of the nation.

For those of us who do not live in cities, no less than for those who do, there is a need to recognize that the way to restrain the mushrooming of violence is to defuse the seething inner cores of the metropolitan areas. As I have already noted, there can be no uncertain trumpet when the safety and order of the community are challenged. But the trumpet would sound a hollow note, indeed, if it blew over devastated community after devastated community throughout the nation.

As in the cities, so in Viet Nam, there has been from the outset of the involvement almost universal agreement that a rational solution in Viet Nam is not attainable by force alone. Nevertheless, the reliance on force has grown, escalation by escalation, until now there are few, if any rational military steps left to take within Viet Nam. What was still a primitive war among Vietnamese a few years ago has grown by successive and mutual increases in the application of force to the point where it has become a devastating war, fought with a great range of modern weapons. It has become a war, moreover, which now finds the United States in the foreground, and our Vietnamese and other allies in the background, against North Vietnamese and the Viet Cong in the foreground opposite and with China and Russia in the background opposite.

As late as May 1965, there were still only 45,000 U.S. troops in Viet Nam. A year and a half later, however, the number was 400,000. Today it stands at over 450,000 and the commitment is expected to grow to approximately 525,000 in mid-1968. These figures do not begin to take into account the tens of thousands of men in units of the 7th Fleet in Vietnamese waters nor the back-up forces in Okinawa and elsewhere, nor the heavy bomber squadrons flying out of Guam and Thailand.

The input of more than half a million American soldiers into the Vietnamese conflict does not mean that the end of the war is in sight. The end is not even in sight insofar as the demand for more men and more resources is concerned. There is talk of the need for one or two more divisions of troops. There is talk of sending Americans into the delta of the Mekong River south of Saigon, which is the Viet Cong stronghold and has heretofore been the responsibility of the South Vietnamese Army. There is pressure to enlarge and intensify the bombing of North Viet Nam even though U.S. planes have already flown to within 30 seconds of the Chinese border on bombing missions.

I do not know how much of the potential for an enlarged involvement in Viet Nam will materialize except that on the basis of experience to date, the only reasonable conclusion is that escalation will beget escalation. I do know that there is no reason to assume that additional air action will achieve what air action was supposed to have achieved months ago but has not achieved; that is, a cut off of supplies and men moving south and the bringing of Hanoi to the peace table.

I do know that when the great build-up

of U.S. forces began in mid-1965, the regular South Vietnamese army was suffering eight combat deaths for every American killed in action. In 1966, the ratio had dropped to two South Vietnamese for each American. This year, American combat deaths are on a one-for-one basis with the South Vietnamese forces and the total of U.S. dead and wounded in the Viet Nam conflict now approaches 100,000.

The costs of the war, too, have risen with the expanded involvement. About this time last year, with 235,000 American troops stationed in Viet Nam, the annual cost was estimated at \$13 billion, or slightly more than \$1 billion a month. At year's end, the annual rate of expenditure for Viet Nam was at an estimated \$21 billion or nearly \$2 billion a month. Today, it is generally calculated that monthly costs are at least \$2.5 billion.

I do not know where a solution for Viet Nam may lie or of what it might consist. I can only say that I know where it does not appear to lie and of what it does not seem to consist. In my judgment, peace does not lie in ever additional inputs of U.S. forces or in ever expanding bombing forays.

This is not a new view for me. I have felt that such was the case when there were less than 50,000 Americans in Viet Nam. I say it now when there are close to 500,000. After a mission to Viet Nam in the company of several Senate colleagues, almost two years ago, we reported that the question which confronts this nation in Viet Nam "... is not one of applying increased U.S. pressure to a defined military situation but rather of pressing against a military situation which is, in effect, open ended."

Despite the new current of rumors in Washington and elsewhere that the enemy is "on the ropes," or that we are "over the hump," I can see no reason to discard the premise that the war in Viet Nam is open-ended—that the logical sequence of greater U.S. involvement is still greater involvement, and so on, until the monster of war runs amuck over the entire Southeast Asian mainland, if not throughout the world. Behind the guerrilla war in South Viet Nam, there are still the largely unengaged forces of North Viet Nam's commander Vo Nguyen Giap. And beyond North Viet Nam, if we need to be reminded, there is China.

Therefore, I share with the President and many others the view that the dilemma of Viet Nam, in end, will yield to negotiations. To date, all efforts to initiate negotiations, however, have been in vain. Over the months many alternative approaches have been suggested. I have had occasion, for example, to urge neutralization of all of Southeast Asia and a cease-fire and standfast in Viet Nam. All-Asian negotiations and direct U.S.-Chinese meetings have been proposed. I have advocated that a defensive barrier be built across Viet Nam just south of the demilitarized zone and extended across Laos to Thailand as an alternative to an extension of the war in Asia in consequence of ever-expanding aerial bombardment. In connection therewith, I have joined Senator Cooper of Kentucky and others in advocating a contraction of bombing to the routes of infiltration in the vicinity of the 17th parallel.

Finally, it has been suggested time and again that the United Nations Security Council might at least initiate a consideration of the question of Viet Nam. The Council has not only failed to act, it has failed even to acknowledge, in an official sense, the existence of the Vietnamese conflict as a threat to the peace. A future reader of official U.N. papers for this trying period in world history would scarcely be aware that a major war had occurred in Southeast Asia. That would be the case unless he read the personal papers of the Secretary General. U Thant has sought to act on his own initiative in his diplomatic capacity to end the war. However, the provisions of the Charter

involving the peace-keeping functions which bind the member-nations have not been engaged.

Let me make clear that the U.N. should not be expected to produce miracles of solution with respect to Viet Nam, inasmuch as all the other avenues, which have been tried, have so far come to dead ends. The world organization, however, does have a mandate regarding the preservation of peace. The members of the Security Council, including the United States, do have a compelling responsibility under the United Nations Charter.

Article I contains a treaty obligation which requires the organization to "take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace. . . ." With all due respect, it does not take a lawyer to interpret this solemn commitment and the responsibility which it places on the United States and all other members of the Security Council.

The vehicle for bringing the question of Viet Nam before the Council is already present in the form of a U.S. resolution which was introduced at the beginning of the year. It has not yet been called up in the Council for reasons which are far from clear. Yet the procedural question of calling up is subject to vote and it is veto-proof under the precedents. Moreover, the precedents are there which would allow involved parties that are not members of the U.N. to participate in the consideration and that, too, on the basis of precedent is not vetoable. In sum, Peking can be included; Hanoi and Saigon can be included; and so too, for that matter if the Council so decides, can the National Liberation Front or any other pertinent nation or group. You may recall that Peking did appear before the Council some years ago in connection with the Korean question. You may recall, too, that in the original Palestine dispute in 1948, two non-governmental groups—the Jewish agency for Palestine and the Arab Higher Committee—were invited by the Council to present their case and the former did appear.

In recent weeks twenty-seven Senators, including Senators Symington and Long have joined in urging that the United States government insist that its resolution on Viet Nam be laid before the U.N. Security Council and, that if necessary, a vote be had—win or lose—on the question of taking up. In our judgment, it is long past the time for the member states and all others involved in Viet Nam to stand up and be counted. At this late hour, we need to know and the world needs to know who is prepared and who is not prepared to move to bring the military struggle to a close without delay and, thereafter, to seek a resolution of the issues of Viet Nam by peaceful processes.

The long night of violence in Viet Nam will know no dawn until the world community can end the diplomatic inertia which has characterized its reaction to Viet Nam. Until the war is brought to an end, moreover, the hope of removing the roots of disorder in our cities may well remain beyond our reach.

FLY ASH UTILIZATION

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in March of this year, a symposium on fly ash utilization, sponsored by the Edison Electric Institute, the National Coal Association, and the U.S. Bureau of Mines, was held in Pittsburgh, Pa. More than 500 industrial, academic, and government representatives from Europe, Canada, and the United States attended the symposium, where the discussions were devoted to the availability, specifications, marketing, utilization, and research of fly ash, a byproduct of coal.

The proceedings of the symposium are included in Information Circular No. 8348, prepared by the Bureau of Mines, U.S. Department of the Interior. I ask unanimous consent that the introduction to the proceedings and the abstracts of papers presented be printed in the RECORD.

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

[Proceedings: Edison Electric Institute-National Coal Association-Bureau of Mines Symposium, Pittsburgh, Pa., Mar. 14-16, 1967]

FLY ASH UTILIZATION

(Compiled by John H. Faber,¹ John P. Capp,² and John D. Spencer³)

INTRODUCTION

Over 500 industrial, academic, and government representatives from Europe, Canada, and the United States attended the first large symposium ever held in this country on fly ash utilization and technology, March 14-16, 1967, at Pittsburgh, Pa. Sponsored by the Edison Electric Institute, the National Coal Association, and the Bureau of Mines, the symposium featured 27 formal presentations by leading experts from the United States and Europe on all major phases of fly ash production, utilization, and research. Representing the three sponsoring organizations were Edison Electric Institute, James D. Williamson, The Dayton Power and Light Co.; National Coal Association, James R. Garvey, Bituminous Coal Research, Inc.; and Bureau of Mines, Harry Perry. Symposium chairman was John H. Faber of the Bureau of Mines.

Gerard C. Gambs, Consolidation Coal Co., addressed the opening session. Moderated by Mr. Garvey, President and Director of Research of Bituminous Coal Research, Inc., the opening session was devoted to a discussion of the nature of the fly ash problem, including availability, specifications, and limitations on its use. Subsequent sessions covered fly ash marketing, fly ash utilization in concrete and masonry products, specialized uses, and recent developments in basic fly ash research. Others serving as session chairmen were Oscar E. Manz, Associate Professor of Civil Engineering, University of North Dakota; Mrs. Katharine Mather, Chief, Petrography and X-ray Section, Concrete Division, U.S. Army Engineers Waterways Experiment Station; Mr. Williamson, and Mr. Perry.

During the week of the symposium a group of Fly Ash Experts representing the Economic Commission for Europe (ECE), under the sponsorship of the United Nations, participated in official meetings of the Commission and highlighted one of the symposium sessions. At this session, four members of the Fly Ash Experts group described the ECE's work in fly ash utilization, and current practices in several European countries. Presenting these papers were Z. Falecki, Coal Committee Secretariat, ECE, Geneva, Switzerland; Henry W. G. Dedman, Central Electricity Generating Board, London, England; Adolphe Jarrige, Consulting Engineer (retired), Paris, France; Hermann Erythropel, Chief Research and Development Department, Steinkohlen-Electrizat AG, Essen, Germany; Antoni Paprocki, Assistant Professor, Institute of Building Technics, Warsaw, Poland; and Dr. Vladimir V. Stoinikov, Chief of the Concrete Laboratory, All-Union Research Institute of Hydrotechnics, Leningrad, U.S.S.R.

¹ Supervisory chemical research engineer.

² Chemical research engineer.

³ Chemical engineer.

NOTE.—The compilers are with the Morgantown Coal Research Center, Bureau of Mines, Morgantown, W. Va.

Luncheon speakers were Joseph Pursglove, Jr., Vice President-Chemicals, Consolidation Coal Co., Inc., and Harry A. Fisher, Materials Handling Engineer, American Electric Power Service. The latter substituted for John A. Tillinghast, Vice President and Chief Engineer, American Electric Power Service Corp., who was unable to attend because of illness. The Honorable Kenneth Holum, Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Water and Power Development, who was scheduled to address the assemblage at the symposium banquet, was also unable to attend. His remarks were delivered by Robert M. Paul, Water and Power Development, U.S. Department of the Interior.

Sidney Katell, Bureau of Mines, U.S. Department of the Interior, served as toastmaster.

The proceedings of the symposium are given in this report, following the abstracts of all the papers.

Trade names appearing in these papers are solely for purposes of identification and to facilitate understanding. Endorsement by the Bureau of Mines is not implied.

ABSTRACTS OF PAPERS

AVAILABILITY, QUALITY, AND PRESENT UTILIZATION OF FLY ASH

(By C. E. Brackett, operating manager, Southern Electric Generating Co., Birmingham, Ala.)

This paper presents basic data on current availability, quality, and use of fly ash. In doing this, the author points out a few of the problems facing the industry as a whole and suggests a few practical methods which can be used to solve some of these problems. He also emphasizes the need for much additional basic research data on fly ash so that a quality product can be produced and sold at all times and under all conditions.

SPECIFICATIONS, LIMITATIONS, AND RESTRICTIONS

(By M. Jack Snyder, chief, Ceramic Research Division, Battelle-Columbus Laboratories, Columbus, Ohio)

In most cases, the selection of characteristics of fly ash to be specified and the specified limits on these characteristics have been based on empirical correlations between the characteristics of a wide variety of fly ash samples and the resultant properties of products made from these samples. Differences in specifications by various groups are given, along with detailed specifications on fly ash for use in concrete. Limitations and restrictions include lack of knowledge on specifications and testing methods, variability of fly ash, existence of broad patents, and marketing factors. A pessimistic outlook for fly ash marketing is presented, but progress is indicated as promising. The work now going on will likely lead to more realistic specifications and confidence in fly ash use.

RAW MATERIALS FOR MANUFACTURERS OF CEMENT

(By William R. Barton, Senior Commodities Specialist, Bureau of Mines, U.S. Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C.)

The domestic portland cement industry consumes more than 12 million tons annually of raw materials chemically similar to fly ash. How these materials are used and how fly ash can serve in their place are discussed. Factors favoring whether a particular plant will use fly ash in place of an alternate material are described and so are negative factors which would disqualify fly ash as a raw batch component at some sites.

PRODUCING SPECIFICATION FLY ASH

(By Henry C. Skaggs, Appalachian Power Co., and Ronald E. Morrison, American Electric Power Service Corp., Charleston, W. Va.)

Described in this paper is the experience of the Appalachian Power Co. in producing specification fly ash at its Kanawha River

Plant. Boiler adjustments, coal-fineness control, ash sampling, and other factors are discussed. Details are also given on a fly ash processing plant for producing a specification product.

PROBLEMS IN FLY ASH MARKETING

(By F. V. Zimmer, sales and development engineer, the Detroit Edison Co., Detroit, Mich.)

In approaching this topic, the author thought it appropriate to provide a short history of pulverized fuel and to present factors that guide the activity of marketing the resulting ash. A brief description of some of the major fly ash markets is included to point out problems associated with these markets.

FLY ASH IN MASS CONCRETE

(By Robert E. Philleo, Research and Development and Standards Section, Concrete Branch, Engineering Division, Civil Works, Department of Army, Office, Chief of Engineers, Washington, D.C.)

Fly ash is used in mass concrete for two principal reasons: (1) economy and (2) reduction of heat generation within the concrete. The Bureau of Reclamation and Corps of Engineers specify a low-carbon fly ash and use it as a straight replacement for a portion of the portland cement. Ontario-Hydro uses ash from its peaking powerplants and, therefore, has developed a technique for using high-carbon ash. TVA has used coarse ash from mechanical collectors, partially as cement replacement and partially as aggregate replacement. European practice is to use portland-pozzolan cement. Research indicates that the proportion of fly ash in interior mass concrete may be increased.

FLY ASH IN READY-MIX CONCRETE

(By Edward J. Hyland, service engineer, Chicago Fly Ash Co., Chicago, Ill.)

Use of fly ash in ready-mix concrete offers a long-term solution to the fly ash disposal problem because large quantities can be absorbed by this potential market. To tap this market, however, producers must consistently supply a high-quality, uniform fly ash. The fly ash broker or sales engineer, to be truly effective, should know the type of customer he is dealing with and have a mastery of the technical aspects of fly ash-concrete mixes. Of equal importance is the giving of extra service such as aggregate analysis or concrete-mix design. National acceptance of concrete containing fly ash can be brought about through widespread advertising, participation in trade conventions, and the combined efforts of all interested parties.

FLY ASH IN ROADWAY CONSTRUCTION

(By J. A. Hester, assistant testing engineer, Alabama Highway Department, Montgomery, Ala.)

Fly ash is presently used in three types of Alabama highway construction: Base course stabilization, concrete bridges, and concrete pavement. The lime-fly ash stabilization projects are experimental, but the Alabama Highway Department has established specifications for fly ash used in concrete construction, and this material is now widely used in the State. Superior workability, flexural strength, and resistance to sulfate attack are claimed for fly ash concrete.

FLY ASH IN CONCRETE AND CONCRETE BLOCK

(By Joseph R. Belot, Jr., vice president, Belot Concrete Block Co., Tiltonville, Ohio)

Producers of ready-mix concrete and concrete blocks use fly ash because it is profitable, increases workability, decreases shrinkage, and produces a high-quality material. Users of fly ash must be certain, however, that it meets specifications and uniformity standards by means of a regular testing program. Increased acceptance of fly ash in concrete products will depend upon educational and promotional programs carried out through the concrete product manufacturers

and their trade associations in cooperation with coal producers and electric power producers.

FLY ASH IN CONCRETE MANUFACTURING

(By John Seabright, Delta Concrete Co., Bellaire, Ohio)

A quality concrete producer who can keep his variation in quality at a minimum is able to market concrete on a strength basis. With fly ash, he can improve the quality of his concrete as far as workability and finishability are concerned, while effecting sizeable cost reductions by eliminating portland cement provided he has the necessary communication and field control so as to make adjustments to the added variables brought about with the use of fly ash.

The greatest advantage of fly ash concrete, namely, its retardation effect, is also its greatest limitation. Research should be done to determine the ill effects, if any, that result from use of accelerators, which must be used in order to market fly ash concrete on an overall year-round basis.

LIME-FLY ASH-AGGREGATE MIXTURES

(By Ernest J. Barenberg, assistant professor of civil engineering, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.)

This presentation summarizes findings from research on lime-fly ash-aggregate mixtures. In certain instances, findings reported in the literature are supplemented by unpublished data. A brief summarization is also made concerning the influence of certain physical properties on the behavior and performance of pavements with lime-fly ash-aggregate materials.

THE UNITED NATIONS ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE AND ITS WORK IN THE FIELD OF THE UTILIZATION OF ASH PRODUCED BY THERMAL POWERPLANTS

(By Zygmunt Falecki, Economic Affairs Office, Secretariat of the U.N. Economic Commission for Europe, Coal Section, Energy Division, Geneva, Switzerland)

This paper describes the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (ECE) and its role in improving economic conditions in Europe and the world. The information exchange media of the Commission are described, along with its cooperative efforts. Highlighted is an account of the work of the ECE on fly ash utilization, including a list of major documents pertaining to activities in ash utilization published by the Secretariat.

AN ATTEMPT TO EXPLAIN FRENCH SUCCESS IN THE UTILIZATION OF FLY ASH

(By Adolphe Jarrige, consultant engineer (retired), Paris, France)

There are two types of utilization of fly ash: Commercial cements and roadbuilding operations. During 1965, both these utilizations reached a level in France not observed in other countries. These results are attributable to special circumstances and to certain human initiatives, which differ for each of the two groups, but also to an overall situation with regard to the coordination of work, particularly with respect to technical research.

THE COMMERCIAL UTILIZATION OF PULVERIZED FUEL ASH FROM POWER STATIONS OF THE CENTRAL ELECTRICITY GENERATING BOARD

(By Henry W. G. Dedman, ash marketing officer, Central Electricity Generating Board, London, England)

Fly ash has been developed into a valuable byproduct of the electric generating industry through intensive research, application, and marketing programs, leading to its widespread use as a building and construction material. In Britain, fly ash-clay bricks, lightweight aggregates, concrete products, and road construction uses absorb over 40 percent of the total output. The degree of progress so far achieved is attributed to the

organization of a system of marketing and timely, convincing publicity.

ASH PRODUCTION AND UTILIZATION IN THE GERMAN FEDERAL REPUBLIC

(By Hermann Erythropel, chief, Research and Development Department, Steinkohlen-Elektrizität A.G., Essen, Germany)

In the Federal Republic of Germany the utilization of brown coal ash is practically impossible, so that these have to be dumped as before. The production of hard coal ash is about 5.8 million tons. This quantity will probably not rise very much during the next few years because the consumption of high-ash coal is declining at present. Of these ashes, about 63 percent is utilized. This percentage, however, will continue to rise, owing to the promotion and instruction organized by private enterprise, and it should be understood that the processes yielding a cheap intermediate product at low capital outlay will be favored.

PRODUCTION AND UTILIZATION OF FLY ASH IN POLAND

(By Antoni Paprocki, assistant professor, Institute of Building Technics, Warsaw, Poland)

Although production and utilization of fly ash in Poland are increasing yearly, the latter lags behind the former and by 1975 almost 5 million tons will have to be discarded. Comparative reactivity tests between fly ash and several types of aggregate show that fly ash has binding properties and should not be treated as an aggregate. A test procedure is described to evaluate the degree of pozzolanic reactivity of fly ash.

FLY ASH IN CEMENT AND CONCRETE

(By Dr. Vladimir V. Stolnikov, chief of the concrete laboratory, All-Union Research Institute of Hydrotechnics, U.S.S.R.; Chairman of the International Committee on Concrete for Large Dams of the ICOLD)

A short discussion is presented on the investigation of fly ash utilization in the Concrete Laboratory, Hydrotechnics Research Institute, Leningrad. The properties of fly ash cement and concrete are described, including specific surface area, water requirements, and the effect of steam curing, particularly on the strength of the product.

EXPERIENCE IN PRODUCTION AND UTILIZATION OF LIGHTWEIGHT AGGREGATE AT CONSOLIDATED EDISON

(By Arthur S. Pearson, division engineer, Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc.)

Consolidated Edison in 1966 collected 350,000 tons of fly ash and sold 60,000 tons (17.2 percent) for commercial purposes. Disposal of the difference cost more than \$550,000, not including capital investment, and operating costs for equipment. Several years of experience in building and operating a lightweight aggregate plant are described, including boiler changes for aggregate quality control. Principal commercial applications for sintered fly ash are discussed, along with marketing experience and promotion activities.

STATUS REPORT ON BRICKS FROM FLY ASH

(By H. E. Shafer, Jr., research geologist, C. F. Cockrell, project research engineer, K. K. Humphreys, cost engineer, and J. W. Leonard, director, Coal Research Bureau, West Virginia University, Morgantown, W. Va.)

Optimization of the West Virginia University-U.S. Department of the Interior, Office of Coal Research fly ash-based brick process for each fly ash-aggregate combination can produce even higher quality brick than those reported previously. Originally, estimated production costs for a fly ash from one source was \$30.52/1,000 brick, assuming a value of \$1 per ton for fly ash; however, optimization tests together with the use of actual rather than estimated equipment cost has shown that the cost of producing brick from this same fly ash can be reduced to \$22.22/1,000 brick. A pilot plant for producing fly ash-

based structural materials is now under construction and should be in operation by late spring of 1967. The plant is so designed that it will be capable of producing tonnage lots of fly ash brick, hollow block, and paving tile. In keeping with the objectives of the pilot plant program, broad-scale and conclusive cost and optimization studies as well as marketing surveys are underway.

CONSUMER ECONOMICS: USE OF FLY ASH IN CONCRETE

(By L. W. Hoy, structural engineer, Weirton Steel Division, National Steel Corp., Weirton, W. Va.)

New and more economical methods of production, fabrication, installation, and erection are a necessary development to maintain a competitive position in our industrialized world. Material prices and wages are increasing constantly, making it mandatory that industry produce a better product more quickly and more economically. The reduction of costs, no matter how relative the area may be in reference to the final product, is constantly being scrutinized in every possible respect so that the ultimate realization of lower total costs may be effected. The use of concrete in the production of steel is not a direct cost, but the reduction of installation and maintenance costs, where concrete is increasingly being used, results in a substantial reduction in a finished ton of steel. Increased technological advances in concrete increases the scope of concrete uses and ultimately will decrease the final product costs.

FLY ASH AGRICULTURE

(By John P. Capp, chemical research engineer, Morgantown Coal Research Center, Morgantown, W. Va., and Dr. Carl F. Engle, assistant professor of agronomy, West Virginia University, Morgantown, W. Va.)

Sintered and raw (unsintered) fly ash in various proportions up to 75 percent was mixed with soils in greenhouse and field tests to evaluate the powerplant waste as an acid soil neutralizer, soil conditioner, and source of trace plant nutrients. In the greenhouse tests, the total dry weight of the first harvest of some plants was greater than that of control plants, with a progressive increase in harvest weight accompanying an increase in percentage of sintered fly ash in the mixture. Toxicity effects of raw fly ash were largely eliminated by adding a high proportion of organic matter (peat). In the field-scale tests, the addition of raw fly ash having a relatively high pH successfully neutralized highly acid surface-mine spoils. Kentucky 31 fescue was planted on the neutralized spoils and established a luxuriant turf in a short time.

UTILIZATION OF FLY ASH IN THE CEMENTING OF WELLS

(By Dwight K. Smith, section supervisor, Research and Development Department, Halliburton Co., Duncan, Okla.)

Fly ash as an additive for oil well cement was introduced to the oil industry by the Halliburton Co. in 1949. Since its early usage in Illinois, the total amount of fly ash pumped into wells has exceeded 30 million sacks. The advantages of using fly ash-portland cement mixtures in wells are fundamentally the same as for concrete except the conditions of placement and curing are variable and the nomenclature of properties are expressed somewhat differently. In some instances deep wells have been cemented with mixtures of fly ash and hydrated lime together with an activator which functions as a catalyst for setting. This fly ash-lime formula has many advantages for high temperature-pressure conditions found in wells.

USE OF FLY ASH IN SPECIALIZED CONCRETE WORK

(By Georg O. Bergemann, Jr., district engineer, the Prepakt Concrete Co., Cleveland, Ohio)

This paper is intended to give a brief history of the Prepakt process application for

"preplaced aggregate concrete" and how fly ash contributes appreciably to its strength, workability, impermeability, and economy. Illustrations and descriptions are also discussed to demonstrate how fly ash is employed in preplaced aggregate concrete to aid its qualities of drying shrinkage, resistance to weathering, and moduli of rupture and elasticity.

FUTURE OF FLY ASH USE

(By Glynn L. Coryell, director, Technical Services Department, National Coal Association, Washington, D.C.)

Discusses the highlights of papers presented at the Fly Ash Utilization Symposium.

ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE

(Meeting summary: By Henry W. G. Dedman, ash marketing officer, Central Electricity Generating Board, London, England, and Chairman of the ECE Group of Experts (U.K.))

An expression of appreciation is given to United States officials for sponsoring the Fly Ash Utilization Symposium and serving as host to the European visitors. Brief minutes are presented covering the first Session of the ECE Group of Experts on Utilization of Ash, March 13 and 17, 1967.

NUCLEAR MEASUREMENT OF CARBON IN FLY ASH

(By Robert F. Stewart, research chemist, and William F. Farrow, Jr., research chemist, Morgantown Coal Research Center, Morgantown, W. Va.)

A nuclear method for the continuous measurement of carbon in fly ash was demonstrated as technically feasible. The number of carbon gamma rays from inelastic scatter of neutrons is proportional to the carbon content of 12- and 20-pound samples. Carbon in fly ashes containing 2 to 16 percent carbon was determined within 0.5 percent carbon, and repeated tests measuring the carbon content of iron ore sinter mix showed a precision of 0.2 percent. The accuracy may be adequate for process control, and the technique shows promise of being adaptable to carbon monitoring of any granular material moving at high-tonnage flow rates.

ASTM SPECIFICATIONS ON FLY ASH FOR USE IN CONCRETE

(By Richard C. Mielenz, vice president, Product Development, Master Builders, Division Martin-Marietta Corp., Cleveland, Ohio)

Committee C-1 on Cement and Committee C-9 on Concrete and Concrete Aggregates of the American Society for Testing and Materials have prepared two tentative standards that cover specifications and methods of test for fly ash as an admixture for portland cement concrete (ASTM Designations: C 350 and C 311, respectively) and a tentative standard on portland-pozzolan cement in which fly ash may be used as the pozzolan. Issued in 1953-54, these standards have been modified as new data and information became available. The specifications provide a sound basis for purchase of fly ash for use in cement and concrete for construction purposes.

REACTIONS OF HYDRATED LIME WITH PULVERIZED COAL FLY ASH

(By L. John Minnick, vice president in charge of research, G. & G. H. Corson, Inc., Plymouth Meeting, Pa.)

Lime-fly ash specimens were cured at constant temperature and subjected to X-ray diffractometry, differential thermal analysis, pozzolanic reactivity tests, and microscopical investigations. Bars of lime-fly ash were subjected to cycles of wetting and drying, and measurements of length change were recorded. A discussion of variations within and among types of lime is presented. The nature of the pozzolanic reaction is reviewed, particularly as related to compounds which are used up and formed during the aging process. The relationship between the pozzolanic re-

action and the resultant physical properties of the mixtures is examined.

THE POVERTY PROGRAM AND CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the highly respected and often quoted financial weekly, *Barron's* magazine, addressed itself in a recent issue to the involvement of the poverty program in incidents of civil disobedience.

Tax subsidized lobbying is odious indeed, but Federal agency involvement in local disorders undermines our entire social and political structure.

I ask that the *Barron's* 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:

POVERTY WARRIORS: THE RIOTS ARE SUBSIDIZED AS WELL AS ORGANIZED

Marion Barry and Rufus Mayfield are angry young men. Former national head of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), Mr. Barry in August, 1965, took part in a protest demonstration organized by the so-called Assembly of Unrepresented People. He was arrested and charged with disorderly conduct while leading demonstrators onto the Capitol grounds. "Riot power and rebellion power," he was quoted as saying last week, "might make people listen now." Mr. Mayfield is a Black Muslim. Twenty-one years old, he has spent most of the past eight years in prison for various offenses, including petty and grand larceny. This month Marion Barry acquired gainful employment. He was hired as a \$50-per-day consultant by the United Planning Organization, top anti-poverty agency for the District of Columbia. Rufus Mayfield, according to Rep. Joel P. Broyhill (R., Va.), will serve as Barry's "back-up man."

While perhaps more arresting than most, these are not isolated instances. On the contrary, the files fairly bulge with equally radical cases in point. Thus, federal and state investigations of New York's Mobilization for Youth, pilot project for the Job Corps, disclosed that its staff included several members of the Communist Party. LeRoi Jones, who was taken into custody during the riots in Newark and charged with illegal possession of deadly weapons, once ran a hate-the-whites Black Arts Theater which got \$115,000 in federal funds from Haryou-ACT before police discovered an arsenal on the premises. The Southwest Alabama Farmers Cooperative Association of Selma, which the Office of Economic Opportunity recently granted \$700,000, numbers among its principals John Zippert and Shirley Mesher. Louisiana's Joint Legislative Committee on Un-American Activities recently documented Mr. Zippert's association with radical causes, including the Kremlin-financed World Youth Festival. According to the Alabama Legislative Commission to Preserve the Peace, Miss Mesher, a former coordinator for SNCC, is "a prime participant in the Black Panther movement designed to overthrow the government . . ."

Right after Watts (Barron's, August 23, 1965), we observed: "In the name of civil rights, a small band of ruthless men has not hesitated to stir up violence, break the law and undermine duly constituted authority. The so-called civil rights revolution . . . has begun to mean exactly what it says." Since then compelling evidence, including eyewitness testimony and the findings of a Cleveland grand jury, has shown that the riots are less spontaneous outbreaks than carefully planned subversion. To judge by the record, moreover, civil unrest is not only organized but also subsidized. Thanks to the Office of Economic Opportunity, the U.S. taxpayer now has a chance to finance his own

destruction. The Great Society, so Newark, Detroit and scores of other smouldering cities suggest, cannot coexist with the American way of life.

Like the poor, slums and rats have always been with us. Only the devastating riots—and the professional agitators who prepare the tinder, await a spark and fan the flames—are significantly new. The 1964 outbursts in Harlem turned up William Epton, vice-chairman of the Red-Chinese-oriented Progressive Labor Party, who taught people how to make Molotov cocktails. Mr. Epton was convicted of criminal anarchy for his part in the riots. The Rev. Billy Graham called Watts a "dress rehearsal for revolution," a description in which radical spokesmen ever since have gloried. Last year's riots in Cleveland, charged Sen. Frank Lausche (Dem., O.) were the work of a "national conspiracy executed by experts." Shortly afterward a Cleveland grand jury, after hearing the testimony of detectives who penetrated the conspirators' ranks, found that "the outbreak of lawlessness and disorder was organized, precipitated and exploited by a relatively small group of trained and disciplined professionals." In a story on the Newark riots, the current issue of *Life* Magazine describes its reporters' "clandestine meeting with members of the sniper organization." Finally, SNCC's Stokeley Carmichael, whose subversive interests range far and wide, openly boasts of what's afoot. After a quick trip to Prague, he landed last week in Havana. There he told newsmen: "In Newark we applied (guerrilla) war tactics . . . We are preparing groups of urban guerrillas . . . It is going to be a fight to the death."

So much for subversion, which the country will ignore at its own risk. As to federal subsidy of violence, an ominous pattern has emerged. From the beginning, as radicals recognized, the war on poverty, notably the Community Action Programs, had impressive trouble-making potentials. Somehow CAP has expanded much faster than OEO expenditures as a whole, surging from \$246.5 million in fiscal '66 to an estimated \$500 million in the current fiscal year. As noted above (much of the material comes from a forthcoming book, "Poverty Is Where the Money Is," to be published by Arlington House and written by Shirley Scheibla, Washington correspondent for *Barron's*), some of the money funded dubious ventures and put jailbirds and subversives on the federal payroll. Mrs. Scheibla cites other horrible examples: John Ross, a member of the Progressive Labor Party, who served on an anti-poverty board in San Francisco; Howard Harowitz, member of a similar board in Berkeley and former member of the W.E.B. DuBois Clubs, which the FBI calls "Communist-spawned"; and a number of U.P.O. personnel in Washington, D.C., who turned out to be SNCC organizers and agitators.

Taxpayer-financed trouble has exploded in one part of the country after another. Last fall the mayor of Perth Amboy, N.J., accused the local anti-poverty leader of seeking "to foment and incite unrest, agitation and disorder," a charge which the city manager of Rochester echoed last week. Newark's police chief weeks ago warned that the city faced anarchy because of agitation by federal anti-poverty workers, several of whom were arrested during the riots. In New York City five marauding young Negroes, collared while looting stores on Fifth Avenue, worked for the anti-poverty program; one wore a sweater blazoned, after the OEO-funded agency, "Harlem Youth Opportunities Unlimited."

To fight riots with OEO grants, in short, is like fighting fire with gasoline. However, Sargent Shriver alone is not to blame. Some of the fault lies with local officials like New York's Mayor Lindsay (tapped last week to serve on the President's special advisory body), who repeatedly refused to condemn the appearance of his Human Rights Com-

missioner at the Black Power conference in Newark, as well as with Mayor Cavanagh of Detroit (first recipient of OEO aid and welfare state showcase), who tied the hands of the police for the first few strategic hours. On the federal level, the country should call to account the Office of Attorney-General and its three recent occupants: Robert Kennedy, who once wrote a letter to the head of an identified Communist front, seeking advice on a national service corps; Nicholas Katzenbach, who shrugged off all evidence of conspiracy; and the incumbent, Ramsey Clark, who testified against pending anti-riot legislation. The blame reaches right up to the official White House family, to Vice President Humphrey, who last summer said that if he lived in a rat-infested slum: "there is enough of a spark left in me to lead a pretty good revolt."

Law and order are the stuff of civilization; they are also the first duty of government. On the record, "liberals" of both parties, by tolerating subversion, have made a mockery of their oaths of office and forfeited the public's trust. Appeals to prayer are all well and good, but what this country needs is a political and philosophic call to arms.

EXCELLENT SPEECH BY SECRETARY UDALL

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, on August 28, 1967, Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall made a magnificent speech before a Democratic Party dinner attended by more than 1,200 Democrats at the Sheraton-Cleveland Hotel, in Cleveland, Ohio. While he addressed a political meeting, his remarks were essentially nonpolitical and concerned the many serious problems facing all Americans.

Mr. President, Secretary Udall was an outstanding Member of the House of Representatives. His reputation as one of the leading conservationists of the Nation was well established before he became a member of the Cabinet. He has been a great Secretary of the Interior. Future generations of Americans will be indebted to him for his efforts to preserve their God-given natural heritage, and I am confident that in years to come he will be looked upon as one of the Nation's greatest Secretaries of the Interior.

His remarks in Cleveland are another indication of the insight and ability he has brought to his high office. I ask unanimous consent that his speech be printed in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS BY SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR STEWART L. UDALL AT THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY DINNER, CLEVELAND, OHIO, AUGUST 28, 1967

There was a time, not very long ago, when Secretaries of the Interior seldom, if ever, visited Cleveland. The Interior Department during most of the years since it was established in 1849 was a regional department of government for the most part—chiefly involved in managing national parks, public lands, Indian reservations and water resources, nearly all of which were in the Far West. The Kennedy and Johnson Administrations have changed that permanently. The Interior Department is a truly national department, with responsibilities for the environment that extend from one corner of the country to the other. Water pollution control has been added to our responsibilities. The creation of the Land and Water Conservation

Fund, managed by the relatively new Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, has given us a whole new range of duties. Much of the experimental work now conducted by bureaus of the Interior Department is directed toward reducing air pollution and halting the wanton dismemberment of the American landscape.

The people of our country have come to realize that the environment in which they live is indivisible—that pollution is an interstate problem which cannot be solved without cooperation between government and industry—that open space and recreational opportunity is needed by all Americans. A natural resource agency must concern itself directly with the conditions of human life. That is what we have come to grips with in recent years. More and more we feel that we are where the action is because nothing is more important to people than their water and air, and the view from their windows, and the places where their children play.

The kind of environment a man lives in has a great deal to do with the kind of man he is. If you grow up and live with plenty of space around you, if you enjoy ample opportunity to feel the sun on your shoulders and a fresh breeze in your face, if you have privacy and no fear for your safety, then it is easy and natural to feel that you have a big stake in your country and in the success of its institutions. America has been kind to you and me. We take these amenities almost for granted. But for millions of our fellow citizens, some of these things, if not all, are as remote as the far side of the moon. Their lives are characterized by lack of opportunity, poverty, ignorance, squalor, despair. Their world seems bounded by rat-infested slums. The cities, apex of Western man's civilization, must seem like grim prisons to many of our countrymen—prisons without even the security afforded inmates in our better-run penitentiaries.

It is not difficult to understand why people may feel this way who lack a livable environment. Government at every level, business and industry, the foundations and the universities, the volunteer organizations, labor unions, and private citizens all have a tremendous stake in our indivisible environment and in maintaining an American society that is not divided against itself. All of us have a lot of work to do in rebuilding our inner cities, in helping people to become more productive, in removing the environmental pollution that menaces the health and well-being of all of us.

I have heard some inspiring things about Cleveland's success with its AIM-JOBS program, financed with Federal help under the Manpower Development and Training Act. A highly encouraging aspect of this program, as it has been explained to me, is that top industrial firms have lent it some of their finest executive talent. I understand that a key to its success is the concept of sticking with the individual until he can stick with a job.

That kind of tenacity, it seems to me, is the surest way to build a man's confidence and feeling of being productive. One-shot, hit or miss approaches cannot begin to accomplish the same kind of results, when we try to deal with hard core problems.

Our country is face to face with some hard core problems in its cities today. To help solve them, the Johnson Administration proposes to stick with several of the programs it has launched in the last two or three years, and to start some new ones. We all realize that tenacity will be needed, because results will not come overnight. The costs will be major. A recent count placed the necessary funding for this fiscal year alone at six or seven billion dollars, to cover programs ranging from crime control and Project Head Start to model cities and aid to elementary and secondary schools. Big as they are, these figures have been pared down with great care.

We may ask ourselves—fighting a painful and costly but necessary fight in Vietnam—whether we can afford to pay six or seven billion dollars a year for these urban-oriented programs. One good look around us ought to answer the question. Either from the viewpoint of moral fervor or the brass tacks of enlightened self-interest, we cannot afford not to pay these bills.

Let us for just a moment look ahead to the turn of the next century. Look into your own heart and ask yourself what you want your children, and their children, to think of us all from that perspective of 30 or 40 years hence.

Will they have reason to be proud of us for fulfilling our promises at home and abroad?

Will they remember us as the generation that faced up to the crisis of the cities, the generation that began in earnest to clean up the environment?

Will they enjoy outings on a clean Lake Erie, drink good water from the Cuyahoga River? Or will they find themselves beyond the point of no return in a sick and fouled country where the American dream has become a nightmare . . . because we lacked the will and the tenacity to get on with the job today?

Higher taxes are never a pleasant subject, but the bills have to be paid. We still enjoy the best standard of living in the world; we still are incomparably the richest nation in the history of man. We can hardly plead inability to pay, even though paying may be unpleasant.

In preparing for this meeting with you, I asked the Treasury Department for some specifics on just how unpleasant the Administration's proposed 10 percent income tax surcharge would be. The Internal Revenue people told me this:

The 16 million taxpayers in the two lowest income brackets would be exempt from any surcharge. For example, a married couple with two children, scraping along on less than \$5,000 a year, would pay no added tax.

A family of four with an income of \$10,000 a year would pay at most an added tax of \$9.25 per month, or about \$2 per week. But the three out of four American families whose incomes are below \$10,000 a year would pay less or no added tax at all.

The tables sent over by Internal Revenue showed something else of interest. For most of us, the surcharge would run about half the amount of the tax cut we received in 1964. We have had the benefit of that very substantial tax cut for three years now. We are way ahead, and we would remain ahead.

The surcharge would raise an estimated \$6 billion this fiscal year, or just about the amount needed to rescue the Nation's urban programs during the same period.

What if we avoid any tax increase? Economists differ somewhat, but most of them feel the danger of inflation and tight money is very serious. We all remember last summer and fall. But even if there were to be no inflation, no tight money, we could make no further progress in the very programs that make us proud to be known as Democrats.

That is no alternative; it is dereliction of duty. It would cancel out a great deal of the progress that this Administration has worked to achieve, with the indispensable help of such men in Congress as Senator Steve Young, and Charlie Vanik, and Mike Kirwan and so many others.

Today, thanks to the vision and the tenacity of these men and others like them, we have achieved a start—a good start, but still only a start—toward correcting some of the grave injustices and inequities that have plagued our society for generations. We have begun—but only begun—to revive our environment so it can be made livable for the generations to come.

Nineteen million older Americans are covered by Medicare.

College education is more available now

than ever before; nearly a million young people are being helped through college by Federally financed and insured loans, grants, and work-study programs.

Nine million disadvantaged children are receiving help under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

More than half a million workers have received training to equip them better for jobs in a skill-conscious industrial world.

Nearly a million needy youngsters have been helped to stay in school by the Neighborhood Youth Corps, which gives them needed community work to do.

Some one and one-half million children have been helped by Project Head Start.

Enough land and water has been set aside for public recreation and conservation during the past three years to make another Yellowstone National Park, plus another Yosemite, plus another Glacier National Park. And an increasing share of this set-aside land is in and around our crowded metropolitan areas. In the last year this has included the first National Lakeshores on the Great Lakes.

Tools have been provided, and funding authority has been multiplied, for the first real, concerted, national drive against the pollution of our streams and rivers and lakes. A drive like this takes years and years to reach its objectives; but at least we have now begun.

These are just a few of the major accomplishments of the past three years. And no Depression created the political climate in which such progress could be made. Quite the reverse; most of us in this room have been enjoying the most prosperous years of our lives.

Still, it is only a good start. The decisions we make—or fail to make—about our cities, our youth, our land and water and air during the next few years will be the crucial ones. Opportunities missed now will be gone forever. On our choices, and on our failure to make them, will hinge the kind of country we turn over to our children.

I think I know what *your* choices, and *your* decisions, will be.

PROPOSED NEWS INDUSTRY CODE FOR REPORTING RIOTS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, on July 29, 1967, I wrote letters to Mutual Broadcasting Corp., and other broadcasting networks and wire news services, suggesting that the news industry draw a code of emergency procedure to be followed in reporting riots.

In answer to that letter, John P. Friam, chairman of the board and president of Mutual Broadcasting Corp., outlined the guidelines established in MBC news and editorial policy and provided several examples of how MBC covered civil riots in Detroit and Newark.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Friam's letter and the examples he provided be printed in the RECORD.

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

MUTUAL BROADCASTING CORP.,
New York, N.Y., August 30, 1967.

HON. HUGH SCOTT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR SCOTT: In replying to your letter of July 29, 1967, we join you in advocating that our nation should undertake "responsible action at all levels so that we may attain rapidly domestic tranquility". The words "responsible action" have a particularly important meaning to this Corporation since they are a vital part of our basic news code and policy. Let me spell out this in

detail since it is the cornerstone of our news operation.

Our major subsidiary, the Mutual Broadcasting System is a radio network of more than 500 affiliated stations throughout the nation. It has no concern with television.

Our chief activity is the presenting of worldwide news and special events, by a staff of experienced, knowledgeable, mature men and women of whom we are proud. Their superior record of the years is ample evidence of their skills. A part of this achievement is based on the news and editorial policy of MBS which serves as a yardstick every minute, every day.

Our guideline emphasizes four basic attributes—responsibility, accuracy, objectivity and fairness.

Our news executives insist that each Mutual newsmen must:

Use candor and good taste with the knowledge that morbid, sensational or alarming details, not essential to the factual reporting of the story, are to be avoided.

Use extreme care to see that his newscast, in content and presentation, avoids the creation of panic or unnecessary alarm.

Guard against distortion through commission or omission.

Ask himself, "Is it in the public interest? What effect will this newscast have on millions of listeners which include young and old, leaders and those who prefer to be led, the strong-minded and weak-willed?"

Use mature and considered judgment, especially in news which affects public morals.

Distinguish carefully between public right—and public curiosity in reporting on private matters or feelings.

Exercise constant, careful judgment in utilizing sources. The integrity of Mutual News and the reputation of our news organization depends on each newsman and his sources.

Make prompt and full correction of a mistake in fact or opinion.

From time to time news managers add specific instructions, oral and written. For example, early last month our newsmen were reminded:

1. Avoid, in script and tape inserts, any material which might tend to incite or inflame.

2. When using "actualities" be certain they are made with responsible persons, regardless of color.

3. Avoid clichés such as "long hot summer", "racial powder keg" and similar expressions which serve no good purpose.

To provide you with examples of our work, I am enclosing several sample editorials, copies of two commentaries by George Hamilton Combs, verbatim excerpts from newscasts the last two weeks of July, a narrative report from our New York Bureau covering this period, a script of Fulton Lewis, III, an outline of one of our special programs called "Postscript to Violence" and tapes of actual broadcasts so you can hear the "sound" of our presentations. We feel, Senator, the Mutual Broadcasting System did not at any time "contribute to the turmoil". On the contrary, as you will note from the material enclosed, it served well our millions of listeners by reporting all the news quickly, concisely, accurately, in proper balance, being responsible, objective and fair.

As you are, so are we aware of the dangers inherent in the irresponsible sensationalism characterizing riot coverage by some news outlets. We do not believe, however, that the answer lies in a code for news media.

News media, as well as members of Congress, have complained in recent years that the federal Executive branch seeks to "manage" news. Any effort to "manage" news is fraught with dangers and inconsistent with the Constitutional guarantee of freedom of the press—a guarantee that applies equally to new methods of mass communications, including radio and television broadcasting.

A free press was established by those who came early to the shores of America from Europe and down the years it has been zealously guarded. The free flow of news has been a major factor in fostering growth, prosperity and security for this nation and its peoples.

Certainly, to develop a code such as you have suggested for consideration, would be contrary to the free press principle. It would mean management of the news by someone—perhaps one subject to whims that often would outweigh sound decision as to what is right or wrong.

To carry this one step further, control of one type of news by code might lead to demands for codes for other types. Finally, all news would become subject to controls, or management, and our free press would be gone.

We do not believe a code is the answer. Instead, each unit of our news industry and each individual in it, must abide by its own concept of responsibility. There are certain to be instances of irresponsibility from time to time, but even a code could not anticipate and prevent such occurrences, and this is a small price to pay for freedom of the press.

When all is said and done, there is only one way for us at Mutual to gain our kind of objective. Build and direct a news organization second to none. No temporary code for a particular purpose can take its place.

Mutual has a team conscious of those sacred freedoms which newsmen have always enjoyed in our nation and of the great responsibility they bear to continue to earn the right to enjoy those freedoms.

We shall continue to earn those rights. In seeking to solve the difficult domestic problems of our times, this network offers its full facilities and services.

Very truly yours,

JOHN P. FRALIM.

DIGEST OF NEW YORK NEWS BUREAU REPORT

July 14, 1967: As Newark developed into a major news story, we sent a reporter-engineer team whose only equipment was an inconspicuous portable tape recorder. The correspondent fed four straight-forward news reports; the engineer fed three statements by Mayor Hugh Addonizio and two Negro eye-witness reaction pieces, one of which involved the Negro's explanation of the causes of the riot; the other appealed for an end to the violence: ("Its got to stop, it's senseless.")

That evening, we broadcast a 7 minute program, highlighting the day's events in Newark. This program stressed the personal tragedy aspect of the riot and avoided all demagogic actuality.

July 15, 1967: We aired actuality of Newark police spokesmen (on the status of the riots), interviews with Newark's Human Relations Director appealing for calm, and statements from Newark fire department spokesmen on the extent of damage. One piece of Negro actuality was broadcast, an eyewitness, who said, "if provoked, we will take up arms."

July 16, 1967: On broadcasts this day, we aired actuality inserts of Governor Richard Hughes on 3 newscasts; a report from the Newark Fire Commissioner; a 30 second statement from Stokely Carmichael, in London, giving his explanation for the Newark riots, "eyewitness" statements from local Negro residents, one of whom said: "I would like to sit down and discuss the problems." Another said, "If we could travel, we'd leave here right now." Also broadcast: Negro Councilman Calvin West, who proposed remedies for the rioting.

July 17, 1967: News teams were sent to Plainfield and Newark, New Jersey to file status reports on these riot-torn cities. Mostly, these were updates on casualty and damage figures. Also, we broadcast a statement by Reverend John McNeil of Plain-

field, who said he wanted to talk to the rioters to calm them down.

July 18, 1967: We broadcast aftermath pieces on the New Jersey disturbances.

July 19, 1967: We devoted 5 minutes of our nightly feature program, "The World Today" to an interview with the President of the New York Urban League, John Mosler, on remedies for racial violence.

July 23, 1967: Since the Detroit troubles developed in late evening, we used but one correspondent's report from the field (station WJBK, Detroit).

July 24, 1967: Most of the news insert material consisted of correspondents' reports which were delivered unemotionally by a team of professional reporters in Detroit. Also broadcast were several actuality statements of Governor George Romney, Senator Edward Brooke, Senators Everett Dirksen and Mike Mansfield and Representative John McCormack.

July 25, 1967: We broadcast a comprehensive correspondent's report on the Newark Black Power conference. This report contained no inflammatory language and no statements from irresponsible persons, white or negro.

Also, on this day, we broadcast correspondents' reports on the status of the Detroit riots, a statement from Cassius Clay deploring the violence, actualities of Senators Brooke and Dirksen and a statement from Governor Romney. That evening, we broadcast a brief report on the East Harlem violence. This report contained no actualities and was treated objectively. Further, we broadcast live President Johnson's report on the racial unrest.

July 28, 1967: We broadcast several situationers from our Detroit correspondents, actuality cuts of Governor Kerner on riot investigation and interview with Senator Peter Dominick on riot causes.

July 29, 1967: We aired one situationer from Detroit plus 5 voice cuts of President Johnson on the racial unrest.

July 30, 1967: We broadcast two correspondents' reports on the aftermath to the Detroit rioting (cleaning up, etc.)

July 31, 1967: Correspondent's reports from Milwaukee on National Guard summons and efforts to restore order; Governor Romney, fed from Detroit, on ways to prevent future riots.

POSTSCRIPT TO VIOLENCE

"Postscript To Violence" was broadcast as a special presentation of "The World Today", Friday, July 21, 1967.

It followed one week to the day, the outbreak of racial violence in Newark, New Jersey.

The aim of the program was to look to the future and determine what could be done to ease tensions in big city ghettos.

To begin, the program sought an answer to the question: "Who suffers by these riots?" The answer was given most vociferously in the cries of Tedock Bell's family as they learned of his death at Newark City Hospital and in the choked-up voice of a fireman who carried a bloodied 10-year-old boy to an ambulance.

In the script, it was acknowledged that problems do exist in the ghetto, but at the same time it was also pointed out that the solutions exist as well.

Whitney Young, Jr., executive director of the National Urban League, was a Negro voice of moderation. In an exclusive interview for this program, he noted that the federal government has been moving too slowly to improve the plight of the Negroes; that Washington should attack the Negro problem with the same zest it's fighting the war in Vietnam. Mr. Young also concurred that the riots are bad; that they hurt the Negro more than they help him.

Sargent Shriver, director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, said it was danger-

ous to build up hope in promises to Negroes without providing action. "We're in trouble," he said, "if we don't listen to what they have to say." Shriver stressed that it's necessary to talk with Negroes and to do things with them.

To show how New York City officials are working to ease ghetto tensions, a Mutual reporter went on a tour of Harlem with William Booth, New York's Commissioner of Human Rights.

The story was told in the sound of happy kids in a pool and active youngsters on a play street as Booth explained the functions of the city's "Summer Task Force".

Senator Peter Dominick pointed out that racial demonstrations have been encouraged by the Johnson administration. "To begin with," said Dominick, "we have to recreate respect for our legal process." The Colorado Senator said that Congress alone can't solve the ills, "but all people must work to help."

Congressman William Cramer spoke about the anti-riot bill to crack down on agitators—a bill which had just passed the House of Representatives.

Congressman Augustus Hawkins—a Negro from Los Angeles Watts district—asserted that Congress has not done enough to provide better housing, more jobs and better law enforcement. He noted that the cures are available . . . but only if Congress acts.

Congressmen Ford and Griffin of Michigan took note of Congressional action taken in recent years and pointed to additional measures which must be provided immediately.

The program ended with a dramatic montage of sound. The script noted that the sounds of riots—the sounds of the 60's—must be exchanged for the hopeful sounds of the 70's—laughing, happy kids—"for the sake of all humanity".

MBS EDITORIAL, JULY 18, 1967

Broken down to its essentials, the important question about those racial riots in Newark is this: Were they "spontaneous"—a sudden explosion of anti-White hostility, or were they "engineered"?

The Justice Department says it has no information that outsiders were involved in the Newark disturbances. Perhaps not, but this seems to miss the point. More relevant—and perhaps more revealing is the fact that Negro leaders in New Jersey have worked out a "truce" with civil authorities.

If Negro leaders will agree to press for an end to the disturbances, we might ask where these men were a week ago when—apparently before the explosion took place.

Had they so acted, 27 persons—Negro and White—would be alive today. Millions of dollars worth of property would not lie smoldering under charred ruins; and racial harmony across the land would not have been dealt such a devastating blow.

MBS EDITORIAL, JULY 20, 1967

Those Negro-White disturbances which have rent the summer air call attention to a problem which goes deeper than racial hostility.

In virtually every report of violence—from Newark to Minneapolis the belligerents have been young people . . . mostly in their teens, a few in their twenties.

We have heard much talk about the generation gap . . . the refusal by youth to respect their parents . . . or the traditional values on which their parents depended to preserve unity in the family and order in the nation.

Most of us have heard or seen those buttons which read, "Don't trust anyone over thirty." Till now, we apparently had felt that white young people had a monopoly on parental resentment. Newark, with its rampaging gangs of teenagers, demonstrates that this resentment, or at least this failure to respect authority, parental or civil, knows no color line.

This, we submit, is a key toward understanding the tragic events which have cast a pall over a score of cities in the past several weeks.

MBS EDITORIAL, JULY 24, 1967

Not often has one American city held the dubious honor of furnishing the scene for two tragic news events within a single week.

Newark, New Jersey, is such a place. The echo of sniper fire was still in the air when several negro extremist organizations converged on that unhappy city to hold a so-called Black Power convention. Any hope that responsible discussion on racial matters would result from this meeting was quickly dashed, as one Negro after the other took the speaker's platform to justify racial violence, to denounce all symbols of authority and responsibility (including moderate men of their own race), to issue impossible demands on every issue from the racial makeup of the Newark city administration to Washington's handling of the Vietnam war.

If those responsible for the Newark convention expected that this kind of fire-brand oratory would win them sympathy and understanding for the causes they espouse, these expectations were in vain. If they expected, however, to shock and anger the responsible men and women of America, they succeeded beyond their wildest anticipations.

MBS NEWS EXCERPTS, JULY 24-29, 1967

July 24, 1967, 11 a.m.—"Eight thousand National Guardsmen trying to keep the peace in Detroit, Michigan, where violence erupted soon after local police raided a Negro tavern last night. Two thousand city police officers patrolling trouble areas. Governor Romney just minutes ago requested an additional five thousand soldiers to reinforce the eight thousand already on duty.

"Canadian officials sealed off the border where Detroit and Windsor, Ontario come together.

"Other racial disturbances earlier reported in Illinois, Wisconsin, Connecticut and in Rochester, New York."

July 24, 1967, 2:30 p.m.—"Tanks rumbling through Detroit's streets at this hour . . . eight thousand National Guardsmen with fixed bayonets patrolling trouble areas where racial unrest has flared since last night. Two thousand police officers on duty and a request from Michigan for an additional five thousand regular army troops to control the riots has been okayed by the White House. As to the make up of these regular military units now on their way, we'll call on a Defense Department spokesman."

(Taped DOD spokesman (30 seconds), content: Named units involved.)

"Governor Romney worried over the possibilities that may erupt tonight in the motor city told Mutual News."

(Taped Romney insert describing the conditions (13 seconds).)

"Special Assistant to Defense Secretary McNamara, Cyrus Vance, is on his way to Selfridge Air Force Base some 30 miles from Detroit for conferences with state and local officials.

"An ultimatum from Black Power advocates to the Federal Government. The Black Power convention delegates concluding a meeting in Newark, New Jersey held a news conference and said Uncle Sam must provide a guaranteed annual wage or face the disruption of the nation's economy by the Negroes."

July 24, 1967, 6:00 p.m.—"President Johnson has not yet decided whether to send Federal troops into Detroit's riot area . . . although the troops have been arriving at Selfridge Air Force Base 30 miles from Detroit to be immediately available if needed.

"Republican leaders are calling big city rioting a national crisis and demand a full investigation by Congress and what they call more forceful action by the President."

July 25, 1967, 11 a.m.—"Federal troops in control of the strife-torn motor city of Detroit this morning. Hit and run snipers met trained military might this morning, tanks and armored units firing machine guns, and light arms. The death toll stands at 23 so far in the three-day riot, more than 1,500 persons have been injured. A state of emergency remains, damage estimated at more than \$200 million."

July 25, 1967, 11:30 a.m.—"Federal troops have taken control with some reports of calm now in Detroit, Michigan, today, following the joining of paratroopers, ordered in by President Johnson in the fight against Negro rioters.

"There are reports of racial troubles in at least three other Michigan cities today, with further racial problems in at least seven other American cities."

July 25, 1967, 2:30 p.m.—"Negro leader Dr. Martin Luther King told reporters in Atlanta he supports President Johnson's action in sending troops into Detroit. Senators and Congressmen from both political sides of the aisle are calling for a full-scale Congressional probe into the racial riots around the country . . . the death toll in Detroit rises . . . more arrests . . . more injuries. A first-hand look at the scene as of the moment, from the man on the scene, Mutual's Lee McNew in Detroit."

(Taped insert, 1:04 seconds. Content: Summary of damage and injuries.)

July 25, 1967, 6:00 p.m.—"President Johnson continues to keep a close watch on rioting in the nation. Report from Detroit . . . an outward calm where rioting, looting, and violence has held forth for two consecutive days . . . Officials, both Federal and local are counting on Federal troops and National Guardsmen to keep it quiet when darkness falls. Things began to return to normal in the country's fifth largest city today . . . with big banks and other businesses open, sanitation trucks picking up debris, and gasoline being sold again.

"Governor Romney has taken some of the state police and National Guardsmen out of Detroit and sent them to other Michigan cities where there have been signs of violence. (Such as Pontiac, Grand Rapids, and Flint.)

"Republican Congressional leaders in Washington are planning to introduce legislation to set up a joint Senate-House Committee to investigate the riots. In the last 24 hours, several areas have been hit—the most widespread racial violence in the nation's history.

"Civil Rights leader Martin Luther King said today he supports the President's use of Federal troops in Detroit."

July 26, 1967, 11 a.m.—"Thirty nine dead in Detroit riots . . . property damage well over 200 million and well over a thousand fires in the city recorded over the past three days. An on-the-scene report now from Mutual's Bob Hagen in Detroit.

(Insert, 48 seconds. Content: Details on damage and injuries.)

"Racial disturbances, in addition to Detroit are being counted from such places as Rochester, New York, Saginaw, Grand Rapids, Pontiac, Michigan . . . Phoenix, Arizona, Toledo, Ohio, and other smaller cities.

"Militant Black Power advocate H. "Rap" Brown's been picked up . . . the story from Mutual's James Hall.

(Insert, 29 seconds. Content: Brown arrested by police at National Airport.)

July 26, 1967, 2:30 p.m.—"The voices of Negro leaders were being raised today in support of the call by President Johnson . . . to every citizen . . . to maintain law and order. A statement released in New York City was signed by Philip Randolph, Roy Wilkins, Whitney M. Young, Jr., and Martin Luther King. It said in part, "We are confident that the overwhelming majority of the Negro com-

munity joins us in the opposition to violence in the streets."

July 27, 1967, 6:00 p.m.—"Federal aid is being made available to Detroit for victims of the rioting. President Johnson telegraphed Governor Romney and Mayor Cavanaugh this afternoon that cabinet members have been directed to help meet the emergency health, food and safety needs of the city. The President also met with Secretary McNamara, Attorney General Clark, OEP Director Bryant, and staff assistants, to study the possibility of other aid as requested by the Governor and the Mayor.

"Detroit appears to be calm this evening, for the first time since rioting broke out Sunday but U.S. troops and tanks are still on the streets to make sure things remain quiet. Both Governor Romney and Mayor Cavanaugh said hopefully today they think the major violence is over.

"In Washington, Rap Brown, the head of the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee held a news conference and said black people have no recourse other than rebellion and that violence is necessary. Brown is free on bail on a charge that he incited to riot in Cambridge, Maryland earlier this week."

July 28, 1967, 11:00 a.m.—"Peace made the riot scene today. There were some isolated incidents . . . for example in Detroit Mayor Jerome Cavanaugh was making an inspection tour of some of the strife-ravaged sections. He was caught in a crossfire between police and at least one sniper. The Mayor was not hurt. The sniper escaped. President Johnson has proclaimed this coming Sunday a day of prayer for order and reconciliation. In Havana Black Power Advocate Stokely Carmichael says he no longer cares what happens to him when he returns to the USA. Carmichael also has called for guerrilla warfare in the United States and had words of praise for Fidel Castro."

July 29, 1967.—"During the night at least nine American cities were plagued by more civil disorders with the most serious racial disturbances in Chicago, Poughkeepsie, New York and Cambridge, Maryland.

"In Cambridge four Negroes were arrested by National Guardsmen after shotgun blasts were fired at a police patrol car. They were charged with assault with intent to kill. In Chicago again police were fired upon as they dispersed a crowd. In Poughkeepsie same situation after police arrested a man in the Negro section of the city."

THE TOP OF THE NEWS WITH FULTON LEWIS III, WEEK OF JULY 24-JULY 28, 1967

MONDAY, JULY 24, 1967—WASHINGTON, D.C.

Riotous bargain hunting in Detroit

At the request of Michigan's Governor George Romney, President Johnson today ordered nearly 5,000 federal troops to the Detroit area to be made available for combat duty should they be needed to bring race riots in that city under control.

The troops were flown in from North Carolina and Kentucky throughout the afternoon in a massive airlift. They are joining more than 8,000 of Michigan's National Guardsmen and 2,000 state police who have already been assigned to duty in the 175-block square Negro neighborhood on the west side, some three miles from the center of Detroit, the scene of a violent outburst of rioting and looting last night.

In his telegram to President Johnson requesting assistance, Governor Romney said: "It is the unanimous judgment of state and local officials and the Michigan military establishment that our situation may continue at least through tonight. Last night the combined efforts of 1,400 Michigan National Guardsmen, 2,000 state and Detroit police and the fire departments of Detroit and 30 surrounding communities were un-

able to contain this massive outbreak of violence, fire, theft and general disregard for law and order." Romney then asked for "immediate deployment of federal troops into Michigan to assist state and local authorities in establishing law and order in the city of Detroit."

The Detroit outbreak, like many previous race riots in other cities throughout the nation over the past year or so, appeared to be sparked as a result of a fairly routine police action. City police raided an after-hours drinking establishment, open in violation of Michigan's 2 a.m. curfew, arresting 73 persons. A crowd gathered, bottles began to fly, and the riot was on.

President Johnson, in addition to dispatching federal troops this afternoon, called former Deputy Defense Secretary Cyrus Vance back to active duty from his retirement. He will act as a liaison between Gov. Romney and the White House for the duration of the crisis. Under the President's orders, the two brigades of federal troops will remain at Selfridge Air Force Base (30 miles from Detroit) until the President issues further directives for them to proceed into the riot areas. These combat orders would apparently come at the suggestion of Cyrus Vance.

Governor Romney, saying this afternoon that there has been a steady increase in the amount of Negro looting of stores, said the federal troops (if called into action) should be enough "to stop the looting, arson and sniping." He added: "Experience of similar outbreaks in other parts of the country indicates that they are rarely limited to a period of one day and night."

Throughout the day National Guardsmen stood guard as firemen fought blazes in scattered sections of the city. Several firemen had been injured by rioters who showered bricks and bottles on them.

At least four persons have been confirmed dead, and there have been five other reported fatalities. More than 800 persons were injured and over a thousand have been arrested as a result of just one day of rioting. The damage, according to preliminary estimates, has soared past the \$100 million figure, and that estimate, of course, does not take into account the fact that many, if not most, of Detroit's industries have been shut down as a result of the violence. The automobile manufacturers in and around the city have closed almost all of their plants for the second and third shifts tonight. Mail delivery has been halted in some areas. Even the baseball game between the Detroit Tigers and the Baltimore Orioles, scheduled for tomorrow, has been cancelled.

In some areas, entire blocks of homes and businesses had been burned to the ground—the hardest hit areas being the Negro neighborhoods—but some looting even took place downtown.

Congressional comment on the Detroit situation was varied. Georgia Democrat Senator Herman Talmadge called mob rioting a "national emergency" and urged President Johnson to "speak to the people" about law and order.

His comments were quickly endorsed by Virginia's Democrat Senator Harry Byrd, Jr.

Talmadge said he has long felt that "there has been a serious lack of national leadership in taking steps to avert rioting and mob violence." He said he has repeatedly urged the President to make it clear to the American people, "both white and Negro, that law and order are going to prevail throughout the land, come what may."

The Georgia Democrat then added: "I do so again today. I fervently urge the President, as the elected leader of this great nation, to speak to the people in this national crisis. It is his incumbent duty to utilize the power of his office and influence to restore law and order and maintain domestic peace. I say that he should take this matter

to the people, and to the responsible leaders of both races, without a moment's hesitation."

Senate Republican Leader Everett Dirksen also took note of the Detroit riots today, describing them as a "form of anarchy" which cannot be permitted to continue.

He said there are fears among the people about where riots might erupt next, such as in Washington, D.C., or in other cities. He said also there are hints that "there is a timetable," but he added that there is not yet sufficient evidence to prove this theory. Dirksen concluded that local, state and, if necessary, federal authority must be used to see that there is "no insurrection, no anarchy, no breakdown of law and order."

Black Pow-Wow in Newark

While Negro rioters were creating havoc in the city of Detroit, a National Black Power Conference was adjourning in Newark, New Jersey, the scene of similar violence just a week ago. The Black Power advocates demanded, among other things, that the Federal Government provide an unspecified guaranteed annual wage to every American, or else, to use their words, or else the Government will face further disruption of the economy by Negroes.

The Conference delegates also approved a resolution calling for the study of a plan to establish two nations within this country—one for the whites, another for the Negro.

Meanwhile, one of the Nation's leading exponents of black power, Stokely Carmichael, wrapped up a week-long visit to England (where he has been attempting to incite blacks into action) and departed for Communist Czechoslovakia. Reportedly his ultimate destination is Hanoi, the capital of Communist North Vietnam.

Carmichael left while Scotland Yard authorities were in the process of drawing up a report on his activities in England for Home Secretary Roy Jenkins. The Home Office has the power to band or expel foreign nationals from Britain, a step which it was seriously considering in the case of Stokely Carmichael.

One prominent British newspaper, the Daily Sketch, earlier today accused Carmichael of violating Britain's race relations act by inciting racial violence, and it demanded to know why "this dangerous man" has not been prosecuted.

The British paper's question has been asked many times by newspapers and grassroots citizens in this country. Justice Department officials have never taken any action against Carmichael for his agitational efforts within the United States, claiming they had neither sufficient law, nor evidence, to prosecute. This deficiency may well be changed, however, should Carmichael proceed on his unauthorized trip to North Vietnam, and should the Congress proceed to pass a federal anti-riot bill.

In the meantime, the city of Detroit will remain in a state of crisis while the burnings and lootings of Negro mobs continue, and law-respecting citizens of every other city in the nation will sit and wait, wondering how long it will be before a similar outbreak imperils the security and safety of their community.

As Senator Talmadge suggested today, Presidential action to reinforce law and order throughout this nation is long overdue. There is a great deal which could be done, including a reversal in the Administration's attitude of leniency toward criminals and toward black-power advocates. But a great first step could be brought about if the President would only lend his name and the prestige of his office to a dramatic and firm insistence on a national respect for law and order.

Poverty programs and rat-control bills are politics, and can be debated at the leisure of the Congress. The people of the nation, however, have some rights of their own which

they expect to be protected during the interim, the most basic of these being the protection of their lives and property from violent mobs. The President's decision to send federal troops to Detroit is to be commended, but a little preventive action is also needed to end the terrorism which has made the cities of this nation as insecure as the villages of South Vietnam.

TUESDAY, JULY 25, 1967—WASHINGTON, D.C.
Civil blights spreading throughout the nation

For the past twenty-four hours, civil warfare and anarchy (most of it led by young Negro hoodlums) has been on a sharp increase throughout nearly every section of the nation, and there is no indication that things will get any better tonight, or tomorrow.

The list of riot-torn cities has grown. It now includes not only Detroit (the scene of the most destructive violence), but three other Michigan cities (Pontiac, Flint and Grand Rapids); New York's Puerto Rican Harlem where a third day of rioting produced two dead and 20 injured; Rochester, New York, where two more died and three were injured; Englewood, New Jersey; Tucson, Arizona; Houston, Texas; Portsmouth, Virginia; Toledo and Lima, Ohio; Minneapolis, Minn.; and, Cambridge, Maryland. And racial tensions have again reached a high point in Cairo, Illinois, which has already suffered rioting, and at least a score of other cities.

In Detroit, the latest toll is 24 dead and more than 1,500 injured. Estimates of the destruction caused by the rioters range as high today as \$200 million.

Late last night, President Johnson under heavy prodding from Detroit Mayor Cavanaugh, and Michigan Governor George Romney, ordered about 1,500 federal troops into the combat area—a 175-block Negro community three miles from downtown Detroit. Some of the crack airborne soldiers deployed are veterans of the Vietnam war, but commented that the present conflict right here at home is even more intense.

This afternoon, Governor Romney, facing a shortage of National Guardsmen and state police in the wake of racial outbursts in three other cities in his state, announced he was releasing what he termed "an appropriate number" of men from duty in Detroit for assignment in the other potentially explosive areas. The exact number of men involved, however, was not disclosed.

National Guardsmen are also on duty patrols in Minneapolis and this afternoon Ohio Governor James Rhodes called out 500 of his state's militia for assignment to Toledo on a stand-by basis. Throughout last night and this morning, that city was the scene of widespread looting and firebombing by roving bands of Negro youths. The picture was best summed up by a Negro Baptist minister who witnessed many of the incidents there, and said: "The trouble carried no racial tones and was downright thievery. It seemed to be a bunch of young people who thought they could get something for nothing."

In Maryland, Republican Governor Spiro T. Agnew today ordered 700 National Guardsmen into the Eastern Shore community of Cambridge to forestall any further violence there, after a night of shooting and arson in which two persons were injured and most of two blocks of the Negro section was gutted by fire.

The violence there has been attributed in great part to an enflaming speech in Cambridge last night by the national chairman of the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee, H. Rap Brown, who repeatedly urged his audience of cheering Negroes to resort to violence to gain Black Power.

Brown told the crowd: "We shouldn't march, unless we march with guns. If Amer-

ica doesn't come around, we should burn it down. We've got to make the change come. The streets belong to us, and we've got to take them."

Later, he made another reference to the need for weapons, saying: "You better get you some guns. The only thing honkies [or whites] respect is guns. The honkie looted us from Africa. He's the greatest thief of all time."

For the next five hours, Cambridge Negroes heeded Brown's advice, exchanging gunfire with police officials, and burning to the ground a barbershop, motel, tavern, church, school and several homes. Damage was estimated at well over \$100,000.

This afternoon, the FBI announced that a federal warrant has been issued for Brown's arrest under charges of fleeing the state to avoid prosecution.

Two state warrants were issued against him earlier. One charged him with inciting a riot; the other said he "counseled and procured the burning of Pine Street Elementary School" in Cambridge. Maryland's District Attorney explained that the federal authorities have become involved in the case after it was learned that the militant SNCC chairman had left the state. He had come to Cambridge yesterday from Philadelphia, was treated at a Cambridge hospital for a gunshot wound suffered during the rioting last night, and departed promptly.

Meanwhile there was some further news today about the whereabouts of another black power advocate—former SNCC chairman Stokely Carmichael. A dispatch from Havana, Cuba, reported that he has made plans to attend the Communist-sponsored Latin American Solidarity Organization Conference to be held there the first week in August—that is, after he returns from his present trip to Communist Czechoslovakia, and Hanoi, the capital city of Communist North Vietnam.

Again, the current outbreaks of racial violence throughout the nation were the dominant topic of conversation on Capitol Hill today. New Hampshire Republican Congressman Louis Wyman introduced legislation that would take away all federal benefits for life for anyone convicted of rioting, including benefits for veterans and the elderly. Mississippi Democrat Congressman Jamie Whitten blamed the Supreme Court for the riots, charging it with creating a sense of lawlessness throughout the nation. New York Democrat Rep. Hugh Carney called for an "emergency" resolution giving the President the authority to embargo all arms and ammunition in riot-torn areas.

And New York's most liberal Democrat, William Fitts Ryan, charged that Congress itself is to blame for the rioting by not having passed even more legislation for improved housing, education and health care.

West Virginia Democrat Senator Robert C. Byrd delivered perhaps the fiercest speech of his entire career, saying that the "insurrection" in the cities "should be put down with brutal force." Police, he said, should not wait to fire until fired upon, and "adult looters should be shot on the spot." The West Virginia Democrat added: "It is later than we think. Hoodlums, looters, snipers should no longer be handled with kid gloves . . . firemen should be equipped with arms to protect themselves, if necessary."

He then criticized public officials, including two Cabinet members, for citing the threat of violence as an argument for passage of legislation to expand federal services to the needy and jobless. Byrd said such programs should be considered on their merits in "reasoned debate," using the threat of violence (and he specifically mentioned testimony to this effect by Secretary Weaver, and by former Attorney General Katzenbach) amounts to nothing more than blackmail.

Byrd deplored public officials who "de-

plore violence in one sentence, and then seek to place the blame for it on society in the next." "It is little wonder," he concluded, "that rioters are encouraged to do violence."

In Atlanta, Georgia, civil rights leader Martin Luther King offered his pat explanation for the violence, saying that "every single breakout of racial violence without exception has substantially been ascribed to gross unemployment." In a telegram to President Johnson, King said: "I propose specifically the creation of a national agency that shall provide a job to every person who needs work."

The fact of the matter is that Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King is very, very wrong in his evaluation, and the massive riots in Detroit prove my point. Ever since the race riots of 1943, Detroit, more than any other city in the nation, perhaps, has been diligent in its efforts to provide a better life for its Negro inhabitants. Discrimination has been totally eliminated from the law books, and almost totally eliminated from practice in employment. Its war on poverty program has been cited even by civil rights leaders as one of the most effective in the nation. Its inner city schools are completely desegregated and are highly rated. Its police force has been commended again even by many civil rights leaders as a model of restraint. The unions there have been free from racial discrimination and have been in the forefront of the fight for improved Negro living conditions. And yet Detroit, this model city of the Great Society, has been the chosen scene of perhaps the worst riot this nation has suffered in the recent outbreaks over the past few years.

New York's Democrat Senator Robert Kennedy, in a surprising statement today, conceded for perhaps the first time in his life that maybe the very concept of government welfare solutions to big-city problems is to blame for the present unrest. He said, in fact, that public housing programs have failed to meet the inner-city Negro ghetto problems. Other welfare state solutions have similarly failed. The answer, according to Kennedy: Call on the Free Enterprise system for a full-scale attack on these problems—have major firms participate in building housing for the underprivileged. A novel approach, indeed—it's a wonder nobody has thought of it until today.

The House Education and Labor Committee today ordered its staff investigators to determine whether poverty program workers were involved in the big city riots of recent weeks.

The Committee, in a closed meeting, voted to send investigators representing both parties to make the inquiry in response to charges that poverty workers were involved in the Newark, New Jersey, riot. The investigators will also travel to Detroit.

For 35 years now, ladies and gentlemen, under the New and Fair Deals, and under the Great Societies and the Wars on Poverty and what have you (all of these, of course, being welfare-state systems), the American people have been taught to believe it is morally permissible and indeed productive to "take from each according to his ability and to bestow upon each according to his need." Or, as President Johnson himself has said: "Take from the haves and give to the have-nots."

Many Negroes living in some of the nation's less prosperous communities have apparently taken the "something for nothing" approach to heart. They have not been content, however, with the speed with which government has been taking from the haves and giving to the "have-nots." So some of them have decided to play the Robin Hood game themselves. When it's done directly, however, Robin Hoodism is not considered "humanitarian" or "liberalism." It is called by its correct names: "theft," "looting" and "destruction."

WEDNESDAY, JULY 26, 1967—WASHINGTON, D.C.

Brush riots around the country

The racial warfare in Detroit, after cooling down somewhat this morning, was on again this afternoon in full force with Michigan Governor George Romney saying: "The sniping . . . is now worse than it has been in previous days."

Estimates of the toll thus far in that insurrection range up to 40 dead, at least 35 of these confirmed, and \$250 million in damage. Thus, the Detroit riots have already surpassed the violence in Watts two years ago, where 35 were killed, and only \$200 million damage was suffered.

Elsewhere in the nation, during the past 24 hours, there were scores of other outbreaks of racial violence. The State of Michigan was hardest hit. Firebombings and lootings terrorized Saginaw in central Michigan last night. At least eight persons were shot. That city, ironically, has a highly respected Negro mayor.

Grand Rapids, Michigan, suffered its second night of race riotings, and in Mt. Clemens, Negro youths put to the torch a big car-racing track and an unfinished high-rise apartment building.

In Chicago, firebombings and lootings plagued the same areas on the west side that were the scene of massive rioting just a year ago.

In New York City Puerto Rican Harlem, violence erupted for a fourth consecutive night.

Other violence was touched off in Phoenix, South Bend, Indiana, Sacramento, California, and Toledo, Ohio. A tense peace has apparently been restored in some previous battle areas like Rochester, New York, and Cambridge, Maryland.

Here in the Nation's Capital, where there is an unspoken fear of possible Negro violence this summer, the Members of Congress seemed to be groping for some solution to the apparent collapse of law and order elsewhere in the nation.

The only legislative proposals which are likely to get prompt attention, however, are a House-passed anti-riot bill which would make it a federal crime for a person to cross state lines to foment riots, and a Republican sponsored bill calling for an immediate, across-the-board, bipartisan Senate-House investigation of the recent racial outbursts. This last recommendation may get caught in a web of partisan wrangling, though, since the Democrats will be hesitant to let any Republican-conceived legislation get the stamp of approval. On an issue of as much public concern as race riots the Democrats will naturally want to get full credit and glory for any widely publicized investigations or hearings. Thus, the proposal today by Oklahoma Democrat Senator Fred Harris that the President personally appoint a "blue-ribbon" commission on civil strife to study the recent riots.

This afternoon, Louisiana Democrat Congressman Edwin Willis, the chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, announced that his panel has found enough evidence that subversives have been involved in recent rioting to pursue the question further in public hearings. The evidence, he said, has been developed as a result of ten months of intensive Committee investigations. He did not announce when hearings will begin.

Suspicious concerning outside involvement in the racial outbursts seem to be supported by FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover's testimony before the House Appropriations Committee in February of this year. At that time, he said, "Communists and other subversives and extremists . . . were active in exploiting and aggravating the [earlier] riots in Harlem, Watts, Cleveland and Chicago."

Just today, at National Airport in the Washington area, FBI agents arrested black-power agitator H. Rap Brown, the national

chairman of the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee. He was taken into custody not on federal charges, however, but so that he could be prosecuted in the state of Maryland for inciting Negroes to riot in Cambridge, Maryland, Monday night.

Even as he was being brought before federal authorities in Alexandria, Virginia, this noon for arraignment, Brown shouted out: "We [black people] built this country and we'll burn it down."

The arraignment was held up for several hours, and Brown was kept in a cell, while the group awaited the arrival of the SNCC-leader's attorney—none other than William Kunstler of the American Civil Liberties Union in New York, who was himself arrested last year for creating a disturbance during hearings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities on Capitol Hill.

Kunstler, after his arrival here, apparently found a legal imperfection in the federal arrest order for Brown, the result of which, H. Rap Brown was released by federal officials at about 3:30 this afternoon.

Virginia police, however, promptly seized the SNCC chairman, saying they were going to turn him over to Maryland authorities. Kunstler immediately protested this action, too, however, claiming that Virginia authorities have no business making arrests in a federal courthouse. That was the way the situation stood at last report. But we'll follow the case of H. Rap Brown closely. If he does NOT even stand trial for his actions in Cambridge, Maryland, I, for one, will want to know why.

Negroes judging the riots

Various Negro leaders spoke out on the recent racial outbursts today. In New York, a statement was issued by Martin Luther King, Jr., A. Philip Randolph, Roy Wilkins and Whitney Young, condemning the violence as unjustified. They said that the riots have been highly damaging to the Negro population.

At his sun-swept resort hideout in Bimini Island, however, the ever-vocal Adam Clayton Powell had a different view. He said the "black power rebellions are a necessary phase of the black revolution," and he had warm words of praise for what he described as "these new breeds of cats" responsible for the uprisings.

Anything uttered by Adam Clayton Powell must, of course, be taken with at least one grain of salt, and the statement issued by the so-called civil rights leaders in New York can only be regarded as "too little, too late." The fact of the matter is that none of these people are in a position of control or leadership in the Negro community any longer. They have been replaced by a new and younger element, a "new breed of cats," as Adam Clayton Powell said, who have not time for things as passive and dull as civil rights.

This new element is highly militant, as demonstrated by both the actions and statements of people like SNCC leaders Stokely Carmichael, H. Rap Brown over the past few months and years, and unlike the Martin Luther Kings and the Whitney Youngs, these young agitators have physically moved into the Negro ghettos around the country and for years have been indoctrinating these communities with their propaganda of hate and violence.

Tragically enough, the federal government has not just been sitting on the sidelines throughout this period. Anti-poverty funds, intended perhaps to help the poor and starving in these ghettos, have all too frequently served only to organize the Negro dissidents, and the militants have moved in to exploit the situation, taking advantage of the fact that the federal funds have already accomplished for them one important and time-consuming task: that of organization.

As an illustration of what I mean, I have

in front of me the latest issue of SPARK, a publication put out by the pro-Red Chinese organization, the Progressive Labor Party, dated July, 1967. This issue was released from the presses BEFORE the Newark or Detroit riots, but it nevertheless contains a full spread, two pages, entitled: "Black Liberation—Now."

Part of the article reads as follows:

"The strongest opposition to the U.S. imperialist government in the United States is the black people, because we are on the bottom of the ladder and have less to lose in rebelling. They know this, and they know that they will never have a 'safe' home base as long as the black people are willing to rebel against them. Not only are the black people in a rebellious state, but we are more and more beginning to line up with the Vietnamese people and other oppressed peoples in the world who are fighting the common enemy—U.S. imperialism.

"If they can break the back of our movement, then they will be in a better position to attack the other movements and whip them into line. If they are able to accomplish this, they will be in a better position to commit aggression against our brothers and sisters in Asia, Africa and Latin America. We must see to it that this does not happen."

That, ladies and gentlemen, is a sample of the vicious propaganda which has been poured into this nation's Negro ghettos, not just by the members of the Progressive Labor Party, but by their comrades in SNCC, RAM, the Students for a Democratic Society, the W.E.B. DuBois Clubs and a score of other militant groups.

These agitators envision their job to be the same as that of the Communist Viet Cong in Vietnam, or of the Cubans in Venezuela, or of the Red Guards in Hong Kong—namely, to create violence and havoc as part of an overall international campaign to bring capitalism, or, as they say, "U.S. imperialism," to its knees. Even the military tactics are the same. The fact of the matter is that this country is right now just beginning to experience its own domestic Vietnam-type war, and we enter this conflict with an Administration which is so blind to the danger of internal subversion that a man is appointed to the Subversive Activities Control Board because he married a former Presidential secretary. We enter this conflict with not one single law on the books designed to combat such subversion. Every one which DID exist has been almost totally neutralized by the Supreme Court. We enter our own Vietnam with nearly a half million American troops tied down in Southeast Asia, 8,000 miles away, and hundreds of thousands more in Western Europe, Korea, the Pacific, Latin America and Heaven knows where else, and with our Secretary of Defense talking about reducing the number of ready reserves in this country. And we enter this, our own Vietnam, with Administration leaders holding the same misguided belief with which we initially entered Southeast Asia—the idea that somehow the hostile militants can be bought off with huge grants of federal aid. Well, you can't "buy off" the Stokely Carmichaels and the H. Rap Browns any more than you can buy off the Communist Viet Cong. And if you either cannot or will not arrest these agitators, then this nation will in fact "be burned to the ground" just as they promise.

THURSDAY, JULY 27, 1967—WASHINGTON, D.C.

Disaster-area Detroit.

With the help of a thunderstorm, National Guard tanks and machineguns, thousands of troops, and perhaps some sheer exhaustion on the part of the rioters, the racial violence which has plagued the city of Detroit for the past five days appeared to have simmered down today. Although the total cost in damage and loss of life will not be computed precisely for another week or so, preliminary estimates show that the rioting left at least

36, and possibly as many as 40, dead, more than 2,000 injured, including 58 policemen, 19 National Guardsmen and 29 city firemen. More than 3,000 persons have been arrested, most of them for arson or looting. At least 1,304 fires were deliberately started during the five-day period, and damage estimates are now set at \$500 million, with the long-range loss to the economy of Detroit ranging to \$1 billion.

The number of homeless has been estimated by city officials to be in the neighborhood of 5,000 persons, and today city, state and federal officials tried to decide what to do now.

Both Michigan Governor George Romney and Detroit's Mayor Cavanaugh promptly asked President Johnson today to declare the city of Detroit "a disaster area," a term usually restricted to communities struck by flood or other natural disaster, the purpose of the request being of course that they want federal assistance for the job of rebuilding from the ruins.

This afternoon, the President ordered Administration officials to study the request. The Romney-Cavanaugh telegram contained a vivid description of Detroit in the aftermath of a racial riot. It said: "Entire blocks have been leveled by fire and pockets of destruction exist throughout the city. Losses due to fire and looting have been estimated at hundreds of millions of dollars and these estimates may very well be proved to be conservative. However, we have been advised by Governor Farris Bryant and the Deputy United States Attorney General (Warren) Christopher that the provisions of the Federal Disaster Assistance Act have not in the past been applied to disasters other than those resulting from natural causes. Last week part of the Detroit metropolitan area was declared a disaster area following a five-inch rainfall. It simply does not make sense not to commit federal assistance to the city of Detroit in view of what has happened there in recent days."

The appeal in the telegram was backed up by a letter from Michigan Democratic Congressman John Conyers, a Negro from the Detroit area, who said he believes the President has the necessary authority to declare that a disaster exists under the terms of present law. He added that Agriculture Secretary Freeman already has the authority to distribute much-needed food stocks currently being stored in the Detroit area.

The question of whether the President should or should not declare Detroit a "disaster area" and give it federal assistance is not as simple as it may first appear. First of all, racial rioting has also struck some 80 other cities throughout the nation this summer, and if Detroit would qualify for federal funds, they would also qualify. And secondly, there is a serious question about whether riots such as the one in Detroit fall into the category of a federal problem, or whether instead they are of local and state concern.

There, of course, can be no possible argument against having the Federal Government release whatever emergency food is needed for the victims of the rioting. It would be a weird touch of irony, indeed, if 3,000 persons who were arrested and jailed on charges of causing the destruction were given three square meals a day in their cells, while the innocent victims were allowed to go hungry.

Likewise, if the President does not have the necessary authority to issue disaster funds to Detroit, the Congress may well take action, making this city a special case in light of the overwhelming destruction done to it over the past five days. Certain federal assistance could well be justified to help innocent victims rebuild their homes, and to get destroyed businesses back in operation.

I think it would also be a wise suggestion, however, for the Congress or the President

to tie some strings to any such aid, outside of the food, of course. One, in particular, would be to require that those who were arrested for causing the damage, and for inciting the violence participate in the clean-up and rebuilding campaign.

When the 3,000 or so arrested persons are brought to trial, and when some of these are convicted, the judges who have the job of assessing punishment for the crimes committed should, at least in my opinion, set the convicted rioters to work immediately, rebuilding what they so eagerly destroyed. Perhaps the memory of some backbreaking constructive labor would linger for a while, and serve as a deterrent to any further destructive outbursts.

And Congress or the President should help inspire such decisions by making any federal assistance contingent on the amount of self-help the state of Michigan is willing to supply, self-help in the form of labor from those who were found guilty of inflicting the damage.

Strengthening the police for problems like H. Rap Brown

Some 38 members of the House of Representatives joined today in proposing that the Federal Government allocate \$300 million to upgrade the ability of local police forces throughout the nation to cope with or prevent riots.

Michigan Democrat Congressman James G. O'Hara, who was the chief sponsor of the bill, said that it would authorize the government to provide localities with funds for organizing, training and equipping their police forces to deal with the problem.

O'Hara explained: "This is not said in criticism of our police, but the simple fact is that, although our history has by no means been free of violence, major civil disorder has simply not been the sort of problem with which local police have had to deal, and that fact speaks well for America."

The experiences of the past three summers demonstrate that there is a need for a bill of the type proposed by Congressman O'Hara. The fact is that throughout the many local race riots which have occurred during the now-familiar "long, hot summers," even the most highly trained crime fighters in the nation have had considerable difficulties in combatting this new type of group violence, and understandably so. Local police officers are by and large trained to cope with isolated criminal incidents, not massive rioting, or arson, or sniping. New training, or perhaps even new police squads specially equipped to handle race riots, have become an obvious necessity.

The best-trained and equipped policemen in the world, however, could not by themselves cope with the threat of huge outbursts of racial violence. They need considerable support from the law, and from the courts which they have not received.

As an example, I mentioned last evening the case of black power agitator H. Rap Brown, the national chairman of the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee, who has been accused of inciting Negroes to riot in Cambridge, Maryland, on Monday evening during an incendiary speech there. Shortly after the Cambridge riots got under way, Brown quietly left that eastern Maryland community for Washington, D.C., where he spent the remainder of Monday night. Maryland officials promptly issued a warrant for his arrest on charges of inciting to riot, and of causing the burning of a Cambridge elementary school. When it became apparent that he had left the state, they asked for a federal arrest order, which was issued Tuesday.

On Wednesday, Brown was picked up at the Washington National Airport while he was purchasing an airline ticket for New York City. He was taken by FBI agents to a federal courthouse in nearby Alexandria, Virginia, but when it developed that the ar-

rest warrant contained some legal imperfection he was released.

Brown was promptly arrested again, this time by Virginia police officers who announced that they were holding him until the Maryland authorities arrived to take him back to that state for trial.

Bond was set for \$10,000, and late last night this amount was posted by a Dr. Nathan Hare, who is also a fairly well-known "black power" advocate from Washington, D.C. His contract as a professor at the predominantly Negro Howard University in the Nation's Capital was not renewed this year because of some of his "black power" advocacy.

Today, H. Rap Brown then is once again free. Tonight, in fact, he is scheduled to address a rally sponsored by the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee here in the Nation's Capital. It might interest you to know that the rally is to be at the church of St. Stephen and the Incarnation.

The Nation's Capital itself is a well-known tinderbox, tense but thus far free of any riotous outbursts. But H. Rap Brown will nonetheless have an opportunity to spew out his words of agitation and hate to Negroes here, despite the fact that he is wanted in the state of Maryland on charges of having incited a riot there on Monday of this week. And you wonder why the police sometimes throw up their arms in disgust.

Speaking to a cheering crowd of Negroes outside the Washington headquarters of the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee this afternoon, H. Rap Brown gave a preview of what he probably has in store for a larger crowd tonight. He called President Johnson "a wild mad dog, an outlaw from Texas" whose Administration was trying desperately to avoid the responsibility for big city rioting.

Brown then repeated his familiar threat: "If America don't come around, we'll burn it down."

"The rebellions will continue and escalate. I say violence is necessary. Violence is a part of America's culture and is as American as apple pie."

In his remarks today, Brown said: "If you [whites] intend to play Nazis" in putting down Negro violence, "black people ain't going to play Jews."

Speaking of the four Negro civil rights leaders who yesterday appealed for non-violence, Brown concluded: "If these people keep endorsing the cracker white hunkies who are sending black people to Vietnam, to be killed, and tell you to be non-violent in the streets, you'd better start questioning them." He said that such leaders would, if they continue, be considered "the enemy."

FRIDAY, JULY 28, 1967—WASHINGTON, D.C.
President Johnson talking his way out of the riot problems

President Johnson's appeal to the Nation last night to work and pray for racial peace has had little, if any, effect thus far in restoring calm to scores of cities torn apart with civil warfare. Although things have simmered down in Detroit to the point where there is only random sniper fire, the list of cities elsewhere which have experienced racial trouble during the past 24 hours has seemed to grow.

There were some new but scattered incidents in Newark, New Jersey, and in its nearby neighbor, Passaic—Negro gangs continued to harass a section of South Philadelphia; outbreaks of Negro violence were experienced in Albany, Poughkeepsie and Peekskill, New York.

In Springfield, Ohio, a tense calm prevailed today after a large crowd of Negroes dispersed following a so-called civil rights rally last night, one sponsored, incidentally, by the allegedly non-violent Urban League and the NAACP. The crowd marched through a south Springfield shopping center, hurling firebombs.

Other communities hit by new outbreaks of racial disturbances included Waterbury, Connecticut; South Bend, Indiana; Sacramento and San Francisco, California. Police officials in both Memphis, Tennessee, and Chicago are bracing for what they believe will be week end outbursts in these cities. 4,000 National Guardsmen were ordered into Memphis today, and Chicago's Mayor Daley has asked merchants of his city to impose a voluntary embargo on the sale of guns, saying that he believes Chicago is "next on the list." He asked that Chicago citizens inform police of any illegal activity, and warned an outbreak of lawlessness would be dealt with promptly and severely.

Daley, when told of the possibility of a visit to Chicago this week end by Martin Luther King, described the Negro civil rights leader as "a troublemaker," saying that King has left behind him a wake of trouble in every city he has visited.

The only three tidbits of news in President Johnson's address to the nation last evening were in his announcement that he has created a special top-level panel to study the causes of the recent racial riots, that he has expanded and improved riot control training for the National Guard, and that he was signing a Presidential proclamation declaring Sunday, July 30th, as a "National Day of Prayer for Peace and Reconciliation" among all races here in this country.

The success of this last proposal, of course, will depend entirely upon how many people throughout this nation cooperate with it, upon how sincere their prayers are, and, of course, upon how much mercy God is willing to bestow on a nation which has removed His Name from its schoolrooms.

The potential success of the other two proposals is much easier to estimate.

The idea about giving riot control training to National Guardsmen across the nation is an excellent one, and long overdue. As a group, the National Guard is a top-notch group of soldiers, well prepared in most cases for many types of combat. Unfortunately, anti-guerrilla warfare is not one of the Guard's specialties, probably because until three years ago nobody anticipated that this nation would be confronted with the task of confronting this highly specialized and demanding challenge either in Vietnam or in the streets here at home.

It has become increasingly apparent, however, that this nation will have to depend more and more on the manpower provided by our National Guardsmen to maintain law and order during the remainder of this "long, hot summer," and during similar summers in the future. Thus it seems obvious that these forces should be given the training they will need to do their job effectively and efficiently. I might add that there is an additional need for new riot-control weapons which either the President or the Congress might well study in the near future. Tanks and machineguns may be precisely what is needed to win a war in the Sinai Desert—they are not, however, the best weapons for riot control or for dealing with arson, sniper fire, or looting in the streets of Detroit.

In some areas, National Guardsmen have been experimenting with measured success with flame throwers which have been redesigned for the use of tear gas. Other weapons like this one will have to be developed, weapons which can be used to bring an enemy under control so that he can be arrested, instead of weapons designed for mass slaughter.

The President's third proposal, the special blue-ribbon study group, falls more into the category of a political plum, than of an effective anti-riot device. This panel will not have the power to compel testimony from witnesses, and it will not have the authority to write new legislation to solve the problems it finds.

The original idea for the Presidential study group was conceived by Oklahoma

Democrat Senator Fred Harris, who, conveniently enough, was appointed to it by the President yesterday. Harris came up with the scheme in response to a proposal by Republican Senate and House members that a bipartisan Congressional Committee look into the causes of these racial disturbances. The Democrats were fearful that, should such a Committee be established, and should it produce any significant findings worthy of publicity, it would be the Republicans who would get the credit for the idea. Thus Senator Harris came up with his suggestion that the President should appoint the study group.

We have already had more than one experience with a "blue ribbon" Presidential panel under this Administration, and unfortunately none of them have been too productive. The most notable, of course, was the Warren Commission which investigated the causes of the assassination of President Kennedy. Their report has been widely criticized for its sloppiness and half-truths, and on the basis of these past experiences there is no real ground for optimism toward this new group of investigators.

The President proudly pointed out that the panel would be "bipartisan," that he had named Illinois Governor Otto Kerner as its chairman, and New York's Mayor John Lindsay as its vice chairman. That, of course, is about as much bi-partisan as would be a panel headed by California's Governor Ronald Reagan and Alabama's Lurleen Wallace. It is no longer possible to say that something is bi-partisan just because it has a Republican and a Democrat on it. You have to go a little further and ask "what kind of Republican or Democrat." And I think even Mayor Lindsay would admit that he doesn't know what the initials GOP stand for.

Nevertheless, the panel has been appointed. It will begin deliberations tomorrow.

H. Rap Brown Reports

Black power militant H. Rap Brown made it clear to a group of cheering Negroes in the Nation's Capital last night that he feels the current black uprisings in our major cities are the United States equivalent of the Vietnam war. He said this nation is, in fact, on the verge of a black revolution that will make "the Viet Cong look like Sunday school teachers."

This last reference was very a-propos, since his remarks were made at a Negro rally at St. Stephen's and the Incarnation Episcopal Church here.

The 23-year-old revolutionary said: "We will take an eye for an eye and a life for a life. Death is no stranger to the black man. So, when the rebellion starts, don't be afraid of being killed."

Brown told the crowd that Negroes should "do more shooting than looting" when they riot. He said the death of a Plainfield, New Jersey, policeman who was shot, stabbed and stomped to death last week "was a beautiful example of black people controlling their community."

His statements drew a standing ovation from the crowd and he was interrupted on at least a dozen occasions with loud outbursts of applause. The rally broke up peacefully, however, and there were no incidents, or at least there haven't been any yet.

Meanwhile at Havana, Cuba, Brown's predecessor as the national chairman of the misnamed Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee, Stokely Carmichael, had some comments of his own. He said: "Detroit and Newark are also Vietnams," and proceeded to encourage his audience of young Cuban Communists to join the American Negro in an international revolution.

Carmichael added: "If we are going to make a reality of Che Guevara's words about making two or three more Vietnams, it should be known that Detroit and Newark are at least two more."

It might interest you to know, ladies and gentlemen, that there are laws in this country which still somehow exist despite the decisions of our present Supreme Court. One of these laws is the Smith Act which, although weakened severely by Court decisions, has been upheld as constitutional. That law provides stiff penalties against any one who teaches, advocates or conspires the overthrow of the United States Government by force and violence. It seems clear, from statements of H. Rap Brown and his friend, Stokely Carmichael, that this is precisely what they have in mind. And it seems to me that the statement they have uttered to this effect might well be a violation of that statute.

Of course, this is something which the Attorney General has to decide.

GEORGE HAMILTON COMBS COMMENTARY—
JULY 27, 1967

I simply cannot go along with the frightened judgment of some of our people who think this summer's riots will plunge us into vast civil war. It just isn't going to be that bad. No outburst which can be quelled by a thunder-storm or by a drop in the temperature is going to destroy the Republic. America isn't going to be subverted by something which can be tamed by a change in the direction of the summer winds. Without stifling temperatures, the agitators couldn't get far. No, I don't minimize the potential future peril of letting these disruptive forces go unchecked or bad conditions go uncorrected. No, I don't think we can shut our eyes to the necessity of intelligent planning for a better era for all our people. I just can't concur in the alarmist judgments that we stand on the threshold of even greater tragedy than we have witnessed.

I'm afraid all our personal temperatures are going to rise if we have to listen to anymore of the rantings of Rap Brown or Stokely Carmichael—two young men whose chief talent seems to lie in the extravagance of their inflammatory language . . . two men who obviously think of themselves as un-kempt Messiahs.

We are a pretty patient people—white and black alike—but it's hard to take wild defamatory statements such as a few of the extremist black leaders are making. Rap Brown, non non-violent head of the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee, today cast aside all semblance of restraint in scurrilous attacks on President Johnson, on which he exhausted his considerable vocabulary of epithet, and on the white community as a whole. Personally, I have no intention of giving Rap Brown a platform from which to scream these slanders and I suggest that we make a mistake in ever giving currency to such hysterical attacks. Neither he nor any of these other radical agitators wield power great enough for us to follow their every word or publicize their every aberration. We give them far too much attention—and importance.

The fact is, if Rap Brown were a young white man, he would be hustled to a psychiatrist for diagnosis of his aggressions—aggressions run wild. Most young men have strong aggressive instincts—and most have the discipline to control them or society controls them if necessary. His are apparently uncontrollable . . . by him, that is.

I simply refuse to give nation-wide radio exposure to the ugly tantrums of this wild young man who seems to celebrate hate as a sacred doctrine. And, of course, his outbursts are self-defeating. Bayard Rustin, the civil rights intellectual leader, says he now thinks the Negro extremists have exercised a veto power over the rest of the Negroes who are working to achieve progress.

There are the seeds of a greater tragedy in this riot situation—the danger that the emotions thus unleashed will spread to a general race antagonism—that is, indiscrimi-

nating white resentment against all Negroes and undiscriminating Negro resentment against all whites. This simply must not be permitted to happen. I think the statement yesterday Roy Wilkins, Martin Luther King and other Negro leaders will help point public reaction away from this infinitely dangerous course. Here is the time for everybody, of every race, to prove that they have hard common-sense. It's not only a matter of goodwill: it is a matter of supreme practical importance to white and Negro alike. There must be no blanket accusations—no sweeping generalities—no blindness in judgment. The overwhelming majority of the Negro people are decent, law-abiding, sensible human beings—and this is certainly true, also of the white community. We are all Americans with a problem to be worked out—worked out in sanity and vision and hard-headed accommodation to the realities. Our interests are fundamentally the same, our approach is basically the same. The greatest calamity imaginable would be the extension of this spirit of conflict to the main bodies of both communities.

On the Negro side, there is bound to be a smoldering body of resentment and fear among many of its people; on the white side, there will certainly be a resurgence of reactionary sentiment. Both are as dangerous as they can be. I hope my Negro friends will ponder the danger that further violence will shove many of our people towards some indigenous form of fascism. Violence breeds new extremes which survive the moment of conflict. It lends encouragement to the racist of both sides. It drives each community in on itself, stoking new fires of grievance and hate.

I noted in a survey of Congressional opinion by the Wall Street Journal today that the probable legislative reaction will be to junk anti-poverty legislation, diverting federal funds to repayment of merchants who have lost their shops rather than to slum-clearance; to pass stricter gun laws (which, I may add, I certainly favor); to train the National Guard in riot prevention techniques; to drive through the pending anti-riot bill and to search for new suppressive measures. There is at present little or no talk except by a few liberals, about a massive attack on city ghettoes and other anti-poverty legislation.

Thus, unless the legislative mood changes, there will now be less rather than more legislation aimed to correcting the conditions which help—I repeat, help—cause these riots.

Dan Moynihan, the brilliant young sociologist whose report some years ago, emphasized the broken homes among Negroes as a cause of anarchy in the Negro community—Dan Moynihan, yesterday said that he interpreted these riots, also, as riots by the lowest class in economic status, which happens to be Negro. He suggested that the riots would have been launched by whites, if they were in the same economic bind—or plight. In other words, it is the economically underprivileged—or if you prefer, simply the poorest people—who tend to revolt in frustration.

While this too may be an over-simplification, I think there is a lot of wisdom in it. I have always insisted that the root of all these difficulties is economic. Of course, other factors enter into the problem . . . race antagonisms, teen-age wildness, incitement by agitators, the steamy heat of city tenements and city streets in summertime—and I think, the world-wide disorder, in which authority—all authority—is rejected by the less affluent groups.

But we won't do anyone any good by jumping into a cauldron of race suspicion and hatred. The day-to-day problems in any urban community now calls for added grace on both sides. For courtesy as well as humanity . . . for reasonable forbearance—and a little imagination.

I personally doubt that the cities and towns have the ability to cope with these

new challenges. They haven't the police strength to handle riots, or the financial strength to clear up the slums, or the economic resources to open new avenues of employment, or the focus—the singleness—of authority to deal with manifold problems. Nor have they the technical skills to solve the challenges of the day, nor the capacity to provide all the services their people need.

Probably we'll have to arrange an overhaul of the existing structures to get really workable city governments. In the meantime, the federal government—and only the federal government—has the resources to handle this growing peril.

GEORGE HAMILTON COMBS COMMENTARY—
AUGUST 2, 1967

Roy Wilkins, head of the NAACP, made a sensible observation yesterday in a news conference out in Chicago. He said it mystified him why television focused on some self-proclaimed leader who had a following of only five or six persons and broadcast his inflammatory utterances as if they came from a recognized spokesman for the negro masses. He said it more succinctly but that is the substance of his comment. He went on to ask, if a little business man begins an operation grossing 25 thousand dollars a year—and shouts loudly about it—is he to be regarded as a threat to General Motors? Would the communications media play it up as a matter of supreme importance?

I think he has put his finger on a vital spot. Most of these negro extremists are swelled-up or inflated to importance only by the media, TV, Radio and the Press. In a sense, they are the creations of our media. They would simply have no existence if it were not for the publicity we give them. At best, they would be leading fragmented little groups of fanatic followers—handful of people without power or influence.

Equally bad, although I suppose unavoidable—is the quickly spreading contagion of riots from city to city—simply because the suggestible negroes of one community saw on TV what was happening in another. Many of them wanted to get into the act. Many were infected by a communicable hysteria. And, of course, this made them susceptible to the exhorting of the few extremists in their midst who saw an opportunity to increase their own power and influence.

I rather doubt that there is any wide-flung master plan or conspiracy in these riots but I am sure that in every community there are extremist leaders—and in a few communities, organized extremist cadres—extremists who would be powerless without the mass contagion which spreads from one city to another—or from one neighborhood to another.

In a country as wide-spread as ours, there would be no concerted or synchronized movements without the wide publicity extended by our media—our communications media.

Publicity can make a radical leader. Lack of publicity can destroy him. In a very real sense, leaders are manufactured; publicity manufactures them. Of course they know this—the limelight seeking extremist rabble-rousers. I don't mean they would not continue their demagoguery on street corners and in hot crowded halls, but they would not and do not emerge into real influences until the devouring eye of the camera is trained on them—or a microphone swells their voice or the printed page gives them a fictitious importance.

I have long insisted that we in journalism have not shown the balance and restraint which goes with the principle of free speech. The publicity we shower on these mountebanks is so indiscriminating that we throw news values out of sound perspective. In short, we provide platforms for the transformation of a local rabble-rouser into a demagogue with a nation-wide audience. And he may not actually speak for a baker's

dozen of followers. Until, that is, we give him a chance to inflame prejudices and stir hate. I see no reason to provide an audience of millions for a hate-monger who couldn't attract a hundred listeners on a hot Harlem street corner.

It's easy in America to organize any sort of splinter or off-beat group—but such a group never attains importance until it's puffed into significance by the giant bellows of our communications media. In too true a sense, they not only report but MAKE the news . . . a manufactured commodity.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO
SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the Senate soon will consider amendments to the Social Security Act, amendments which, I hope, will end at least some of the many inequities in the present law.

George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO, made an important statement after the House of Representatives acted on this legislation, and I commend his remarks to the serious consideration of all Senators. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Meany's remarks be printed in the RECORD.

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

COMMENTS BY AFL-CIO PRESIDENT MEANY
ON THE SOCIAL SECURITY BILL PASSED BY THE
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thirty-two years after President Franklin D. Roosevelt signed the first Social Security bill into law, the House of Representatives has passed the 1967 version of the law.

While the House has improved the Act, it certainly hasn't improved it enough. After 32 years, millions of Social Security recipients and the poorest Americans barely existing on public assistance have a right to expect more than the House has voted.

Since the rules of the House made it virtually impossible to improve the measure on the floor, it is clearly up to the Senate to up-to-date the bill and make it the sound down-payment on a modern Social Security law which the AFL-CIO supports.

The 12½ percent increase in benefits and the House-passed minimums would still leave in dire want large numbers of Social Security recipients. The President's proposals for minimum benefits and a 15 percent across-the-board increase in benefit levels would come closer to meeting the minimal needs of large numbers of Americans.

While the bill contains some improvements in Medicare, it does not extend Medicare coverage to the disabled. As a group with much higher-than-average medical needs and limited incomes, the disabled particularly need Medicare. The bill does practically nothing to control rapidly escalating hospital charges and doctor fees paid under Medicare.

Some of the most glaring deficiencies in the bill are in the public assistance field. The bill provides for mandatory participation in training programs of mothers with young children receiving public assistance but it sets no standards for adequate day-care for children in such families. Financial support would not be assured for needy children whose parents are removed from public assistance. The bill does nothing to raise shockingly low assistance payments standards which are currently in most States below minimum needs standards set by the States themselves. Thus, hundreds of thousands of our poorest people would be even worse off if the bill's provisions on public assistance were to be enacted in their present form.

We are disturbed that the House has failed to transfer the community work and training

program to the Department of Labor, as the President wisely recommended. The Labor Department has developed the skill, the knowledge and the machinery for effectively training those who have been marginally equipped to enter the labor market. Welfare recipients need the best possible training under good working conditions and decent wages, to restore them to self-sufficiency. We also strongly object to the possibility under the House bill for placement of welfare recipients, assigned to community work and training, in private industry at sub-minimum wages and without other safeguards that would prevent their exploitation.

The bill's drastic cutback income eligibility standards for Medicaid will deprive hundreds of thousands of the needy and the medically needy from required medical care they cannot afford to pay for out of their meager incomes.

It is now up to the Senate to fill the gaps and correct the defects in the bill the House has passed so that the final bill will more nearly measure up to America's Social Security and Welfare requirements.

The House bill nowhere near meets the long-range objectives of the AFL-CIO for a Social Security Act that will truly meet all of America's needs. To achieve our 1967 goal, the AFL-CIO will urge the Senate to:

1. Raise the minimum benefit level to \$70 for a single person and \$105 for a couple, and increase all other benefits by at least 15 percent. This would make possible the over-all 20 percent increase in Social Security benefit payments the President has recommended.

2. Finance the benefit improvements by an increase in the earnings level, on which both contributions and benefits are determined, by steps from the present \$6,600 to \$10,800.

3. Extend Medicare coverage to the disabled.

4. Establish reasonable controls on unduly high hospital charges and physician fees paid under Medicare.

5. Assure that Medicaid is available to the needy and the medically needy whose limited incomes cannot pay for adequate health care.

6. Improve present appallingly inadequate public assistance payments and assure adequate day-care for children of families receiving assistance in which the mother is participating in training programs.

7. Strengthen rather than weaken the possibility of poor families remaining together by requiring States to make assistance available where the father is in the home until he can obtain work for which he is qualified.

8. Transfer administration of community work and training to the Department of Labor with provision of adequate safeguards for those assigned to this program, including requirement of payment of prevailing wages and in no case less than the applicable minimum wage.

THE RAT CONTROL BILL

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, many people throughout the Nation have become alarmed over the refusal of the House of Representatives to pass the rat control bill.

This modest measure, which would spend only \$40 million over a 2-year period, was not even permitted to come to debate in the House.

The causes of social disorder, discontent, and riots are clear. Filthy and degrading slums breed riots.

In a recent editorial published in the Chippewa Herald Telegram, John Lavine, the able editor, eloquently describes the inexcusable tragedy of the House action.

The Senate can still revive the bill if it so chooses.

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:

[From the Chippewa Herald Telegram, July 21, 1967]

THE "RAT" LEGISLATION

There is a time for thinking about politics and selfish interests, and there is a time when politics and selfish interests should be thrown aside and people, regardless of where they live, should be the only consideration.

Certainly, in their turning down the Administration's "rat legislation," the Congress of the United States showed its most heartless and selfish qualities.

The legislation was simple in intent. It would have established a federal program to rid our country's urban slums of the rapidly growing rat population—a population which has killed more children in Chicago and New York in the last few years than ever before in the cities' history.

Now, it is true that this legislation would not be of any specific aid to the rural population of America. However, it is also a fact, as President Johnson pointed out when he heard about Congress' action with respect to the rat legislation, that we already have federal programs aimed at destroying rodents who might be harmful to our farm animals. Yet, the amazing and sickening thing about the House of Representatives' action on the rat legislation was that they voted it down, "because it did nothing for the rural people, just for those in the cities."

Perhaps the House of Representatives think that they were helping themselves at home in the rural areas by voting down this legislation. If they really do believe this, all we can say is that they don't know much about the non-urban mind.

It is true that this rat bill would not directly benefit those Americans who do not live in big cities—or, to be more specific, who do not live in big city slums. Yet, we do not know one person in our own non-big-city or in this rural area who would be so selfish and heartless as to not want to try and save some American children's lives by wiping out the rats in big city slums.

To think that America can have a rat problem in its cities is to recall the days in the last centuries in Europe when cities were fighting rats. That is a horrible thought. And we doubt that any American—be he in a big city or in a rural area—would not give a lot to see that this picture is wiped away. The only exception to this is that majority of men in Congress who can bear on their shoulders the responsibility for the death of each child—and there are some each day—who are bitten and eventually die at the fangs of a rat in a slum in an American city.

REPORTED SIGHTINGS OF IVORY-BILLED WOODPECKER REVEALS NEED FOR URGENCY IN BIG THICKET NATIONAL PARK BILL

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I have been gratified to see the extensive coverage given in the American press to the rediscovery of the ivory-billed woodpecker in the big thickets area of Texas.

One of the essential components of any effective conservation effort must be an awareness of the problem by the public and their support for corrective measures. I have a bill (S. 4) presently before the Senate to declare the big thicket area of Texas a national park, in order to preserve the habitat of such rare ani-

mals as the ivorybill and to conserve a beautiful part of our heritage for posterity. I am confident that with the increased coverage which the situation is receiving popular support for the bill will become overwhelming enough to guarantee its passage.

Helping to arouse this support is an article written by Larry Hatfield, of United Press International, and published in the Dallas Morning News of September 3, 1967. Mr. Hatfield, in an excellent story, explores the hope for survival of the ivorybill. I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "Ivory-Bill Chances for Comeback Good," be printed in the RECORD.

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

IVORY-BILL CHANCES OF COMEBACK GOOD

(By Larry D. Hatfield)

PATUXENT WILDLIFE RESEARCH CENTER, Md.—Government wildlife specialists here are quietly optimistic that the recently rediscovered ivory-billed woodpecker can make a comeback.

Renewed interest in the ivory-bill, the largest and rarest of American woodpeckers, has been prompted by recent sightings of the big bird in the Big Thicket country of Texas—a wild, swampy area northeast of Houston, encompassing parts of Trinity, Tyler, Hardin, Liberty and San Jacinto Counties.

Most experts believed the bird had joined the passenger pigeon and other species into oblivion.

One of those hopeful about the ivory-bill's future is John V. Dennis, 50, the Leesburg, Va., ornithologist who made the recent sightings.

Dennis, working under contract to the Interior Department, first spotted a pair of the birds briefly in early December of last year. The last previous confirmed sighting had been made in Florida in 1950.

Most ornithologists had concluded that the ivory-bill was extinct, although there were occasional reports of sightings by both professional and amateur birdwatchers.

Dennis has sighted two other pair since December and thinks there may be "from five to 10" pair in the Big Thicket.

In addition, the Interior Department is going to try to track down other reports of sightings along the Congaree River in South Carolina, the Apalachicola River in Florida, the Tombigbee River in Alabama and Mississippi and the Altamaha River in Georgia.

Dennis, who likens the first sighting to "what a mountain climber must feel when he reaches the top," said he feels "there is room for some optimism" that the ivory-bill population can be built up.

He pointed out that the pileated woodpecker, which often has been confused with the ivory-bill, formerly was relatively rare "but has come back."

Both woodpeckers are larger than a crow but their black and white markings are different. The ivory-bill has an ivory-colored bill while the pileated's is black. The ivory-bill's call is trumpet-like, according to Dennis, while the pileated cackles.

Dr. Ray C. Erickson, assistant director of the wildlife research center and an expert on endangered species, also feels there is a good chance the ivory-bill will make a comeback.

He adds, however, that very little is known about the bird. "We don't know much about their distribution or numbers," he said. "At no time has there been more than one bird seen at the same time so we don't really know whether there are six or 60 or how many." In fact, he said, some ornithologists

still are not convinced of the bird's survival and want further proof.

Erickson said the fact that the elusive ivory-bill has survived this long despite continuing encroachment on its natural habitat by man is a reason for believing it will keep on living. Their "retiring nature" and extreme wariness "may have kept them alive this long," he said.

The woodpeckers formerly lived in swamps from southeastern South Carolina to eastern Texas, ranging as far north as the Ohio River and as far south as the Florida cypress swamps.

They feed on wood-boring insects that live in the inner bark or between the bark and sapwood of dead or dying oak, gum and cypress trees. Because of their size and strong beaks, the ivory-bills can reach areas that could not be exposed by smaller woodpeckers.

The Interior Department has asked lumbering operators in areas where the ivory-bill might still survive to help protect the habitat. Harry Goodwin, chief of the Office of Endangered Species in the Interior Department, says he is confident the lumber companies will cooperate.

RURAL MIGRATION TO THE CITIES

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, the Washington Post today carried a thoughtful editorial on the problem of rural migration to the already-overcrowded urban centers. The editorial pointed out that this migration is caused by a lack of opportunities in rural areas, and the way to halt it is to make rural life more attractive and more rewarding. Cities also will benefit, since the influx from rural areas now is making it virtually impossible for them to solve the problems of housing shortages, inadequate transportation, air and water pollution, overcrowded schools, crime, and juvenile delinquency.

I heartily agree with the Washington Post, and would like to point out that the Rural Job Development Act of 1967 could be an important factor in ending this rural-to-urban migration. The distinguished junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] and I, on July 21, introduced this bill providing for tax incentives to private industry locating and expanding in low-income rural areas and small towns and for training the poor. Advantages of this bill are the direct involvement of the private sector and the fact that it would require no additional Federal administrative organization. I hope the Senate will give prompt consideration to this needed legislation.

Mr. President, I ask that the Washington Post editorial entitled "Rural Migrants" be printed in the RECORD.

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

RURAL MIGRANTS

Two witnesses before the Presidential Commission of Urban Problems last week suggested that the tide of immigration from rural to urban areas be reversed. Paul N. Yivisaker, New Jersey Commissioner of Community Affairs, called for a national migration policy to halt the flow of the rural poor into urban slums. Jack E. Wood of the National Committee Against Discrimination in Housing recommended steps to open opportunities for citizens migrating from city centers to suburbs.

This is a healthy sign that the country is awakening to a crisis that long has concerned many rural experts. There has been an historic movement from farm to city areas

that the country has come to regard as normal and inevitable. In the earlier decades of this century it was a migration of representative rural folk, including some of the most gifted people. An annual flow of some 250,000 high school graduates into cities has been a great contribution to urban progress. But the migrants have increasingly come from disadvantaged areas. The rural counties lost 8 per cent of their population to the cities between 1950 and 1960. And many of these migrants were people driven from rural areas by a technological revolution in agriculture. Their emigration to the cities simply transformed rural wretchedness into urban wretchedness.

A democratic society cannot stop such population movements by ukase or decree. (Some totalitarian systems are trying to stop similar shifts by such means.) Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman has defined the only democratic means of reversing this tide. He told a population conference in 1966: "When meaningful alternatives give Americans real freedom of choice . . . the population movement from country to city will level off, and even go into reverse."

The President's National Advisory Commission on Food and Fiber has pointed out that the 1959 annual median income of urban families was \$6166 compared with \$4750 for rural non-farm families and \$3228 for rural farm families. It recommended a broad program of rural help—fuller use of rural manpower, investment to increase the skills of rural people, assurance to the rural poor of a decent living standard. The Commission urged a whole program of action to "encourage economic development within reach of rural people."

The Commission concluded that "economic development of the rural areas must be the answer," in the long run. It urged guaranteed minimum incomes to take up the slack in the short run. Whatever the precise means, we need to cease moving people from impoverished rural areas into impoverished urban areas. This unwise, unplanned and unprofitable migration can be reversed only by making rural life more remunerative economically and more rewarding culturally.

OFFENSIVE MINE LAYING

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask that there be printed in the RECORD for the information of the Senate a brief extract from the U.S. Strategic Bombing Survey, Pacific, No. 78, entitled "The Offensive Mine Laying Campaign Against Japan," page 11.

Senators will see that it details the World War II closing of the Port of Haiphong for the duration of that war by the use of only two airplanes.

While present North Vietnamese defenses would force us to make a more elaborate effort, we can and should close the port now. The subsequent events will be much the same as those in 1943—Haiphong will be out of the war and victory for the allies will be nearer.

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

[From the U.S. Strategic Bombing Survey, Pacific No. 78]

THE OFFENSIVE MINE LAYING CAMPAIGN AGAINST JAPAN

In October 1943 the Fourteenth U.S.AAF joined the list of commands engaged in mine laying. Its first two missions, consisting of one B-24 sortie each, were directed at Haiphong. A ship was sunk in the main channel almost immediately, and a 10-ship convoy which had been blocked out of the harbor milled around for some hours and then pro-

ceeded to Northern Hainan Island. There the Fourteenth Air Force caught up with it and sank 6 of the 10 ships. That experience plus another ship casualty in the mine field caused the Japanese to abandon Haiphong as a port for anything larger than junks for the duration of the war.

WILBUR SCHMIDT, DYNAMIC PUBLIC SERVANT OF WISCONSIN

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I am very much pleased to note that Mr. Wilbur Schmidt has been chosen to serve as Secretary of the newly combined departments of health and welfare in the State of Wisconsin.

The new post results from the reorganization of State government. Wilbur Schmidt has served with distinction as head of the welfare department for 12 years.

Under his dynamic leadership, the State of Wisconsin has made great progress in the field of social welfare.

John Wyngaard, a keen observer of the Wisconsin scene, has written a fine article which was published in the Post-Crescent, of Appleton, Wis., describing Wilbur Schmidt's outstanding qualifications for his new post.

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:

[From the Appleton (Wis.) Post-Crescent, Aug. 4, 1967]

SCHMIDT APPOINTMENT AS SECRETARY OF NEW BOARD COMMENDED

(By John Wyngaard)

MADISON.—There is a traditional tendency for puffery among government officials when they talk about each other in public, but Dr. William Studley, the chairman of the newly created Board of Health and Social Services, probably had the support of most persons familiar with the state government operations in recent years, when he spoke warmly about Wilbur Schmidt, chosen to be the secretary of the new state department that combines the old Health and Welfare Departments.

"I believe we have in Mr. Schmidt one of the truly outstanding public servants in the country today," he said.

The Schmidt selection for the command of the combined health and welfare administrations was one of the comparatively rare certainties in upper level state government personnel recruitment. That it was unanimously approved by the new board surprised no one. Any dissent would have been a headline event.

THE MAN ADMIRER

Since this man of driving energy, keen intelligence and wholesome homeliness took over the direction of the Welfare Department 12 years ago, legislators and governors have marveled at his performance and admired his understanding of the multifarious aspects of his job almost without exception.

To observe him in a presentation of his mammoth budget, for example, is an extraordinary experience for the reporter who becomes accustomed to less skilled and sometimes poorly informed heads of other services who are content to present the data gathered by underlings in a prepared manuscript.

The Welfare Department's programs run the gamut of social problems in Wisconsin. They include probation and parole, operation of correctional institutions, numerous treatment centers for the mentally ill, public assistance programs of half a dozen categories, youth conservation camps, a foster home

program for dependent children, institutions for handicapped children, child adoptions, ad infinitum. It spends more money than any other agency represented in the state executive budget and has more employees than any other.

Yet it is rare that Mr. Schmidt is asked a question that he cannot answer promptly, clearly and confidently. Obviously he crams for his appearances and is sensitive to the responsibility of the administrator to the Legislature in providing all of the information that is available and relevant.

ACCOUNTANT TRAINING HELPS

Perhaps his striking ability to grasp and retain a myriad of facts and figures about his huge department reflects his professional training as an accountant. He was the department's chief accountant before he was chosen as director.

Normally such a responsible position would be occupied by a person with professional training in social welfare specialties.

As the story is told, Schmidt would not have won his original appointment except through a lucky chance. A predecessor who had professional training in social work had resigned to take a similar position in a larger state at a higher salary. The Board of Welfare was prepared to search the country for a successor with similar background and training. But they needed an acting administrator. Somebody mentioned Schmidt, then a comparatively obscure back room man. He was willing, and it didn't require much time for the board to conclude that they wanted him as permanent department commander.

The Schmidt experience as an officer in a vital and sensitive service exemplifies the career opportunities, without benefit of formal tenure rules, that is one of the distinguishing characteristics of the Wisconsin system among the state governments of the country. His job is not protected by law. He could be dismissed tomorrow. But there is no one who doubts that he will remain on the job indefinitely, if he chooses to do so.

EAST-WEST RECONCILIATION

Mr. McGEE, Mr. President, the most hopeful development in East-West relations has been the lessening threat of direct military confrontation between the big powers and the correspondingly increased rate of trade and cultural exchanges which represent competition on a different level. We are witnessing the gradual liberalization of Eastern Europe and, in this country, a growing belief that ideological conflict between East and West can be laid to rest.

As Crosby Noyes wrote in the Washington Evening Star of September 7:

It's very unfashionable these days to call a spade a spade, an enemy an enemy, or a Russian a Communist.

In his column, Noyes makes the well-taken point, however, that East-West reconciliation is a long way off and that we must not shun the competition which our system of Government is clearly capable of winning. 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:

[From the Evening Star, Sept. 9, 1967]

EAST-WEST RECONCILIATION A LONG WAY OFF
(By Crosby S. Noyes)

It's very unfashionable these days to call a spade a spade, an enemy an enemy, or a Russian a Communist.

In the aftermath of Glassboro, anyone in

this country who speaks in terms of ideological conflict is likely to be written off as an unreconstructed reactionary bent on reviving the Cold War. The most persistent theme of the critics of our involvement in Vietnam is that it tends to hurt our relations with the Soviet Union that otherwise, one gathers, would be dandy.

Among these critics, there seem to be few who recognize the very distinct limits to the new spirit of ideological harmony that prevails in the West. They overlook the fact that reconciliation is a two-way proposition and that the Russians—to say nothing of the Chinese—have no intention of abandoning the conflict that is inherent in the nature of communism itself.

It is true, of course, that the conflict can take different forms. Today world leaders are much less inclined to talk in terms of blasting each other off the map. Since the Cuban missile crisis, the threat of a direct military confrontation between the major nuclear powers—in spite of Vietnam—has mercifully receded.

It is also true that where interests happen to coincide, limited areas of agreement and even limited areas of collaboration can be found.

Trade and cultural exchanges between East and West can be increased. Agreements on the exploration of space and remote areas of the globe have been signed. More doubtfully, a joint effort to limit the spread of nuclear weapons may be forthcoming. It is even conceivable that in the end the Russians will cooperate in an attempt to limit the armaments in the Middle East.

Finally, it is true that communism as a system has evolved in Russia and elsewhere since Stalin's day. Particularly among the countries of Eastern Europe—Communist more by necessity than by conviction—the trend toward gradual liberalization has established itself. Some day, perhaps, communism as a system could become as harmless as socialism is in Western Europe.

But that day, most emphatically, is still a long way off. At this point no Communist worthy of the name would admit such a possibility. And anyone who fails to recognize the essential hostility of communism to the political, social and economic system that prevails in the West would be well advised to have his head examined.

Because the conflict between the two systems is neither an accident of history nor a figment of overheated Western imaginations.

From the Communist point of view the antagonism is the very essence of Marxist-Leninist teaching. Whatever areas of limited truce may be staked out, this essential element of conflict and competition is certain to remain for a very long time.

For all the talk of peaceful coexistence, the assumption is that in the end only one system will survive. When Nikita Khrushchev promised that "we will bury you," he may not have meant it literally—but he meant it.

To accept this as a fact of life is neither illiberal nor unduly pessimistic. For if the conflict with the centers of Communist power can be confined to non-military areas, it is likely that we will survive it. And if we bring to the competition a reasonable proportion of the resources available to us, it is highly probable that we will prevail.

Certainly it is not impossible to demonstrate the superiority of our system, not only for ourselves, but also for the emerging nations of Asia, Africa and South America which are the real battlegrounds. The assumption that ours is a rich man's system and that communism somehow offers a magic key to instant development is being dramatically refused in many parts of the world today.

The appalling failures of communism in such places as China, Indonesia and Cuba hardly recommend it as the wave of the future among the underdeveloped countries.

What has been achieved in Japan, South Korea, Taiwan and Thailand sets a pattern that a good many other countries might someday hope to match.

Success, however, is by no means assured. To achieve it will call for a clear recognition in this country of what is at stake and an acceptance of the competition that has been imposed upon us. That it is being accepted is one of the more hopeful features of the world today. And those who would abandon it in the hope of some illusory reconciliation with communism are the real defeatists among us.

ADM. CHESTER W. NIMITZ: THE MODEST HERO

Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. President, the Senate was in recess on Saturday, September 2, the 22d anniversary of the signing of the Japanese surrender in Tokyo Bay aboard the U.S.S. *Missouri*. That signing formalized the end of World War II, and the victory that brought it about can be largely attributed to our brave, determined naval forces who vindicated our losses at Pearl Harbor by annihilating the Japanese fleet.

Today I am particularly proud to pay tribute to a fellow Texan, Adm. Chester W. Nimitz, the commander in chief of the Pacific Fleet and the architect of our successful naval strategy.

Chester W. Nimitz was born on February 24, 1885, in Fredericksburg, Tex., a colorful, German-flavored town in the central Texas hill country. His grandfather, a retired sea captain, was an early pioneer builder of the town. Throughout his childhood young Nimitz longed to attend West Point, but at the age of 15, when no appointment was available, he decided to enter the Naval Academy. Two years after his graduation when he had completed the required period of sea duty, he was commissioned as an ensign. Thereafter he commanded various obsolete minor ships for several years. He won his first naval award, the Silver Life Saving Medal, for rescuing a fireman on his ship who had fallen overboard into a swift current.

In 1913, then-Lieutenant Nimitz was sent to Belgium and Germany to study diesel engines and afterward was responsible for building the first diesel engine for the U.S. Navy. During World War I, he was assigned to the staff of Admiral Robison, commander of the submarine force in the Atlantic Fleet. In the interwar years, Nimitz established a Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps unit at the University of California and later returned to sea duty. When Pearl Harbor was bombed, on December 7, 1941, Nimitz was a junior rear admiral serving as Chief of the Bureau of Naval Personnel.

Nimitz' experience, thoroughness, confidence, and exemplary record combined the perfect qualities for the new Commander in Chief of the Pacific Fleet. Ten days after Pearl Harbor, President Roosevelt appointed Chester W. Nimitz, out of a field of 29 men, to replace Adm. Husband E. Kimmel.

When Admiral Nimitz arrived at his new post, he found the men demoralized and uncertain and the fleet and facilities in shambles. However, his self-confidence was quickly passed on to his men and in

less than 2 years Nimitz had converted a naval junkpile into the world's most powerful fleet.

The first major sea engagement which Nimitz commanded was the battle of the Coral Sea on May 8, 1942. Although tactically the United States was defeated, Nimitz could claim a strategic victory, for he had forced the Japanese to divert their thrust from Australia to the American base at Midway.

Most historians and politicians including President Roosevelt, considered the Battle of Midway, fought June 4-6, 1942, the greatest success of the war in 1942, and one of our greatest victories in World War II. Nimitz' foresight led him to base his tactics on intercepted Japanese codes indicating Midway as a major target. Washington strategists interpreted these messages as diversionary decoys. However, Nimitz concluded that the messages were authentic. The result was an overwhelming naval victory for the United States and the turning point of the war in the Pacific. The Battle of Midway halted the Japanese threat to Hawaii, the Panama Canal, and the United States and prevented the isolation and occupation of Australia. Thereafter Japan could only fight a defensive war.

Another outstanding accomplishment of Nimitz was his ingenious device of floating naval bases to follow the fleet ships. With these efficient stations providing fuel, supplies, and repairs, American ships could remain away from their ports for extended periods, thereby deceiving the enemy.

Nimitz carefully avoided publicity, always remaining in the background, never exercising his power unjustly, and allowing all credit to be given to his subordinates. Even in his speech on board the U.S.S. *Missouri*, after signing the Japanese surrender, he praised the other branches of the Armed Forces and our allies as well as his own men as instrumental in the victory.

In 1944, Nimitz was promoted to the newly created rank of admiral of the fleet, and from 1945 to 1947 was Chief of Naval Operations in Washington. He later served the University of California as a regent and worked with the United Nations and President Truman in an advisory capacity.

When Fleet Admiral Nimitz, winner of five Distinguished Service Medal Awards, died last year, he was buried according to his modest request—near the Pacific Ocean, side by side with other sailors and soldiers who had served with him, and without the ceremony of a state funeral.

But modesty cannot hide the valor of this great American, and it will not. In Fredericksburg, birthplace of Admiral Nimitz, a group of civic-minded individuals have come together to form a museum honoring him. The Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz Museum occupies the old Nimitz Hotel, long-operated by the admiral's family, located on Fredericksburg's main avenue, very near the center of the downtown shopping area. The building itself is a tribute to the admiral. Nearly a century old, it is built in the shape of a ship. It will house relics of the life of Adm. Chester

W. Nimitz—a life dedicated to serving and protecting his Nation.

I have asked that the flag flown over the U.S. Capitol on September 2, date of the 22d anniversary of the signing of Japan's surrender, in which Nimitz played such a central role, be made available to that museum as an added tribute, and a fitting one, I believe, to a man who did so much for the United States.

NEGROES AND JEWS

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, from time to time, I have invited the attention of the Senate to the excellent articles presented in the Progressive magazine, published by the extremely able Morris Rubin, of Madison, Wis.

The current issue contains many provocative and informative articles.

In an editorial entitled "Negroes and Jews," the Progressive rejects the notion that the Negro community has become anti-Semitic. The magazine contends that the violent outburst of the SNCC hate mongers is not an accurate reflection of Negro sentiment.

The eminent Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE], in an article entitled "New Tools for Social Progress," describes his plan for a domestic social program over the years to come. I believe the Nation would profit by reading it.

I ask unanimous consent that the article and editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

NEW TOOLS FOR SOCIAL PROGRESS

(By Senator WALTER F. MONDALE)

Early this year, the National Committee Against Segregation in Housing charged that for the past three decades, good intentions notwithstanding, various Federal programs had fostered racial segregation and consequently trapped Negroes in slum ghettos.

Their specific criticisms attacked a broad range of programs and policies, among them urban renewal, transportation, and public housing. Some of the programs the Committee cited sought to improve American society generally; others, such as public housing, aimed at improving the condition of the poor. Of urban renewal, the Committee charged that the programs "have consistently violated the rights of Negro Americans and other minorities by forcing their continuous upheaval and relocation in racially segregated areas to accommodate local community prejudices."

Because the main target of the criticism was the Department of Housing and Urban Development, HUD Secretary Robert C. Weaver prepared an eight-page response which said, generally, that the Department was doing the best it could under current laws but stronger legislation was needed.

There the matter rests, and as a United States Senator who has voted for some of the programs, or supported others enacted before I came to the Senate, I am perplexed and troubled.

As the situation now stands, there is no prospect for an accurate and public accounting of the extent of racial segregation in the United States that would enable us to determine whether government programs are cures or contributors to the perpetuation of this social cancer.

The lack of verifiable, public information exists in a number of broad areas: physical health and mental illness, the quality of edu-

cation, the effect upon society of a gradually deteriorating natural environment.

Unhappily, we have had a whole summer of unprecedented violence in our cities that revealed glaringly the shocking lack of knowledge of the nature and extent of the social ills that plague our rich nation. The proliferation of ad hoc committees at the national, state, and local levels to determine the causes of rioting in the urban ghettos is ample evidence of the need for an on-going, permanent coordination of these social indicators. In these cases violence serves as a measure of the lack of jobs, poor health care, inferior educational opportunity, de facto segregation, and the multitude of other burdens that grind upon the poor and those discriminated against by the majority.

There certainly must be more peaceful ways than riot, and hopefully more precise methods, too, to measure our failures and document the considerable successes of governmental efforts to improve the quality of American life. Obviously, we need better indicators. For America to approach the future unequipped to evaluate and plan effectively is to invite chaos.

One of the social sciences, economics, has proven that by carefully measuring and watching various indicators such as retail sales, volume, amount of new investment, and levels of gross national product, we can take action to head off economic disaster. What do the social sciences have to offer in noneconomic areas of the human conditions? Very little of a solid or continuous nature. We now have no comparative system that will alert us to social disaster—a system of social indicators, widely broadcast, by which we could keep watch in a general way on the social processes in our nation and plan for society's orderly development.

Instead, we undertake ambitious and laudable programs, and watch in shocked amazement when the reaction is different from what we expected. Then we scramble to try to ascertain the facts, often with dubious success.

Take urban renewal, for example. For a decade, urban renewal has been held high as the salvation of our rotting cities, and damned as merely exporting the poor to new ghettos.

In my files are two magazine articles published within three months of each other in 1965. One of these, a critical article, cites a 1961 report that sixty per cent of the displaced poor were relocated in new slums while high-income families occupied the handsome new glass and steel towers. The other article, on the optimistic side, reported a 1964 finding that only eight per cent of displaced slum families remained afterward in substandard housing. The three-year time difference between the studies could account for at least some of the disparity—perhaps all. But in any case there are no clear, current, public, well-announced figures available to refute or support either claim. The two articles punctuate our ignorance about the real effects of one of the most ambitious and promising Federal programs. We know we are building new buildings, but what are we doing to people?

The absence of adequate, publicly announced indicators can also veil our successes and encourage mistaken exploitation of surface indications of failure, whether it be the testing of new educational techniques, methods of fighting crime, or the administration of welfare funds. As *The Progressive* noted in its June issue, White House aide Joseph Califano had performed the distinct service of coordinating welfare data revealing that only 50,000 of the 7.3 million persons receiving welfare throughout the nation are actually capable of being trained to hold jobs. This data, pulled together for the first time, effectively refutes the conservative bugaboo that, as *The Progressive* put it, "Americans on pub-

lic welfare rolls are lazy bums leeching on society. . . ."

What I am suggesting is that as our present programs continue in their sometimes uncertain way, we must undertake to devise statistical and analytical methods to help us find out what we have done and what we ought to be doing. To say that our societal programs may be imperfect and sometimes miss the mark is not to say, of course, that we should halt all attempts toward social betterment. But perhaps we can find ways to get more done at less cost and with less waste motion.

Beyond the establishment of social measures, there should be persistent and perceptible and continuing high level analysis of our social processes, their problems and possibilities, such as is provided for the President by the Council of Economic Advisers in the economic field.

Man's oldest method of self-education is trial and error, but it is also the least efficient. Try we must, but there are ways of reducing the margin of error.

Incessant trial and error and the absence of accurate measurement sap public confidence in otherwise highly desirable programs, and this perhaps is the core of disagreement about many programs designed to improve the public welfare: programs encompassing health, education, transportation. How do we measure success in terms that reflect impact on individuals? By amount of money spent? This may be a measure of effort, but not of effect.

To be sure, there are many surveys and abundant statistics. There are thousands of statisticians at work in Washington alone, and thousands more working for public and private agencies across the nation. And despite the fact that we do collect mountains of statistics, as the 1,000-plus pages of the *Statistical Abstract of the United States* attest, there remain frightening gaps in information essential for accurate evaluation. Much of the statistical information we now collect is incoherent; that is, it bears no readily apparent relationship to other data which, taken all together, would allow reasonable conclusions.

In other instances, the information is available from widely different agencies, but few people know where to get it. A social scientist doing some post-Watts research told me recently that all the statistical indicators warning of the impending explosion were available before the outbreak. Unfortunately, there was no one to gather and analyze them and no agency existing with the prestige and attention-getting devices to warn the public and government officials.

It would be an oversimplification, of course, to imply that social indicators can magically reveal the "truth" in every case in which an effect is disputed, or alert us to every impending crisis. But it cannot be denied that a system of statistical indicators, measured regularly and watched constantly, and not the least important, available for easy public examination, can yield invaluable guidance for future action. Such a system might make it possible to avoid the risk of dangerous sociological backlash.

The riots in Watts have been partially blamed on the frustrations that arose because of the transportation success of the Los Angeles freeway system. When public transportation withered as automobile travel became more and more convenient, the impoverished Watts residents without cars were effectively isolated from job opportunities and from state and local facilities where they could receive aid.

Columnist Joseph Kraft blames unfortunate consequences like this on our "innocence." Kraft laments that "Lack of regular information fosters an innocence and irresponsibility that is positively terrifying. City after city launches urban renewal drives only to discover—belatedly and with surprise—

that poor people are being driven from their homes. County after county launches drives for new industry only to learn—also belatedly and with surprise—that it is polluting the atmosphere. State after state pushes highway projects, only to realize—with astonishment—that the result is impossible congestion in city streets."

This may be "innocence." It is also appalling ignorance.

We were once just as ignorant of the consequences of economic policy. We used to thrash around making decisions on the basis of untested theories and inadequate information, assuming that cyclical waves of boom and bust were inevitable.

But with the enactment of the Employment Act of 1946 establishing the President's Council of Economic Advisers, the Council fostered the refinement of the abundant economic statistics into a reasonably accurate measurement of the nation's economic health. These indicators provide the basis for analysis and planning that have been remarkably effective.

The valuable lessons learned over the past two decades regarding economic indicators suggests that if we had more and better data on social conditions, and if these could be molded into a coherent system of social indicators comparable to their economic counterparts, we would be able to do a far better job of decision-making regarding social programs.

The tantalizing prospect of social measurement was suggested by Gunnar Myrdal in his *American Dilemma*, written in 1944. He wrote, "We should . . . have liked to present in our study a general index, year by year or at least decade by decade, as a quantitative expression of the movement of the entire system we are studying: the status of the Negro in America."

In 1962, the Behavioral Science subpanel of the President's Science Advisory Committee acknowledged the benefits of systematic gathering of economic data, and commented: "We call attention to the great advance over the past generation in the quantity and quality of our information about the economy and the effective use that is now made of such information in formulating and administering national economic policy. Similar benefits would flow from a corresponding advance in the quantity and quality of information about non-economic aspects of behavior."

Another appeal for a social accounting appears in "Technology and the American Economy," the report of the National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress, submitted last year. In its chapter on "Improving Public Decision Making," the Commission declared:

"The American commitment is not only to raise the standard of living, but to improve the quality of life. But we have too few yardsticks to tell us how we are doing. A system of social accounts would seek to set up 'performance budgets' in various areas to serve as such yardsticks. A series of community health indexes would tell us how well we are meeting the needs of our people in regard to adequate medical care. A national 'housing budget' would reflect our standing in regard to the goal of a 'decent home for every American family.'"

A system of social auditing or accounting would serve five purposes:

It would sharpen our quantitative knowledge of social needs.

It would allow us to measure more precisely our progress toward our social objectives.

It would help us to evaluate efforts at all levels of government.

It would help us to determine priorities among competing social programs.

It would encourage the development and assessment of alternative courses without waiting until some one solution had belatedly been proved a failure.

I have introduced legislation in the Senate

designed to accomplish these aims. The Full Opportunity and Social Accounting Act (S. 843) is an attempt to elevate social evaluation to as influential a position as is now occupied by economic measurement.

Modeled after the Employment Act of 1946, the legislation contains four key sections:

One—It establishes full social opportunity for all Americans as a national goal.

Two—It establishes a three-member President's Council of Social Advisers and charges them with devising a system of social indicators, and with appraising governmental programs and advising the President on domestic social policy.

Three—It requires the President to submit an annual Social Report, comparable to the Economic Report, disclosing the indicators for public examination, and giving them wide exposure.

Four—It establishes a Joint Congressional Committee on the Social Report, which could hold hearings and subject the President's Social Report to critical analysis.

When the nation's population was widely dispersed on farms and small hamlets, the rate of social change was slow. Much of the social adjustment to sickness, unemployment, disability, old age, broken homes, poverty, and crime was handled within the local community. In 1890, half of our people lived on farms and many of the rest in small towns. Today, something like five per cent of our people live on farms and practically all population increase is taking place in the large metropolitan areas. With people so concentrated, social change can be rapid, the sense of responsibility for one's neighbors is diminished, and the impact of a catastrophe is so overwhelmingly large that no neighborhood—however well-intentioned—can possibly cope with it.

Urban concentration has made necessary large technological projects in transportation, water, sewage and waste disposal, as well as housing construction and renewal. The pace of technological adaptation of man to his environment has certainly increased.

At the same time, we have—if anything—impaired our ability to identify and deal with the inescapable social dislocations that accompany new urban technology. The burgeoning growth of social programs at Federal, regional, state, county, and municipal levels has already created a cats-cradle of inter-governmental authorities. Partial data of varying quality are pouring out to confuse us. Large projects employing "systems" techniques are taking into account social impacts related to their own construction, but cannot hope to coordinate with similar social impact analysis of other projects.

Clearly, in the collection, management, and evaluation of sociological data, the qualitative evidence points without exception to our large and growing deficiency. William Gorham, Assistant Secretary for Program Coordination in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, said last year, that "When it comes to planning for the efficient allocation of national resources against competing social needs, the United States is an underdeveloped country. We have neither a planning board examining possible futures nor a central statistical agency gathering the data necessary to evaluate possible ways of getting there."

Gorham's chief, HEW Secretary John W. Gardner, has given this glum appraisal of past practice: "We have a great and honored tradition of stumbling into the future. In management of the present, our nation is—as nations go—fairly rational, systematic, and orderly. But when it comes to movement into the future, we are heedless and impulsive. We leap before we look. We act first and think later. We back into next year's problems studying the solutions to last year's problems. This has been true as long as I can remember."

Two reasons are sometimes advanced for our past unwillingness to take the necessary steps to prevent future chaos. Long range social planning is supposed to be expensive, and to be restrictive of freedom. It can be both; I suggest that it need be neither.

Long ago, John Dewey pointed out the essential distinction between planning in a dictatorship and planning in a democracy. Dictatorial planning sets fixed time goals over long periods and rigidly programs actions to achieve them. Democratic societies must plan continuously, modifying programs and even objectives flexibly as circumstances change. Technology and the planning for its use become our servants, not our masters.

In a seminar late in June this year and formal hearings on "The Full Opportunity and Social Accounting Act" during July, forty-two witnesses were heard. They came from a wide array of posts in government, the academic world, and public and private efforts to deal with social change. They were unanimous in endorsing the principle on which this legislation is founded—the need for better information and coordinated efforts to improve the social health of the nation. Senator Fred Harris of Oklahoma, Chairman of the Subcommittee on Government Research which conducted the hearings, said at the close of the session, "It is perfectly clear that this Act, with refinements, should become law."

Today our country is confronted with an issue that may be as dangerous to national stability as was the Civil War. As we attempt to face that issue we know too little about the causes of ghetto upheaval and the forces at play in the current crisis.

We would know more now if we had been working at it harder in the past. That is what the "Full Opportunity and Social Accounting Act" is all about. It could provide expert knowledge at the highest level of visibility. It could give the social state of the nation the kind of analysis it must have. Perhaps it could present alternatives to violence for the President, the Congress, and the American public to consider.

Unless we provide government with new modern tools we are likely to waste more and more of our resources in crash programs without knowing what will result, a process both wasteful and dangerous.

NEGROES AND JEWS

The Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee's attack on Israel and Zionism last month revived heated discussion of the recurring charges of anti-Semitism among American Negroes. Most Negro leaders joined Jewish spokesmen in emphasizing that the SNCC was not reflecting Negro sentiment—a small, far-out minority.

This latter view is confirmed in a recent University of California study of alleged anti-Semitism and other Negro attitudes. The study reports some cool facts on the matter and may succeed in bringing about a better understanding of the subject.

Sociology Professor Gary T. Marx, of the Survey Research Center at Berkeley, supervised Negro-conducted interviews of a scientifically selected sample of more than a thousand Negroes in New York, Atlanta, Chicago, and Birmingham. Marx reported that, to the degree that Negroes distinguished between Jewish and non-Jewish whites, they favored Jews and were less anti-Semitic than were whites.

Harry Lee Moon, Negro editor of *The Crisis*, monthly publication of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, wrote in a recent issue that anti-Semitism "among Negroes is a minority phenomenon unrepresentative of the total community."

In fact, wrote Moon, "Negroes have been constantly urged . . . to emulate the Jews . . . No other people . . . have been so con-

sistently regarded by Negroes as a worthy example."

Benjamin R. Epstein, national director of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, said in a comment on the Marx study:

"The Jewish community would be well advised to focus its attention on the main sources of American anti-Semitism and to drop preoccupation with Negro anti-Semitism, which only serves to divert energies from the civil rights struggle."

A VICTORY FOR PAUL HALL

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, in recent weeks it has become evident that soon we may see the advent of a new era for the American merchant marine.

It looks as though we are approaching the day when Congress and the Nation will be presented with a workable maritime program that will bring an end to years of stalling and frustration, and that will set us on the road to revitalizing our aging merchant fleet.

When the new maritime program does appear, much of the credit for its creation can be given to Paul Hall, president of the Seafarers International Union and of the Maritime Trades Department of the AFL-CIO.

Mr. Hall has been a courageous and tireless fighter for domestic shipbuilding. As one of the strongest voices in the American labor movement, he has used his vast influence wisely and skillfully on behalf of the overall good of the maritime industry.

Helen Delich Bentley, the distinguished maritime reporter for the Baltimore Sun, recently published a profile of Paul Hall. I ask unanimous consent that this praiseworthy article be printed in the RECORD.

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

AROUND THE WATERFRONT: NO-BUILD-ABROAD VICTORY IS HALL'S

(By Helen Delich Bentley)

WASHINGTON.—As words have been written and hot ones exchanged in recent months over what the new maritime policy of the United States should be, the man constantly named as the "Number 1" force leading the opposition to the Administration's program has been Paul Hall, a smooth-talking ex-sailor and president of the Seafarers International Union of North America (AFL-CIO).

He is also president of the Maritime Trades Department of the AFL-CIO and is often described as the probable successor to George Meany as head of the House of Labor.

More than that, when President Johnson recently was reviewing the maritime program, Hall was the only person referred to by name when Mr. Johnson said he didn't want to engage in a fight on the matter. Last year, the President publicly acknowledged at a White House dinner that among the tribulations borne by the position of Chief Executive is a defeat such as he had recently incurred at the hands of Hall on Capitol Hill.

NOW RIDING HIGH

Right now Hall is riding high because the concessions made by the Administration regarding a maritime program have come his way or as Hall prefers to put it, "the way for the good of the over-all industry—my whole fight has been in behalf of a strong, healthy industry which will be good for all of us."

Paradoxically, Hall reached the conclusion through this long haranguing that his support in the labor movement had to come from almost every segment of the trade

union movement other than the maritime unions.

In fact most of the maritime unions criticized him and even denounced him for prolonging the institution of a program by being such a determined "holdout." Now secretly they are glad about the results although not one will say so publicly.

One of the principal points snagged onto for criticism was that he has opened up the membership in the Maritime Trades Department to everyone outside maritime labor, that he has permitted railway clerks and doll makers, carpenters and electricians to join.

"Yes, we have," the 53-year-old tow-headed onetime fireman admits flatly. "We have because they have a role in whether there is an American merchant marine or not. There is a definite interdependency on exports and imports; certainly railroads are tied closely in the transportation picture with ships."

"Although the maritime unions are composed of the best-hearted persons in the world, we don't have the capacity to stay together on issues."

FINDS INABILITY TO UNITE

"There seems to be an inability among all of us to unite and stick solidly together on one issue regardless of the period of time it takes to put it over."

"Therefore, I reached the conclusion that we needed other sources of strength, sources which were constant and on which we could depend at all times. Maybe it's easier to work with them because there is no conflict of jurisdiction at any time. Too, many of them are more accustomed to cooperating and sticking to an issue."

Also he points out that if all of the seamen and all of the longshoremen were lumped together, they would not make up one half as many union members as the membership of the State and Municipal Employees Union, which is part of the six-million-member M.T.D.

OTHER POPULOUS COMPONENTS

All the seagoing and shoreside maritime personnel would not make up 25 per cent of the Carpenters Union or 40 per cent of the Retail Clerks Union—"just single unions."

Hall is a fiend on details and on carefully working out plots. Any time the S.I.U. or M.T.D. is responsible for an affair, he emphasizes to his men in charge that the minutest of details must be thoroughly checked out because they can make or break the function.

When he moves into a campaign—be it to help a favorite win a political election or to fight on Capitol Hill on any issue—he lays out strategy beforehand. He is always the general. He is always the one who may hold his army back because his inner senses warn him the timing is not quite right.

ADMIRATION OF DISSENTERS

It is because of these traits and an extremely sharp mind—one with which many persons disagree but which they nevertheless admire—that he is described as one of the most politically astute leaders in the entire labor movement.

Over the years, he has had his sailors help in the picket lines of State and Municipal Employees, of the American Newspaper Guild, of the Carpenters, the Butchers, the Bakers, the Garment Workers.

You name them and you can bet that the white caps which mark the S.I.U. members appeared in strength on the picket lines.

ALL AFL-CIO CONVENTIONS

Hall himself has made it a point to participate in the State conventions of all AFL-CIO groups as well as international conventions, more of which are calling upon him in their programs because of his oratory along the lines they want to hear.

He has never hesitated publicly to criticize

the Administration or anyone else. Although many union leaders agree with him, they are afraid to make such statements publicly. Therefore, they applaud with special enthusiasm when he sounds off.

As a result of these factors, all of these unions feel a special strong bond of friendship towards the S.I.U. and Hall and have maintained a steady position backing him up during all the maritime bickering in Washington.

TWELVE HOURS AT STRETCH

Hall has been known to sit at his desk talking strategy and plotting generally for twelve or more hours at a stretch without ever getting up. He credits years of training at the bargaining table, training "to throw management off course," for his durability.

His strategy on Capitol Hill has been to win as many friends as possible by following the rule of "helping your friends" and "fighting your enemies."

The friends of the maritime industry have been helped through campaign contributions, "just as the friends of all other industries who are much smarter than the maritime people have been over the years," and maybe even have been lent some leg men and strategists to assist their campaigns.

CONGRESSMEN'S HONORARIUMS

Another American tradition followed by the SIU has been that of paying honorariums to Congressmen for services rendered, such as participating in the weekly breakfasts and luncheons or monthly seminars sponsored this year by the Maritime Trades Department.

Some sources recently have been shooting at the maritime-minded Congressman for taking part in these meetings, although no one is criticized for collecting an honorarium from the Chamber of Commerce, the Automobile Dealers Association, or a major political rally.

It seems that all stops "have been pulled to try make it tough for Hall or friends of the American merchant marine," some sources have said.

HALL FORCES ON CAPITOL HILL

There is no doubt that the hardest salesmen for an American merchant marine and maritime policy on Capitol Hill—certainly along the lines seen by most maritime interests—have been those people educated the MTD-SIU-Hall way.

They are the ones responsible for the introduction of the record number of 106 bills calling for the Maritime Administration to be an independent agency.

They are the ones responsible for the trouncing given the Administration last year on the House floor on the issue of transferring the Maritime Administration into Department of Transportation.

Independent-agency and no-foreign-building have been the two points on which the public fight has been waged regarding the new maritime program.

OTHER AIMS ACCESSIBLE

Everything else such as building bulk carriers and expanding the numbers of ships built annually could have been accomplished simply by implementing the 1936 Merchant Marine Act.

GENERAL SHOUP SPEAKS OUT AGAIN

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, on February 20 I introduced into the RECORD the text of remarks made by Gen. David M. Shoup, former Commandant of the U.S. Marine Corps, on May 14, 1966, before a student audience at Pierce College in Los Angeles.

General Shoup's remarks, previously little noticed, drew widespread attention because of the vigor with which he ques-

tioned our involvement in Vietnam. Perhaps the most quoted statement from that speech, which has since been circulated in reprints numbering scores of thousands, was this:

I don't think the whole of South East Asia, as related to the present and future safety and freedom of the people of this country, is worth the life or limb of a single American.

Since then General Shoup has repeatedly been beseeched by various groups to address them on the subject of Vietnam, but he has consistently declined those invitations. However, he did consent to be a guest on the "ABC Scope" program dealing with the Vietnam war in a broadcast viewed throughout the Nation on August 5.

Because of his great experience as a heroic military leader who has held high command, the words of General Shoup deserve careful attention. He believes that we can and must negotiate, and suggests that we pledge to stop all firing except in self-defense at a time which Ho Chi Minh would be invited to name as the hour at which negotiations will begin.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this broadcast may appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

ABC SCOPE: THE VIETNAM WAR, PART 85—
AN UNCOMMON BREED

Producer: Dave Jayne.

Commentator: John Scall.

Guest: Gen. David M. Shoup, USMC (Ret.).

President JOHNSON (at Gen. Shoup's retirement ceremony at the White House in December, 1963). We have come here to the first house of the land today to honor General David M. Shoup, not because of the victories which he has brought to our country, but also for the honors he has brought to our heritage. He is a man of war who believes in peace. He is a man of great discipline who cares about people.

I deeply regret his retirement from the service for he is one of an uncommon breed whose numbers are too small and whose duplication is too rare. I would personally have had him continue as Commandant of the Marine Corps.

General SHOUP (August, 1967). I don't believe that, with respect to the freedom and security of the people of the United States of America, for today or in the future that the whole of South Vietnam is worth the life of a single American.

ANNOUNCER. ABC Scope, the Wide World of People and Events. This week, the Vietnam War, Part 85, "An Uncommon Breed," featuring the views of the retired commandant of the Marine Corps—General David Shoup. Now, here is ABC News correspondent John Scall:

SCALL. I'm standing before the Iwo Jima memorial which commemorates the fighting tradition of the United States Marine Corps. A memorable moment is etched in stone here—the hoisting of the flag atop Mount Suribachi on a lonely Pacific island during World War Two. One of the great heroes of the war against the Japanese was a tough, dedicated colonel who was awarded the medal of honor for his bravery during the battle of Tarawa. That man, David Shoup, a former Indiana school teacher, later became a general and commandant of the entire Marine Corps. He served three Presidents, Eisenhower, Kennedy and Johnson, as a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff before he retired almost four years ago. Today, he lives quietly in a little home within sight

of the Pentagon and as he continues to ponder the problems of the world, he's a troubled man. He's not sure what the United States is trying to do in Vietnam is wise. Almost unnoticed, he spoke out publicly more than a year ago to raise some critical questions. Since then he's refused many offers to write and speak before anti-Vietnam protest groups. But for this program, he agreed to set forth his views in greater detail.

ANNOUNCER. John Scall and General Shoup will return after this message in just one minute.

SCALL. As I understand the view of some of our leading generals and military strategists over the past years, it has been to avoid fighting a land war on the Asian mainland. Is this the kind of war that we are now fighting in Asia? The very one that our military leaders, by and large, thought we should not fight?

General SHOUP. John, I believe I could go under oath and state that what is now transpiring in South Vietnam is exactly the situation which most military and naval people, in my time in the service were most against ever coming to pass. And I believe that you could find in public records, the same ideas expressed by two or three of our presidents.

SCALL. Yet, if this was the view of the military people, why didn't they speak out against that course of action when it came time to make a decision?

General SHOUP. You seem to be, assuming that they didn't. I'm not aware of whether they did or whether they didn't. The only thing that I'm aware of is that, the one who had the final decision, decided to do what we're now doing. Now I think that it might be darned interesting someday to find out just exactly, how did this happen. I don't know but I don't believe that every member of the military family, whose responsibilities are to make recommendations to the secretaries and to the President, to the chairman of the Joint Chiefs, were in favor of doing what we have done, or that they are in favor of doing what we are now doing.

SCALL. Yet, it seems from the comments of most of the leading generals and military figures in the administration today, that they enthusiastically support the Vietnam policy. Is that wrong?

General SHOUP. I think there's a great distinction, John, between Vietnam policy of getting involved, and Vietnam policy of what do we do now that we are involved? Now I don't think that there's a military man alive, and I hope that there are no Americans alive, that don't enthusiastically support the idea of our government supporting our troops that are in combat. Absolutely. But I think you can find millions of people, and I think amongst them a great many military people, that are not now, and never were, in favor of the policy of getting involved in the ground warfare in South Vietnam to the extent that we now are. There's a great difference between this policy of doing it at all, and then, one you have your finger in the boiling pot, to keep bandaging it up.

SCALL. But that is not saying they should be there right now?

General SHOUP. Well, now, they have to be there; that's my point.

SCALL. If they're ordered to go.

General SHOUP. They're ordered there under legal orders and, of course they should be there. They're ordered there. But whether they should have ever gone in there in the first place, for the purpose for which we are told they must be in there is what I question.

SCALL. Well, General, at the risk of quoting you out of context I just want to read one sentence in that speech that you made. "I believe that if we had, and would keep our bloody, dirty, dollar-crooked fingers out the business of those nations, so full of depressed, exploited people, they will arrive at a solution of their own."

General SHOUP. Right.

SCALI. Is this the basis of your whole case?

General SHOUP. Well, I think perhaps you could use that as a basis, because I truly believe, and I think Mexico is a wonderful example, that these people will solve their problems themselves. And if they can't do it without bloodshed, hopefully, maybe they can, but if they can't do it without bloodshed, o.k., but let them do it. And what they do, they make themselves for themselves. And they don't have to be asked to put their future and their nature of their nation in a mold that we designed. Let them decide the mold of the future of their nation—the picture that they want for their nation. Let them decide it as a people. And then they'll be happy with it, proud of it and willing to defend it.

SCALI. Well, as I read your speech, General, you dwelt, at some point at least, on the fact that we were fighting eight thousand miles away, when we might have problems within our own hemisphere, here, which are similar, and which we are taking no drastic action to solve.

General SHOUP. Well, yes. That's part of the incomprehensible part of this thing, as far as I'm concerned. That we say why we're down there, but the same situation exists closer to home. Now as I like to point out, we used to have weeds in the field around the barn at home, and some across the lake and we always took care of the ones around the barn first. And then we took care of the ones across the lake. And I think that the thing is that the same things are going on in South America that we use to support the contention that we ought to be doing what we're doing in South Vietnam.

And I mean they're killing magistrates and the mayors are getting their throats cut, and the brigands are running around doing these horrible things and what have you—they're doing the same thing right down in South America.

So, I only say, why do we have to go eight thousand miles away to do it. Let's do it close at home first, and then see how big we want to make this circle we're gonna take care of everybody.

SCALI. Well, how about the Domino theory. We have heard much about the inevitability of neighboring countries either falling victim to Communism, or making adjustment of the kind in their policy to permit them to live with the Communist states. What happens then?

General SHOUP. Well, I'm not so sure if we have the clairvoyance with the talent to project such a thing sufficiently in the future to come to all these fine conclusions that this is detrimental to us. I'm not so sure whether it would be detrimental or whether it wouldn't. Now, I'm not so sure that if they got started and you said that it was a Communist regime, well, what basis would you be drawing that conclusion? That somebody outside of these countries was pulling the strings? That again we're going down the old road of the monolithic Communist world, in which one great Communist nation is pulling the strings on everybody like a bunch of toys. I don't believe that will happen any more. I'm just not clear enough about it to be sure that if the dominoes all fell one way, that in ten years they wouldn't all fall back the other way.

SCALI. However, the administration lays great stress on the need for the United States to uphold its commitments.

It says that if we do not uphold our commitments in Southeast Asia, particularly in South Vietnam, that a potential enemy could question them elsewhere in the world, particularly in Europe. Do you disagree with this?

General SHOUP. I don't know that I disagree with the idea of keeping your commitments, but I believe that history will show that a great many times commitments haven't been kept, and I don't know whether

the world is better off because of it. Of course, as you mention that, it flits across my mind that time when there was some little country called Hungary was pleading for us to help them a little, and, at least they said that we owed them something, we'd promised them something, but it didn't seem exactly in our interest at that time to help them.

SCALI. Do you think, General, that it is possible, not only to coexist with Communism, but to coexist with a brand of Communism which is not as bad as the kind that first came on the international scene?

General SHOUP. Well, I think we're doing it pretty well today and I think there's a lot of happiness around the world that we are coexisting with Russia like we seem to be, and Russia seems to be pretty happy to help along in this area. And while neither nation of course, is gonna give up their sovereign rights to play big and bold, and I think that's a part of the way of life and part of the way of human beings and part of the way of our nationalism, and their nationalism.

SCALI. You don't think we have to be fearful of Communism, then, General?

General SHOUP. To the extent that we have just discussed, that we don't have to be fearful of Communism coming in and making the freedom and security of the people in these United States at stake, I cannot see it. I do not believe it. That there's any reason for us to fear the takeover of Communism in this country. This is not the kind of a fertile field for the planting of the idea of Communism. This is not the kind of a country you plant those seeds in. And, I hope it never becomes that way . . . Although back in the thirties we seemed to have a hell of a lot of people that didn't have anything and were wondering if there wasn't a better system. And I think that's a provable statement. But, I don't think it's possible to sow the seeds. They'd die. They'd die in our streets, they'd die in our factories; they'd die in our homes, in our radios, in our television; they'd die in our saucepans, in our boys' camps, in our recreation centers. They'd die.

ANNOUNCER. General Shoup will discuss the bombing of North Vietnam and set forth his own plan for getting negotiations started after this message in just one minute.

SCALI. General, as a military man, how successful do you think our bombing of military targets has been both tactically, in South Vietnam, and against the military targets in North Vietnam?

General SHOUP. If the interdiction of the supply lines of the North Vietnamese hasn't been effective or hadn't been started, I'd hate to think of the situation we'd be in today. We would have been long since kicked out of there.

Now the effectiveness with respect to their economy—well, it doesn't help anybody to have an oil plant blown up, but as we found out after they bombed the first oil area, then they used the bomb pits to roll the fifty-five gallon drums in to protect them from the next raid.

These people are ingenious. And further, I think there must have been some little mistake in thinking, or in memory, because there seemed to be the idea that after Tonkin Bay that if you plastered these people with a few bombs, just let them see what the big fast jet and fighter bomber looked like from the great old United States that they'd say, wait a minute, wait a minute, we don't want any of this kind of stuff, let's knock this off and sit down and talk this over, now let's don't go on with this foolishness. Well somehow this didn't happen. And when we bombed the submarine pens in Germany there in World War II—we bombed 'em, and bombed 'em, and bombed—they still produced the submarine. But, that was history, we didn't think much about it. When Germany bombed London, bombed 'em right into the heart of

the city and everything else with the idea of demoralizing them, oh, well, it didn't do it, it just got them closer together with a greater determination.

And I wonder why we thought that wouldn't be the case with the Asiatic, in the same way that it was the case with white man in England.

SCALI. But now that we have started the bombing, would you discontinue it? Would you suspend it?

General SHOUP. John, any bombing whatsoever, that will increase the chance of success of those people on the ground that are bearing the brunt of this thing on the ground, must be continued. It must be continued. We cannot let these men down. We cannot let them feel that now we're stopping the bombing and their fate will be worse. No. That cannot be done.

SCALI. Well, General, as you look, at American forces now heavily committed in Vietnam, you say, of course we must support them. As long as they are there. How do we get out of this? What solution is there that you can see?

General SHOUP. Well, John, I feel really ill at my stomach. It's very vomitating, so to speak, to think that there are many, many people today and a great many factions of our fourth estate that are mouthing the idea that negotiations are long since impossible. I don't believe that. I believe that we can still arrange negotiations. And without negotiations, if there is to be no negotiation, well, John, this thing could escalate until today's commitment could just be a baby's battle, compared to what we're going to get into.

SCALI. Well, how do you convince the other side to come to the negotiating table in a mood to make the kind of concessions necessary for a compromise peace?

General SHOUP. John, we just, you hit on a very difficult thing, of course, that's the crux of the whole thing. But I believe we can do it. I think it can be done. I think there are ways to do it and while I believe that our State Department states that we have made twenty-eight different efforts to do this I don't think we ought to quit at twenty-eight—Edison didn't. And further, I believe that at least in some of the cases at least that's been espoused by many observers and analysts that a proposal that was made for negotiation in the first place had a built-in absolute failure right in it. And I at least remember one, which one of the things was that, Ho Chi Minh was to quit supplying his forces in the South. Well, that's just like asking somebody to quit feeding their baby. (laugh) They can't do it. But I believe we can do it. And you permitting, I'd just like to give you an idea of how I think this could be done.

SCALI. Please do.

General SHOUP. Number one, I think we can concede that Ho Chi Minh is also very serious when he says, that he would like the bombing stopped. And I think that's understandable, because, after all, this is not a very nice way to live every day, waiting for the bombers to come over, and some of us have experienced that in other war zones. And even though you know about the time they're coming. It's a fearful thing to say, well, now, eleven-thirty-five, the bombers are coming. Well, he wants to stop it. So he has said, you've got to stop your bombing before we'll negotiate. Well, that's a built-in failure for our side and he wants it to stop permanently. Well, now, that would be, I think, an utterly stupid thing for us to agree and promise that we would stop bombing on a permanent basis before we negotiate.

So, why don't we just ask why doesn't President Johnson and Premier Ky send a message to Ho Chi Minh something along this line—in substance like this . . . Our governments request that you, in collaboration with the NLF, to the degree you feel

appropriate, set the time and the place for negotiations to begin, in order that we may stop this holocaust. We will provide that our emissaries be at that place at that time.

SCALI. Right.

General SHOUP. And when the gavel sounds at the beginning of negotiation, we pledge that there will be no more combat, no more firing of any lethal weapon by our side, except in self defense. We don't even tell him he has to stop. We just say we won't fire, except in self defense. And long as negotiations are in progress, we will maintain this status quo, not firing, except in self defense. And that, during this time, we shall continue aerial and ground reconnaissance, only to the degree necessary to prevent surprise. Now, I feel, John, that there is food for thought in that for the government of South Vietnam. They have the option of stopping the bombing, and they can stop it, and they can keep it stopped.

SCALI. You mean the government of North Vietnam.

General SHOUP. Yes, I mean Ho Chi Minh's government.

SCALI. Right.

General SHOUP. He can stop it at his will, and he can keep it stopped at his will, and that's what he wants to do. And it doesn't cause us to stop it before we actually are ready to sit down and negotiate.

I think it has room for thought. Further, I feel this way about it. By an effort of this kind, number one. . . . If Ho Chi Minh can refuse such an offer, then the peoples of the world, and the people of America are going to be one hundred per cent behind our government, by making such an offer and having it turned down. And secondly, if it's turned down, I believe we will find out the one thing, we, in my opinion, need most to know. And that is, that China is, in fact, in a position of having guaranteed Ho Chi Minh that they will, at the appropriate time, enter this war, with all of China's forces. And I think it would be well worth finding out what the situation is there, even though Ho Chi Minh turned it down. And I don't think he can.

ANNOUNCER. John Scali will be back with a final word after this message in just one minute.

SCALI. There will be people who will be surprised by the General's outspoken remarks. Many will disagree. But although his views are unconventional, he can't be labeled a dove. He favors full backing for American troops in Vietnam, including bombing, as long as the fighting goes on. But as a thoughtful military man, he's deeply troubled because so many young Americans are now committed on the mainland of Asia, fighting the kind of war that he and many of his colleagues have always warned against. But his criticism is not solely negative or backwards looking. His suggestion for a total cease fire, with appropriate safeguards, as a means of getting talks started is new, and imaginative. It deserves serious consideration by an Administration seeking an honorable way out of the Vietnam dilemma. This is John Scali in Washington.

ANNOUNCER. This has been ABC Scope, the Vietnam War, Part 85, "An Uncommon Breed." Join us again next week over many of these ABC stations when ABC Scope presents "Battlefront in the 'Other War'"—a study of the pacification program in one crucial Vietnamese province. John Causier speaking. This has been a presentation of ABC News.

WHITEWASH OF BLACK REVOLUTION

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, George S. Schuyler of North American Newspaper Alliance has recently written a provoking column which other Senator's may find it worthwhile to review. I, therefore, ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

NEGRO CONSERVATIVE VIEWS: BLACK RACISTS CAN NOW SIT, WAIT FOR THE BIG WHITEWASH

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—George S. Schuyler, the Negro conservative, the author of "Black No More" and "Black But Conservative," has been a newspaperman for half a century. He believes that the government, by pampering to the least responsible and least ambitious segment of the Negro community, is creating a social and moral problem that will become more tortured with each passing year.)

(By George S. Schuyler)

NEW YORK (NANA).—Judging by the past, long-suffering America can look forward to a monstrous whitewash of the Black Revolution by the President's Commission on Civil Disorders. Its membership does not inspire confidence that it has the guts to face the harsh facts and come up with a courageous and forthright solution. The odor of politics pollutes the air.

What good can come of it in the face of the depressing spectacle of supposedly intelligent and responsible people excusing this crime wave on the same grounds as the criminals' advocates advance? What can be expected when some police forces hold off shooting down these arsonists, vandals and guerrilla fighters for fear of further inflaming them? What is the future of a society where a guerrilla who rapes a child is (or at least used to be) executed while guerrillas who rape a city are released with fines?

Police stations are picketed and stoned. Cops who try to suppress insurrection are accused of "police brutality." Responsible Negroes, in the vast majority, are terrorized into silence, their homes gutted, their property destroyed, their womenfolk lining up to get refugee rations because grocery stores and meat markets have gone up in smoke. And, as in Newark, the conspirators hold a Black Power conference even before the debris has cooled, and anticipate the general thought by demanding the old Communist solution of a segregated Negro state.

One of the more frightening curiosities exhumed from the ashes of the proliferating holocausts has been the revelation of official ignorance and malfeasance. These supposed public servants almost tearfully now confess that they didn't know the black racists were playing "for real"; that they were unaware of the subversive cells dug into the framework of their communities and parked on the anti-poverty payroll. These hibernating agitators, awaiting the pep talks of peripatetic incendiaries before, on signal, sending their mentally retarded and criminal followers into the streets flinging Molotov cocktails, have become so sure of themselves that, unlike the traditional criminals, they neither hide nor go on the lam.

Rather, they impertinently accuse the white victims of their outrages of being actually at fault and demand, at the price of communal peace, that the wastrels be provided with residential Taj Mahals and jobs for which they are untrained.

Part of the softness of high officialdom is due to its trance-like fascination for the theories of guilt-ridden intellectuals who, for lack of anything better to do, would remake the world. Never at peace with themselves or their country, these book-bred Svengalis would revolutionize America into a place unrecognizable, and, to most sensible Negroes and whites, unwanted.

This has pathetically raised the expectations of the cretins and incompetents and encouraged the delinquent and criminal element which lurks in the shadows in every city on earth. This process has been variously dubbed the New Freedom, the New Deal, the New Frontier and the Great Society (it grates on the national nerves).

Millions unconvinced that pushing a piece of paper into a box once a year will bring

utopia, have been bedeviled into herding to the polls, with no specifications for what. Rural roustabouts, subnormals and incompetents have been encouraged to abandon the boondocks to flood city relief rolls which swell despite increasing prosperity. Prolific females breed industriously with a succession of "husbands" at taxpayers' expense until bankrupt big cities bawl for Federal succor.

For ten years officials supposed to represent the people's interests were cowed by accusatory fulminations of the organized intellectual hustlers, fakers and frauds mouthing their sociological mumbo-jumbo, and the interminable public demonstrations and confrontations they masterminded. This moronic rigamarole was enthusiastically aided and abetted by the communications media that preferred to promote the idiocies of black Marxists over the sagacity of Rev. Joseph H. Jackson, head of the 5.5 million National Baptist Convention, Inc., in projecting the Negro image. This was backed by the growing swarm of "ologists" (psycho and socio) whose apologetics packed the daily and periodical press, holding to the heresy that you could conjure "culture" from a cretin—if you spent enough tax money.

Meanwhile the alarmed colored and whites who had sought the civilizing influence of the cities as relief from Appalachia, the Ozarks and the Piney Woods, now in turn fled the deteriorating and anachronistic metropolises for the suburbs they could afford as the myriads from the marshes and glens moved in. This left the welfarists, the indigent, the incompetent to booze, bed and burglarize, while their offspring roamed the nocturnal by-ways, knowing they could sleep on their desks next day.

Regardless of education, anybody could accurately predict where it would lead. Just as mutations occur in the steaming, primordial swamps, so strange, new breeds are born in the asphalt jungles with hominid intellects increasingly prevailing as the epicenter is approached. It has become fashionable to tell these denizens they are frustrated (as who isn't?); that they deserve a skilled job although untrained to do anything but procreate and mug; that they should have a home commensurate with the number of their offspring; and that they should run the schools and take over by plebiscite the spending of the enormous funds allotted for their succor, and now glommed by prehensile politicians.

This is a happy hunting ground for young adventurers inspired by The Guevara and other more venerable exponents of guerrilla warfare. They have learned how to shout up a mob and use juvenile delinquents and criminals to do the rough work of arson, sniping and vandalism. The urge to rob and steal being world-wide, whenever a store is broken into the weaker neighbors are ever ready to reach in for a ham, a TV set or a bottle of Old Crackskull.

However, this looting mob would never move without leadership that has indoctrinated them to despise and defy the forces of law and order, to make them sorry for themselves for being "deprived" and to stir hatreds which are never far from the surface. The more handouts that are given, the louder they clamor for more.

It is clear that these destructive uproars are the work of trained instigators who lure out the delinquents and criminals. They have a cell in every city ready to seize upon the slightest incident to precipitate a riot. Like Marxist Typhoid Marys, they roam the countryside spreading infection. To stop the disease you have to curtail the carriers.

Many of these "leaders," marching under the shield of civil rights, are clearly psychiatric cases and need long care in some quiet place far from the temptation of the maddening crowd. So one wonders about Micronesia where several thousand palm-fringed atolls cover an area almost equal to that of the continental United States. This solution

(which Johnson's commission will not present) would calm down the mobs, save lives and property and give our country some much-needed peace.

POVERTY IN RURAL AMERICA

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, poverty in rural areas has not attracted as much attention as the conditions plaguing our urban areas, but the poverty in rural areas of this Nation is just as real and just as tragic.

In a recent article, the Washington Post described the shameful living conditions of some parts of Kentucky and the efforts being made by the Government to help change the lives of the people there.

I am pleased that the Nelson amendment to the poverty program has a part in that work.

But not enough is being done, and the overall situation is far from satisfactory. We are supplying a trickle of assistance when a massive effort is needed.

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:

DON'T SMILE AT A REAL DOGPATCH: IN KENTUCKY'S HOLLOWES

(By Paul Good)

Go into the mountains of eastern Kentucky and you'll never again smile at Lill Abner's Dogpatch. But you may come away wondering about the ability of present Federal programs to change the face of rural poverty in the United States.

Despite \$6.5 billion spent to fight poverty in the 12-state Appalachian region, men without work or the hope of it still sit outside their shacks staring away their days in towns with names like Scuddy, Defiance and Boon Ledge. Women come out from the hollows between green hills to buy Federal food stamps to keep their families alive. Children who have happily gone barefoot all summer now hope that shoes will arrive from some quarter so that they can begin school.

The poverty in eastern Kentucky is overwhelmingly white but it is the same spirit-sapping variety endemic among Negroes in the rural South. It has become a way of life in counties where a quarter of the adults cannot read or write and the per capita income hovers around \$600 or \$700 a year.

FUGITIVE WEALTH

These poverty-stricken lives are lived in an area of unique natural beauty and great mineral wealth. Fifty-five years of mining have removed two billion tons of coal and there are an estimated 33 billion tons remaining. But absence mine ownership paying virtually no taxes extracts fortunes from the mountains and leaves only a pittance in salaries.

Harry M. Caudill, author of "Night Comes to the Cumberland" and chairman of the Congress for Appalachian Development, recently told the Senate Committee on Government Operations:

"Perry County, Ky., boasts the biggest coal auger and one of the best seams of steam coal in America. A single mining combine holds orders from TVA for more than \$100 million worth of fuel. Millions of dollars worth of mining machinery send a river of coal past ancient flimsy school houses. Perry County pays only 8 per cent of the cost of running its schools—enough to keep them going three weeks out of the year."

Fifty four per cent of the families in Perry County earn less than \$3,000 a year. There are 8,130 families in the county and 1,483 of them

earn less than \$1,000 a year. The anomaly between these figures and coal company orders for \$100 million provides a background for the plight of eastern Kentucky today.

FLIGHT TO CITIES

Fifteen years ago, the coal industry was providing full employment in the area. Then, overnight, automation arrived and men who had spent their lives laboring awoke to idleness. James E. Widner and his five children are among the victims.

They live in Leslie County, one of the 611 families there which make less than \$1000 a year. The county population has dropped 30 per cent in one decade as people fled known poverty to the unknown life in big cities. The blackened timbers of abandoned coal tipples scar the green landscape and scaffolding for mine cars sags grotesquely.

The Widner family lives in a shack that rents for \$10 a month. They must cross the highway to a neighbor's to draw water. Like so many mining veterans, Widner is an ailing man who looks much older than his 55 years.

His back was broken in a mine accident and his sight was failing, but he worked until jobs ran out. For a while, he drew a \$50 a month pension, but he says that his papers were lost in some remote office and the pension stopped. With a fifth grade education, Widner can do little more than write his name.

The poverty program touched the family briefly when he was enrolled in the Work Experience and Training Program, which pays up to \$250 a month to chronically unemployed men over an eight-week period while ostensibly preparing them for work. Because he is technically employable under Kentucky law, he cannot get on the welfare rolls, where the average benefit for a family of four is \$111 a month.

"I raise me a pretty good garden," he says. "I couldn't make it if I didn't. That and the food stamps. Now they just dropped the price and we pay \$3 for \$90 worth and that lasts us about three weeks. Then you have to scrape around, borrowing."

"Even though I got busted up in the mines, I'd go back if there was anything there and I could get a work certificate with my eyes. But I'm blind in one and have 30 per cent vision in the other, and they won't give it to me."

A father's dead-end pattern is being repeated with his son. George Widner, 21, is married and has two children. He dropped out of school in the eighth grade to help his family and knows no other work but mining. But he has been unable to find a job for many months, his unemployment checks have run out and he is up against it.

George Widner is bright and clean-cut, but his philosophy of life and work is disturbing.

"You just go out looking and hoping to snatch a job here or there," he says. "Sure, I'd like to do something else, but I know I can't without an education. The way I look at mining is, if you get busted up like my daddy, you don't get much out of it. But if you get killed, at least your family gets a chunk of money that'll do them for a while."

"SO THEY CAN LEAVE"

In the city of Hazard, Office of Economic Opportunity director Everett Tharp tries to make bricks without straw.

"There's an air of defeatism now," he says. "Here in Perry County we've got 6000 people on food stamps out of a population of 34,000, and there's more than that needs them but aren't getting them. I know there are hungry children and I also know the best food program is a job for the father in the house."

"What I'd like to see—but I don't see it—is a broad, comprehensive manpower plan for the area, like the Job Corps but bigger, with courses in heavy equipment training, mechanics and such. Teach them a trade so maybe they can leave this county and get work."

Kentucky's state welfare regulations are inflexible, do not provide immediate funds in emergencies and scarcely meet long-term subsistence needs. Although the Federal Government contributes more than 50 per cent of welfare money, it has no say in how cases are handled. Applicants for Tharp's poverty programs vastly outnumber available places and he does not know how much longer even these programs will be funded.

The local operation of the Labor Department's Work Experience and Training Program suggests why so many millions pumped into Appalachia have produced as little result. Theoretically, the program (dubbed "Happy Pappies" in eastern Kentucky) provides both money in the pocket and a new lease on employment life to unemployed heads of households. But to begin with, Tharp had funds for only 34 men while Perry County's 40 per cent unemployment left hundreds in need.

What training did the 34 get? OEO worker Charles Maggard, 27, explained:

"They taught how to dress, how to fill out job questionnaires, even how to make out their income tax. Some of the men were 60 years old. They just thought it was a big joke."

"Younger men get out of here as fast as they can. I'd say 95 per cent of those I went to school with have gone to Detroit or someplace looking for factory work."

The irony in teaching men with no income how to fill out tax forms indicates a flaw in the poverty program not limited to Appalachia.

It is also clear that the OEO alone cannot remake eastern Kentucky in the absence of legislation that would oblige mining companies to shovel some of the wealth they take from the ground back into communities through special taxes. But ways do exist for the poverty program to make an impact on the area.

For example, the Nelson amendment to the Manpower Act provides funds to communities for year-long employment of jobless men to work on projects like bridge and school building and improvement of water and sanitary facilities.

It is basically the old WPA idea of the '30s that provided jobless men with the dignity of labor and in the process created some works of lasting value. But Nelson amendment funds are a trickle where a massive flow is needed.

In the four-county OEO area of Leslie, Knott, Letcher and Perry Counties, there are openings for only 89 men on Nelson amendment projects. Leslie County Judge George Wooton is chairman of the OEO. He grows lyrical envisioning what a major commitment could do for eastern Kentucky.

"Our area is steep, rough, rustic, rural and remote," he says. "Here in Leslie County we have no railroad, inadequate roads, too many one-room schools and an economic situation going down, down, down, down."

"But it doesn't have to be that way. This county should be planned and zoned, dams built to prevent floods that bring disaster and a whole series of waterway lakes created to create electric power for industry and bring in tourism."

"We should be living up on the tops of the mountains instead of down in the hollows. All we need is the resources to get going on the job. We've got the manpower, good mountain people who like their old ways and values but want to work to make this a place their kids will want to stay in instead of running away from."

SOME NATIONAL ATTENTION

He is pushing projects in Leslie County to create roadside parks and rebuild the picturesque but precarious swing bridges that link mountain families to the main roads over creeks that run wild in flood time. But he is hampered by a skimpy county treasury and Federal funds that supply a tantalizing

glimpse of what might be done if a major financial commitment were made.

Forces are in motion in Appalachia to spur such a commitment. A board of inquiry called by the Citizens Crusade Against Poverty held a public hearing at Hazard last week to record the experiences of mountain families. Eventually it will include its findings in a broad report on Nationwide poverty. In Chicago recently, 50 of the 88 sisters in the Glenmary order of Catholic nuns left the order to work full-time in Kentucky and other Appalachian regions. Men like Harry Caudill have gone to Washington to plead the case for the region.

But whether brave words and individual dedication can budge Congress into drastic action is a large question. This month, as the plight of eastern Kentucky worsened, the House Public Works Committee cut \$53.6 million from the Administration's aid-to-Appalachia bill in the name of national economy.

VIETNAM'S ELECTIONS WERE A "REMARKABLE PERFORMANCE"

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President—

When all the pluses and minuses are balanced out, Sunday's election in South Vietnam was truly a remarkable performance.

This is the editorial view of the Washington Evening Star—and, I daresay, of most reasonable Americans.

For, as the Star notes, some 80 percent of the country's registered voters turned out at the polls on election day, despite the terror tactics of the Vietcong—tactics that emphasized the importance they gave to these elections.

I doubt whether the importance of these elections can be easily exaggerated. As Rev. Edward Elson, of Washington, who observed the elections in Vietnam, declared recently, the elections were "a mighty step forward—an election in Asia in a country at war."

The Vietnam elections were indeed a "mighty step forward" for the people of South Vietnam. And as President Johnson has said, the election was even more important to that nation's future than a victorious military engagement with the enemy.

I ask unanimous consent that the Washington Star editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

THIEU-KY VICTORY

When all the pluses and minuses are balanced out, Sunday's election in South Vietnam was truly a remarkable performance.

Most remarkable of all, of course, was the fact that some 83 percent of the eligible voters went to the polling places. If many and perhaps most of them did not quite understand what it was all about, the fact remains that they were determined to vote—and that they did vote. The Viet Cong terror tactics, which killed some and injured many more, could not frighten away the voters. Advance charges of fraud, some suggesting that the election had been rigged and would be a meaningless affair, did not cool the ardor of the South Vietnamese. One may hope that they simply did not believe these accusations, and our own view is that there was very little basis for them.

In any event, the ballots were cast and the consensus of observers from 24 countries, invited in by the Saigon government, was that the election was more fair than unfair. As the Rev. Dr. Edward L. R. Elson, pastor of the National Presbyterian Church in

Washington, put it: "One point should be made strongly. If not precisely fair, it is still a mighty move forward—an election in Asia in a country at war."

The winning Thieu-Ky ticket did not do as well as the two men had hoped or as well as had been generally expected. On the basis of a nearly-completed unofficial tally, the winners got about one-third of the total vote. They had hoped for about 40 percent, and Ky had predicted a clear majority. The rest of the votes were split among 10 teams of civilian candidates. The winners, however, were holding a 2 to 1 margin over the second-place team headed by Trong Dinh Dzu. Perhaps significantly, he was the foremost spokesman for peace and the leading critic of the military regime. He had been expected to run fourth or fifth.

Well, what now?

President Johnson is represented as being pleased with the outcome, and, since he had a considerable prestige stake in the election, he should be. Thieu, who will become president of South Vietnam, has said new peace overtures to Hanoi will be made. This may not mean much, however, since Hanoi, though it tried to wreck the election, has given no public indication that it is interested in peace.

Perhaps the most that can reasonably be hoped for is that South Vietnam, when its elected government is finally installed, will step up its war effort, expedite reforms essential to success of the pacification program, and function within the framework of something resembling a democratic system. There will not be a democratic society, as we understand that term. Only the hopelessly deluded could expect anything of this sort, however, since a really free political system for South Vietnam is something that, at best, must await the end of the war plus years of experience with the esoteric art of self-government.

GROWING RECOGNITION OF NEED TO STIMULATE RURAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, on August 30 I spoke on the subject of the national consensus regarding the need to slow down and to better control the great rural to urban migration which, on the one hand continues to depopulate the countryside and small towns and on the other hand intensifies the population pressures on the already overcrowded and troubled cities. At that time I inserted in the RECORD a sampling of newspaper editorials and other documents serving to indicate the breadth and depth of this consensus.

This growing national debate has been most encouraging and I have been particularly pleased with the favorable public reaction to the Rural Job Development Act of 1967 introduced by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS] and me on July 21. We, and the 28 other Senators who have cosponsored this measure, are gratified that we have been able to contribute to this national debate.

Mr. President, last week two witnesses before the Presidential Commission on Urban Problems joined the growing number of urban experts in arguing that the slowing down or actual reversal of the flow of rural migrants to the urban areas would constitute a major and valuable new approach to dealing with the crisis of the cities.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD

at this point a column by Dorothy Wood appearing in the Wichita Eagle of September 2, 1967, which reviews various editorial comments from around the country on the subject of slowing the rural migration, and the editorial appearing in today's Washington Post entitled "Rural Migrants."

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

[From the Wichita Eagle, Sept. 2, 1967]

SOLUTION: KEEP 'EM ON THE FARM

(By Dorothy Wood)

Problems of the cities were still engaging the attention of the nation's editorial writers this week. But many of them are turning the problem around, and scrutinizing the proposal that one way to help the cities is to keep people "down on the farm."

"Studies of federal bureaus indicate that the rural migration to the cities by white and Negro poor will continue through the mid-1970's. The predictable consequences will include a swelling of urban welfare rolls, an intensification of existing urban social problems and a further drift of the white middle class to the suburbs and beyond. Is there no way to arrest this unhappy trend?" asked the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

It answered itself:

"Some social philosophers, notably Paul Goodman, have urged that public policy be directed toward creating a viable rural alternative. Why not help rural families to stay in the country if that is what they want? And why not help urban families, particularly the newly-arrived rural immigrants, to return to the open spaces if that is what they desire? The \$17,500 average cost of one of the new public housing units at the Blumeyer project might buy more and better housing in the country. And as Goodman points out, welfare checks that purchase only destitution and undernourishment in the big cities are more than sufficient for a decent life in the de-populating areas of rural America.

"The Scandinavian countries have promoted rural life as an acceptable alternative to urban living, and there is no reason why we cannot do the same. Our excessive urbanization and the continuation of migration from the countryside lend urgency to the need."

The Minneapolis Star joined the chorus:

"The crowding of people from rural areas into urban centers is largely responsible for this summer's racial violence," it charged.

"Thus new attention has turned to rural development, not only to stem the migration to overcrowded cities, but to reverse the trend. The Republican party's National Coordinating Committee has just released a report by its Task Force on Job Opportunities and Welfare. The task force proposes a program to revitalize rural America.

"The recommendations include incentives (such as tax concessions and government contracts) for factories to locate in poor rural districts, assigning government installations to such areas, increased aid for rural schools and more vocational-technical schools in the country, federal-private co-operation in poverty programs, better employment services in rural communities, etc.

"Most Republican congressmen voted against a similar program for the Appalachia region, which was enacted anyway. Now they may have a change of heart . . . Agriculture Secretary Freeman and other top officials are sponsoring a meeting in Washington on Dec. 11 to try to spread more evenly across the nation a population which now has 70 percent of its numbers crowded onto 1 per cent of the land . . . making rural America more attractive economically will help solve the

problem of low farm incomes as well as relieve the pressure on metropolitan centers.

"Maybe a Rural Coalition is needed to supplement the work just begun by the Urban Coalition."

And Farmland paid tribute to a measure sponsored by a Kansas Senator, which predated the GOP Task Force report:

"On an allied front at the Capitol, meanwhile, two Senators are pushing a new bill designed to do something concrete about providing job openings in rural areas. The bill by Senators James Pearson of Kansas and Fred R. Harris of Oklahoma would offer new tax incentives to private industries which locate in low-income rural areas.

"Pearson is a Republican and Harris is a Democrat. Their bipartisan plan is based on the theory that the nation as a whole would gain from the economic revival of rural areas and should be willing to invest in the effort through a tax subsidy.

"But in the long run, the Senators maintain this investment would pay a cash profit to the federal treasury. Exact predictions are impossible, they conceded, but the taxes which would be paid by new industries and newly-employed people would be in the long run add up to more than the government would give up in tax concessions.

"... The crisis of the cities looms so large today precisely because we have been so ineffective in the past in dealing with the basic problems of non-metropolitan areas... the great challenge is not simply to make the cities more livable for more and more people, but how to keep more and more people from crowding into them," says Pearson."

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 11, 1967]

RURAL MIGRANTS

Two witnesses before the Presidential Commission of Urban Problems last week suggested that the tide of immigration from rural to urban areas be reversed. Paul N. Ylvisaker, New Jersey Commissioner of Community Affairs, called for a national migration policy to halt the flow of the rural poor into urban slums. Jack E. Wood of the National Committee Against Discrimination in Housing recommended steps to open opportunities for citizens migrating from city centers to suburbs.

This is a healthy sign that the country is awakening to a crisis that long has concerned many rural experts. There has been an historic movement from farm to city areas that the country has come to regard as normal and inevitable. In the earlier decades of this century it was a migration of representative rural folk, including some of the most gifted people. An annual flow of some 250,000 high school graduates into cities has been a great contribution to urban progress. But the migrants have increasingly come from disadvantaged areas. The rural counties lost 8 per cent of their population to the cities between 1950 and 1960. And many of these migrants were people driven from rural areas by a technological revolution in agriculture. Their emigration to the cities simply transformed rural wretchedness into urban wretchedness.

A democratic society cannot stop such population movements by ukase or decree. (Some totalitarian systems are trying to stop similar shifts by such means.) Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman has defined the only democratic means of reversing this tide. He told a population conference in 1966: "When meaningful alternatives give Americans real freedom of choice... the population movement from country to city will level off, and even go into reverse."

The President's National Advisory Commission on Food and Fiber has pointed out that the 1959 annual median income of urban families was \$6166 compared with \$4750 for rural non-farm families and \$3228 for rural farm families. It recommended a broad program of rural help—fuller use

of rural manpower, investment to increase the skills of rural people, assurance to the rural poor of a decent living standard. The Commission urged a whole program of action to "encourage economic development within reach of rural people."

The Commission concluded that "economic development of the rural areas must be the answer," in the long run. It urged guaranteed minimum incomes to take up the slack in the short run. Whatever the precise means, we need to cease moving people from impoverished rural areas into impoverished urban areas. This unwise, unplanned and unprofitable migration can be reversed only by making rural life more remunerative economically and more rewarding culturally.

POVERTY—A PERSONAL PERSPECTIVE

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, most discussions of poverty in our affluent society are full of statistical arrays depicting such generalized items as income levels, units of housing, and health status. Such statistics are, of course, vitally necessary, for they inform us of conditions which must be remedied.

But statistics are abstracts of reality, only indicators of the circumstances in which millions of our fellow citizens really live each day. The danger of such abstract grappling with the problems of poverty is the peril of losing sight of persons in the jumble of numbers.

Losing sight of people, even while trying to improve their situation, will cause the antipoverty effort to fall more certainly than anything else. The human being is the target of our effort. We must not forget that individual men, women, and children, living with little hope for a better tomorrow, are the only reason for the Economic Opportunity Act.

Recently, the Meeker-Wright County, Minn., Community Action News carried a column by the Reverend Oliver Dufresne, pastor of Our Lady of Manannah Church in Grove City, Minn. Mr. President, this unusual column discusses poverty from a personal perspective. Pastor Dufresne parallels the nationwide antipoverty effort with communitywide efforts to fight serious flooding, or to search for a lost child, or to rebuild a farm building damaged by fire. In Pastor Dufresne's view, the Office of Economic Opportunity is but an organized and institutionalized effort to extend the hand of help—so much a part of the American tradition—to the millions of our countrymen living in poverty.

Mr. President, I commend this excellent column to the attention of the Senate and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

OEO WAY OF BEING BROTHER'S KEEPER

(By the Reverend Oliver Dufresne, pastor, Our Lady of Manannah Church, Grove City, Minn.)

A tremendous outpouring of manpower occurs, searching fields and woods, when it's reported a child has been lost. When rivers reach flood stage, many hands offer help in stacking sand bags and in rescuing victims. When a farmer's home burns out, we hear of many helping hands, as the people of a community give their prompt and generous aid.

What accounts for man's response to his

fellowman's need? Isn't it the bond of brotherhood, the fact that, in some way, we are all part of each other? Isn't it this that motivates us, promptly, to aid a distressed fellow human being?

Oh yes, there are always the shortcomings, when human nature fails to respond, as the 30 people who only watched, but didn't help, when a girl was raped and stabbed to death. However, such lack of response shocked us, because, normally, we somehow feel a strong tendency to assist another in a crisis.

OEO (The Office of Economic Opportunity) (or; also called the Anti-Poverty Program) is simply this.

"The man who can, is helping his fellowman." A lost child, a flood or a fire, take many people to give effective help. The larger problems of unemployment, slums, sub-standard incomes, widespread illiteracy, much-needed health care all the more need the help of many more people. Bigger problems need bigger solutions.

In other words, there are so many, many poverty-category U.S. citizens that a big and organized program like OEO is the only way effective help can be given to the many in real need.

Sure, here too, we don't have perfection. Lazy citizens, social parasites, always exist. But who are you and I to say that all, or most, poverty plagued people are lazy and good for nothing? It has never been proved that more than a very small minority are lazy.

I believe most people want dignity and self respect. But I do believe many are caught in a bind, due to such things as: no talent; no education; no opportunity to break the poverty cycle; no example of a stable and industrious family to imitate.

To me, it seems cruel and harsh for someone to say: "Let them work as I did"; "Let them pull themselves up by their bootstraps." Does one who speaks this way have the facts he judges so rashly? Such wild generalizations are not in the tradition of American fairplay and patriotism, to say nothing of Christian charity.

I wonder if we have Cain's blood in our veins, when we become testy and tight fisted with our income? The very talents that may have brought some success to us, are really God's gifts. He expects a return, by our generosity to our fellowman. We are our brother's keeper!

Surely, the American genius can see the good in the Anti-Poverty Program, can work out its bugs, and can loyally cooperate in the tradition that has made our country so great. A good start has been made by the Meeker-Wright Community Action Council. The Neighborhood Youth Corps, has had good results. The Farm Management program is active and received favorably. The Project-Headstart Program is doing well too. . . .

Would that the American dream would evolve into an ideal society, where all men help each other, patient with those who are frail, and in this way, proving that love is greatest when it is compassionate and merciful.

Who amongst us wants to forget that spirit of America, surely inspired by God, and so well summed up by the inscription on the base of the Statue of Liberty:

"Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore,
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tossed, to me:
I lift my lamp beside the golden door."

McGEORGE BUNDY'S ANALYSIS OF REPORT OF PREPAREDNESS SUBCOMMITTEE

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, this morning's Washington Post contains a communication of great importance and wis-

dom from McGeorge Bundy. Mr. Bundy has engaged in a critical analysis of the recent summary report of the Preparedness Subcommittee which recommended wider air action against North Vietnam. He finds it deficient and, with utter reasonableness and a great deal of logical argument, details its weaknesses. The report, he states, appeals to the authority of military professionals simply because they are professionals, rather than to evidence; it pushes aside political and diplomatic considerations; gives lip-service to the principle of civilian control, but tends to deny that principle in fact, and moves dangerously in suggesting that our current course of action in Vietnam increases the human cost for Americans.

Taken together—

Bundy writes—

these four weaknesses make the subcommittee's report a poor guide to action.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Bundy's communication be printed in the RECORD.

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

A COMMUNICATION

The summary report of the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee is a document which repays study. There can be no question of the patriotism and dedication of Sen. Stennis and his colleagues, and their unanimous recommendations of wider air action seems impressive—until one examines the argument with which they support it. That argument contains four decisive weaknesses which fully explain the President's polite but firm insistence on hearing the counsel of all his senior advisers before deciding on matters of this moment.

First, the Senators appeal not to evidence but to authority. They set a group of generals and admirals against Secretary McNamara, and their position is that the generals and admirals are right simply because they are professionals. The Subcommittee does not demonstrate the military value of the course it urges; it simply tells us that the generals and admirals are for it. It is true that both sides in such a public argument are hampered by problems of security, but Secretary McNamara, in his powerful public statement before the Subcommittee, offered extensive evidence—facts and figures—in support of his position. The Subcommittee answers only with a repeated appeal to the opinions of officers it heard.

Nothing is less reliable, in hard choices of this sort, than the unsupported opinion of men who are arguing the value of their own chosen instrument—in this case military force. We must not be surprised, and still less persuaded, when generals and admirals recommend additional military action—what do we expect them to recommend? The interesting question is always whether their supporting argument is strong or weak, and on this critical point the summary report tells us nothing. There is literally no evidence at all, in this report, for the Subcommittee's sweeping conclusions that the restrictions currently in effect are "vital to the success of the air war."

In fairness it must be said that the appeal to authority instead of evidence is a habit which others have developed, too, in the long argument over Vietnam. Just last Sunday, for example, another journal once more cited the authority of the Secretary General in support of a new bombing pause, while on another page we were told that the Secretary General's own assistants say he has no direct evidence to support his judgment. Given his well-known views on the war in

general and the bombing in particular, the Secretary General's obviously sincere belief in the value of a new pause is no more convincing—in the absence of supporting evidence—than military belief in intensified bombing.

Second, in reaching its conclusions and recommendations, the Subcommittee report pushes aside all political and diplomatic considerations—and all risks of wider conflict. The Subcommittee tells us simply to "take the risks that have to be taken and apply the force that is required." It thus neglects to examine what its own report calls the "serious and legitimate question" of policy "over and above purely military considerations." The Subcommittee heard no intelligence expert on the dangers of such an action as closing the port of Haiphong. It heard no political expert on the international costs of "striking all meaningful targets with a military significance" (a definition so broad as to permit virtually unlimited target choice). It attempted no trial balance between the military advantages it claims for this course and the risks whose existence it admits but does not examine. The Subcommittee might well reply that other committees of the Senate are responsible for questions of intelligence and of foreign policy, but then it would have to tell us why it has chosen to move from its assigned field of preparedness into these very large questions of national policy.

Third, while the Subcommittee gives lip-service to the principle of civilian control, its main line of argument tends to deny that principle. The Subcommittee is quite right in its assertion that the military leaders of this war have been generally scrupulous in their respect for civilian control, but its own report is not so careful. It tells us that it is wrong for "strategy or tactics to come under the influence or direction of unskilled amateurs." In another place the Subcommittee recognizes the right of the Commander-in-Chief to set "broad policies and objectives," but it does not seem to understand that the real issues between military men and their civilian supervisors develop just where there is a conflict between the tactical or strategic desires of the military and the broad policies of the Commander-in-Chief. Is it really wrong to insist on directions of flight that minimize the danger of intrusion into Red China? Is it an error to insist on standards of accuracy and identification much tighter than those which "purely military considerations" have imposed in other wars?

When we move to larger issues, the case for civilian control is stronger still. These issues require a careful judgment between military value and political cost (I use the word political to include the whole range of non-military considerations ranging from simple humanity to complex intercontinental diplomacy). In such a calculation there is no escape from the necessity to ask hard questions—to test the evidence and not simply to bow to professional authority. Presumably nearly all well-executed military measures have some military effect, but how much? and how lasting? and at what overall cost? In our system of government there is only one place where these questions can be resolved; this is precisely why our Commander-in-Chief is the President. The President cannot delegate this responsibility, and I am sure the Subcommittee does not want him to. But civilian control means civilian control, and in a complex contest the exercise of that control will inevitably place limits upon both strategy and tactics.

Fourth, the Subcommittee Report moves onto dangerous ground when it suggests that the course chosen by the Administration has increased the cost of the war in American lives. The Subcommittee knows that the President yields to no one in the depth of his feeling for those whose lives are at risk in Vietnam. If he knew a cheaper way of

doing this hard job, he would surely choose it. But it is a part of the necessary price of this war—as of all wars—that there is unequal sacrifice for the wider safety of all. To take an extreme example, the President could save American lives—at least in the short run and in the immediate theater—if he were to authorize the use of nuclear weapons in Vietnam. Obviously he will do nothing of the sort, and everyone knows it. Similarly—and the case is not extreme at all—General Westmoreland could probably limit his immediate casualties at least a little if he did not insist on standards of discipline in fire control and target identification, which are unique in American warmaking. But the President and General Westmoreland cannot serve the wider interest which is the true justification for the sacrifices asked of our forces if they do not insist on such restraint. No one on any side of these arguments can want larger human losses—to Americans, to allied forces, to civilians, or indeed to the enemy. So none of us should yield to the temptation to wave the bloody shirt of other men's sacrifices.

Taken together, these four weaknesses make the Subcommittee's report a poor guide to action. I am far from saying that there is no argument at all for intensified bombing—as far as I am saying that there should never be another pause. What I do say is that the Subcommittee report does not make its case.

My own summary belief is that both the advocates and the opponents of the bombing continue to exaggerate its importance. I think it has had the real but limited value that Secretary McNamara described in his statement to the Subcommittee, but I know of no solid evidence for believing with the Subcommittee that its expansion offers our best hope of success, or with others that its indefinite and unconditional suspension will produce serious negotiations. To me it is the struggle in and for the South that will be decisive—bombing or no bombing, pause or no pause. I believe with Mr. McNamara that limited bombing helps in the Southern struggle, but neither in expanded bombing nor in any unconditional suspension do I see a likely substitute for the very hard work ahead in the South—for us, and still more for the new government of South Vietnam.

McGEORGE BUNDY,

Former Special Assistant to President Johnson.

THE PARTY (DEMOCRATIC) THAT THINKS IT OWNS THE PLACE (THE U.S.A.)

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the current issue of Life magazine contains a staff editorial which should be read by every American. It is entitled "The Party That Thinks It Owns the Place." As I place this editorial in the RECORD, I am modifying the title a bit to clearly define both "the party" and "the place" alluded to.

As one who has served in Congress almost 30 years and who before that was a college teacher in the field of political science and public administration, I have observed the slow but steady process by which those elected or appointed to serve in our Federal Government, and their favored associates in private life, have developed a startling and disillusioning change of attitude whereby instead of considering themselves the servants of the people far too many of them have come to conceive themselves as the rulers of America.

Those who read and listen carefully to the speeches and pronouncements of certain high officials who have been either

ected or appointed to positions of great power and influence and who belong to the political party which has held almost undisputed power in Washington for far too long will note the frequency with which these men who would be king al-lude to our Capital City and the entire country in possessive terms. The Life editorial has surfaced a state of mind and an official attitude which has attained a stature that is highly alarming to many knowledgeable citizens regard-less of their party affiliations.

The opening sentence of this unprece-dented editorial comment provides the theme which the remainder of the ar-ticle carefully develops. It reads:

The Democratic Party, which has held the Presidency for 27 of the last 35 years, has developed an unfortunate personality trait. It believes it owns the United States govern-ment lock, stock, and bureau.

Mr. President, the maintenance and functioning of a sound and workable two-party system at the Federal level has throughout history been one of the basic reasons for the unparalleled suc-cess of this Republic. When either poli-tical party for too long controls the Presidency with its vast appointive power and a Congress which is persuaded to rubberstamp its projects and pro-grams, our Nation weakens and jeop-ardizes one of its fundamental safe-guards of our individual freedoms.

Even the Federal courts, from the highest to the lowest, now reflect a po-litical philosophy and a prevailing atti-tude directly associated with the politi-cal party which through its President has appointed a vast army of Federal judges devoted to its concept that the Federal state can do no wrong and that the peo-ple are the puppets of the bigtime politi-cians and their overwhelming powers.

I ask unanimous consent that the Life editorial entitled "The Party That Thinks It Owns the Place" be printed at this point in the RECORD. I do so with the realization that undoubtedly more Americans will read this remarkable analysis in Life than will read it in the comparatively small circulation pro-vided by the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. However, future historians who will search the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for reasons for the curious changes now so unhappily making themselves felt in our American way of life should have avail-able to them this highly significant edi-torial with its perceptive observations and its prophetic statements.

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

THE PARTY THAT THINKS IT OWNS THE PLACE

The Democratic party, which has held the Presidency for 27 of the last 35 years, has developed an unfortunate personality trait. It believes it owns the United States govern-ment lock, stock and bureau.

There is no longer much of the old feeling that the party has been given a trust to guard and nurture, that it has the marvelous federal machine only on loan and it is to use it with care and even a little awe. Instead, the Democratic party has assumed that it is the proprietor of all it beholds along the Potomac. There are whiffs of this feeling even in the Capitol, which has changed hands more than the Presidency over these years. And the feeling grows stronger as one pro-

gresses down Pennsylvania Avenue toward the White House. The regulatory agencies and the huge departments are kind of private fiefdoms peopled by the favored patrons of the power structure. The Treasury is looked on as a gushing faucet to be used expressly for the experimentation of Democrats. Legislation is a kind of private game for the President to play. The party feels it owns the facts of democracy—the news—and is free to dispense them as it alone sees fit. Democrats even consider it their right to regulate the art and architecture of the federal city, and the cocktail circuit is becoming sort of a private race track for the promising Democratic yearlings.

To the victor, of course, belong the spoils. And the Democrats have won the government fairly. But they have been in residence so long now that they are irritable when any-body intrudes into their world. A great many of the very top civil servants who ad-minister the executive branch came in as young men in Franklin Roosevelt's time. They have lived their lives in government, raised their children in Washington. They are in their early 60s, at the peak of their bureaucratic power. Dwight Eisenhower could not touch this structure in his whole eight Republican years.

The bright young attorneys who played such important roles in the Roosevelt and Truman administrations stayed in the city to found or join law firms. They now con-sider Washington's legal business their right-ful inheritance. They know the machinery of government since they helped set it up. The great law firms, like Arnold and Porter, are headed by men who have held high govern-ment positions and now have many good friends and colleagues in high position in-cluding, in the case of Arnold and Porter, Supreme Court Justice Abe Fortas, who doubles as one of L.E.J.'s most trusted ad-visers. Men like Thomas (Tommy the Cork) Corcoran and Clark Clifford move quietly and confidently through the rear corridors of power, including the White House. Even graduate Democratic insiders no longer resi-dent in the capital—Schlesinger, Galbraith, Salinger, Sorensen—travel through the lec-ture halls and the literary markets, not to mention foreign capitals, with authority and assertiveness.

The quintessence of proprietorship is shown by Lyndon Johnson, a 35-year resi-dent of the city. He talks of "my govern-ment, my army, my bombers, my bills," and on his Far East trip last winter he told Australia's Harold Holt he was happy to have a chance to come out to look over "my prime ministers." He believes that it is his right to conduct the creative processes of government behind closed doors and tell the public only as much as he sees fit. He is now preparing his program for 1968, which will be vital to him politically but also will be vital to the nation. He has sent his men to gather ideas from more than a hundred of the best minds in America and all the suggestions, including those from his Cab-inet officers, have been collected in a massive book from which Johnson will choose the things he wants. Neither the names of the contributors nor their suggestions will be made public, a process alien to the Demo-cratic party, which used to derive its strength from its open noisiness.

A few weeks ago the party opened new headquarters down along the Potomac River, and the night that the Number 1 Democrat came to look over the new digs, they banned the press. When the President addressed some Democratic workers not long ago, the meeting was secret. The functions of the President's clubs, formed all over the United States to finance the party, are closed to public scrutiny. The party of the people that used to sweat and swear in the marketplace is now the party of the peephole.

Even the little rituals are guarded fero-

ciously. During the Eisenhower years one journalist thought that since payday was such a delightful American institution it would be interesting to chronicle the Presi-dent's payday. Ike, who never lost his awe of big government, was more than obliging, telling how his pay check came around from the Treasury Department, how he endorsed it and sent it over to his bank to be put into his personal account, and even a little bit about how he spent it. Several months ago when another writer went to the White House and asked for a story on what Lyndon Johnson did with his \$100,000 salary he was met with a horrified expression and an in-credulous, "Are you kidding?"

THE OPERATING ENGINEERS AND THE JOB CORPS

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the Job Corps program has been one of the Na-tion's most important means of helping youngsters fit themselves for useful fu-tures. However, after they have com-pleted this training, everything may be lost unless these young people have the opportunity to enter into fruitful occu-pations.

The Operating Engineers, one of the leading AFL-CIO unions, has been train-ing and finding jobs for needy young men who have graduated from the Job Corps. I was most gratified to read in a recent issue of the AFL-CIO News that the Job Corps has recognized this important service by granting the union an award.

I ask unanimous consent that the story of the Operating Engineers' fine work be printed in the RECORD.

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

IUOE GIVEN GOLD AWARD BY JOB CORPS

The Job Corps has presented its gold award to the Operating Engineers—a tribute to the union's success in training and finding jobs for needy youngsters.

The Operating Engineers, under the direc-tion of their national administrator of train-ing programs, John A. Jones, conduct a heavy equipment training program at Jacob's Creek, Tenn., which recently graduated 51 Job Corps trainees.

According to Reese Hammond, director of research and education for the Operating Engineers, 37 of these young men already have been placed in jobs throughout the nation, 26 in their home localities.

"MIGHTY PROUD"

As he presented a plaque to IUOE Pres. Hunter P. Wharton, Job Corps Dir. William T. Kelly declared:

"You ought to be mighty proud. Your orga-nization is interested in working with poor kids. You have heart, interest and imagina-tion. You care.

"We've got 41,000 youngsters throughout this country," Kelly continued. "They're Negro, white, Eskimo, Puerto Ricans, you name it. They aren't shooting their way out of the Job Corps. They're not leading riots. These kids are tough and poor and in all our 123 centers we teach them what unions are all about. You are making our task much easier."

Kelly was accompanied by his assistant, Robert Young; David Oestrich, chief of place-ment, and Joseph Jay, who handles labor liaison.

At the invitation of Wharton, the federal officials sat in on an Operating Engineers board meeting, at which Hammond gave a re-port on the heavy-equipment pretraining program at Jacob's Creek, where such equip-ment as scrapers, dozers and front-end loaders is used.

Key to the success of the placement in jobs, Hammond said, was the full co-operation of 29 Operating Engineers local unions all over the United States. Many of these have taken youngsters from outside their territory.

The plaque presented to Wharton was handmade by the Clearfield, Utah, Job Corps and was inscribed with the signatures of Vice Pres. Hubert H. Humphrey, Sargent Shriver, director of the Office of Economic Opportunity and Kelly.

LABOR COOPERATES WITH UNITED FUND DRIVES

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, this year marks the 25th anniversary of co-operation between the American labor movement and the United Community Funds and Councils of America. This lengthy period of common effort has been of immense benefit in increasing the funds raised and in developing programs and services in communities all over the Nation.

In anticipation of the United Fund drives this year, which begin in some places late this month and continue in others as late as Thanksgiving Day, I ask unanimous consent that an article on this anniversary of cooperation, published in the AFL-CIO News, be printed in the RECORD.

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

JOINT LABOR, UNITED FUND DRIVES MARK 25TH YEAR OF COOPERATION

The silver anniversary of labor participation in the united way of financing and administering social services is being marked this year by the AFL-CIO and the United Community Funds & Councils of America.

The now-accepted common effort developed out of a wartime agreement on joint campaign cooperation at a time when fund-raising appeared headed for chaos. It was signed Aug. 17, 1942, by Community Chests & Councils, Inc., predecessor of the UCFCA; the CIO Committee for American & Allied War Relief, and the AFL United Nations Relief Committee.

AFL-CIO Vice Pres. Joseph A. Beirne, who is president of the UCFCA, said the agreement signed 25 years ago "paved the way to active labor participation in community affairs in an organized and disciplined way."

Beirne, president of the Communications Workers, is chairman of the AFL-CIO Community Services Committee.

"Both as citizens and as trade unionists, we rejected separatism and accepted integration," he added. "By joining forces with the rest of the community in fund-raising and in the development of programs and services, we not only contributed to the strength of the united fund and labor movements but to the community and its citizens as a whole."

The original agreement provided for labor representation on the boards and committees of boards and agencies, that solicitation for funds be organized jointly by union and employer representatives with all pledges voluntary and coercion prohibited, and that local union war relief committees be recognized and incorporated into local War Chest campaigns.

How this cooperation has grown over the years was detailed by AFL-CIO Community Services Dir. Leo A. Perlis, who cited as its fruits "both measurable and immeasurable benefits which have accrued to the whole community."

"Before the agreement there was not a single labor man on the staff of any community chest anywhere," he recalled. "Today

there are 160 full-time AFL-CIO community service representatives in 110 industrial communities.

"Twenty-five years ago there was not a single union counselor. Now there are 65,000 union counselors.

"Twenty-five years ago labor contributed only a few thousand dollars to local chests. In the past three annual campaigns, employees in AFL-CIO organized plants contributed almost half a billion dollars.

"In 1941 there were a handful of labor people on the boards and committees of community agencies. Today there are 75,000 union men and women serving on the policy-making bodies of these agencies—many of them as officers."

Perlis emphasized that whereas prior to the agreement strikers could expect no help from any community agency, voluntary or public, today thousands of agencies offer their services "as a matter of course and on the basis of need regardless of the cause of that need."

"As a result of this agreement," he continued, "united fund agencies benefited from labor participation, including the Boy Scouts, 20 percent of whose local leaders are AFL-CIO members; and the Red Cross blood banks, one-third of whose blood comes from AFL-CIO members.

"AGENCIES STRENGTHENED

"What cannot be readily measured but what is discernible, nevertheless, is the wholesome climate which this labor participation has brought about in many communities—wholesome in terms of agencies which are now more representative of the people and more responsive to people's needs."

The AFL-CIO was congratulated on the anniversary by UCFCA Exec. Dir. Lyman Ford, who declared that the united way "has been immeasurably strengthened by splendid support from organized labor for the last 25 years."

"I am happy," he said, "to pay tribute to my predecessors at UCFCA and to the leaders of organized labor a quarter-century ago who developed this constructive partnership. It has paid rich dividends in communities all over the land.

"The most significant aspect of the development is that organized labor has successfully organized its interest and involvement in community affairs. This has included intelligent assumption of responsibility as well as pressure for improved community services."

LEWIS AND CLARK JOB CORPS CENTER, N. DAK.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, recently, Fort Totten, a former cavalry outpost in North Dakota, held its centennial celebration. Two history buffs from the Lewis and Clark Job Corps Center attended the celebration, wrote a brief history of the fort, and, in general, helped to make the celebration a success.

The Mandan Pioneer, Mandan, N. Dak., took editorial note of this, pointing out that the corpsmen's history of Fort Totten was praised by officials of the Lewis and Clark Center.

Another article from the same newspaper also points to the pride taken in the Lewis and Clark corpsmen. The article reprints excerpts from letters written by corpsmen to their friends. In one letter a corpsman praises the Job Corps for what it can do for him. Another corpsman, in talking about the recent riots across the country, writes that it makes no sense for the Negro and white to fight because everyone is equal in God's eyes. This boy is a Negro, and does not want

anyone stirring up trouble in which people are killed.

We can all learn something from these corpsmen. I think the Job Corps is doing a commendable job in training, education, and character development in its centers in North Dakota.

I urge Senators to read these two articles from the Mandan Pioneer and ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

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

CORPSMEN WRITE BRIEF HISTORY OF FORT TOTTON

There are two history buffs at the Lewis and Clark Job Corps Center south of Bismarck.

Corpsmen Paul Bray and Larry Estill, recently returned from attending the Fort Totten Centennial celebration, have written a brief history of Fort Totten—a work that has been lauded by officials of the Job Corps Center.

Paul and Larry point out that the development of the west influenced an overland route extending from southern Minnesota into western Montana.

"A series of posts were built for protection, and in July, 1867, Fort Totten, Dakota Territory, was established by General A. H. Terry," wrote the pair.

Fort Totten was named in honor of Major General Joseph Gilbert Totten, late chief engineer of the U.S. Army, point out Paul and Larry.

The writers also delve into Fort Totten background of education, legend, landscape and important names associated with the area.

BISMARCK JOB CORPSMAN WRITES: "I'M GOING TO MAKE SOMETHING OF MYSELF"

Officials of the Lewis and Clark Job Corps Center south of Bismarck take pride in progress being shown by some of their students.

They recently released a letter written to a friend in Missouri by Corpsman Willie Lee Anderson, a Negro. Excerpts from the letter:

"I like the Job Corps and I am sure you will like it too. A lot of boys get homesick. The Job Corps is what you make out of it.

"I have some nice teachers and staff members here. If you are not going to join the Job Corps stay in school. Some of you think seven dollars a day is something, but it is not too much.

"I hope you will all try to make something out of yourself. Before I left some of you were getting smart with the teachers and getting thrown out of school, but it is not no big deal.

"I am on the fire and drill team and a reporter for the newspaper. I am going to make something of myself. When I get out of the Job Corps and in two years I am going to join the Army."

Willie Lee Anderson also had this to say about the recent disorder in American cities:

"I am a Negro boy and about these Freedom Riders: I don't think it makes sense for the colored and white to fight. If you want to fight go to Vietnam. They need people who like to fight. In God's sight every man is equal no matter what race you are.

"When the Freedom Riders fight, a lot of innocent people get killed. I hope they don't start that in Missouri."

Want to know a little about Willie. Here's some background, as written by another Corpsman Reporter, Larry Estill:

"Willie Anderson is a corpsman at Lewis and Clark J.C.C. He is 16 years old. He has two sisters, six brothers, and stands 5'4" tall. He came to Lewis and Clark May 23, 1967.

"Willie says that some of the reasons he came to Job Corps is to 'take the trade that

he wants, learn more education, and to meet new friends.' He is on level 4 in reading and writing, and level 5 in mathematics. He has chosen electricity as his vocation.

"Willie is a Baptist. He attends one of the Baptist churches in Bismarck. He hardly ever misses attending church on Sundays.

"As Willie says, 'I have made a big change in my life and I hope that you will too.'"

CAPITAL LIBERALIZATION IN JAPAN SHOULD EXPAND

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, as a member of both the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Commerce, I have an active interest in U.S. foreign trade and expansion of U.S. industry abroad. I have frequently expressed concern not only with investment restrictions suggested by our own Government for U.S. investments abroad but also with restrictions some governments place on U.S. investments in their countries. My concern is heightened further in light of the fact we place no such restrictions on foreign investments in this country.

I was, therefore, pleased to note that on June 6, the Government of Japan announced a plan to liberalize capital investment in Japan. This is a very fine first step. I am hopeful that Japan will take further steps to liberalize capital movements and direct investment in Japan.

The viewpoint of most American businessmen having interests in Japan is, I believe, summarized accurately in an editorial which appeared in the July 5, issue of the *Journal*, the official publication of the American Chamber of Commerce in Japan. 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:

COMMENTARY ON JAPAN'S CAPITAL LIBERALIZATION PLAN

On June 6th the Government announced its long-awaited capital liberalization plan which accepted fully the recommendations of the Foreign Investment Council of June 2nd. After so much preparation and debate, it must be said that the plan in its present form is disappointing in its basic philosophy and objectives, its scope of liberalization, its preconditions to automatic approval categories, and its relative emphasis on countermeasures. On balance the plan has a strong protectionist orientation and gives little real weight to the benefits to be derived from liberalization in terms of stimulating domestic industry and commerce to modernize, the interest of domestic consumers, and the international interests of Japan.

It is a basic concept of the plan that no industry should be liberalized until it is fully competitive on an equal basis with foreign capital. This seems to mean that Japan considers every industry to be an important national interest and therefore to be defended against anything but very minor foreign participation. The classical economic idea of comparative advantage is rejected implicitly. If every other country adopted this concept there would be very little liberalization anywhere. It means that consumers in Japan must wait for better products and services until domestic industry develops. It means that the "development" aspect of any industry will not be liberalized. Foreign capital will only be permitted to enter freely those industries or segments of industries where the opportunity is marginal. Consequently the

amount of direct foreign capital inflow in the liberalized categories is likely to be unimportant.

Another basic concept is that nothing should be liberalized until corresponding countermeasures are in effect. There are several desirable long range objectives in the countermeasures program, such as improvement in capital markets, modernization of the industrial and distribution structures, increased emphasis on technological development, etc. Realization of these objectives will depend to a large extent on Government measures to open the way. However, the immediate countermeasures visualized will amount to replacing external barriers to foreign investment by internal ones which are vaguer and may be more difficult to deal with than present barriers. The idea of countermeasures is to eliminate the bad effects of liberalization while retaining the benefits. In every business development there are bound to be some interests which are affected adversely at least temporarily. The idea that the net effect of advantages and disadvantages of a specific case may be good does not appear to carry much weight. One of the benefits of liberalization should be the stimulus to improve given to domestic interests. The plan's concept of countermeasures largely eliminates the stimulus and tempts domestic industry to continue to lean on government aid.

As far as the scope of immediate liberalization is concerned, the "industries" in the liberalized categories are not industries but products or segments of industries. Consequently the "population" from which the 17 cases in the 100% and the 33 in the 50% categories are selected is very large and if liberalization is measured in simple statistical terms the extent of liberalization is very small. Apart from the fact that the scope of liberalization is small by this measure, the liberalized industries themselves are unlikely to attract very much foreign capital for various reasons. Some industries are mature and the prospect for growth and profitability is limited. Some cases depend for success on special positions which could not be effectively duplicated by foreign ventures. In other cases, production cannot include important components, etc. In addition it is a requirement that the foreign venture start from the ground up. In other words, even with the very limited liberalization list, the odds appear to be heavily against the foreign investor entering the liberalized fields so far indicated. The announcement of the 100% category has symbolic value but little more at this point. The plan provides that measures should be revised every one to two years and that liberalization should be carried out in a considerable number of sectors before the end of 1971. However, the thrust of liberalization in respect to the 1971 target is not to increase the number of industries in the 100% category, but to increase the number in the 50% category.

The idea that liberalization should be based mainly on equal partnership between domestic and foreign interests is not shared by other OECD countries. Japan itself does not acknowledge the idea in the internal guidelines which the government lays down for Japanese direct overseas investment. These guidelines call for the Japanese side to have more than a 50% interest. From a practical business point of view, equal joint ventures are at best questionable. They run the risk of being ineffective and less efficient. They are slow moving in areas where major decisions are required. They are unlikely to be leaders or innovators and they can be plagued by conflicts of interest between the partners. In short, joint ventures are full of potential problems especially if they are forced by national policy rather than developed from natural commercial circumstances.

With respect to both "liberalized" categories

the condition under the present case-by-case system that a new venture should not have any seriously adverse effect on Japan's interests is still in effect. This provision has generally been the real basis in the past for MITI intervention in a foreign investment proposal. The plan justifies retention of this condition on the grounds that it is in the OECD Capital Liberalization Code. This condition is in the Code but there are two important qualifications: (1) Japan's concept of "serious adverse effects" or "particularly harmful" is wide apart from the OECD definition; (2) Exceptions to liberalization on this ground require explanation to the OECD and are rare.

Although the plan places primary emphasis on the 50/50 principle, the actual conditions promulgated for automatic approval of industries in this category make it clear that the Japanese partner is intended to have a stronger management voice than the foreign partner. The guidelines for automatic approval call for the Japanese side to have more than 50% of the shares and more voice on the board than the percentage of their shares. In addition to these requirements the Japanese partner must be in the same industry as the venture. Apart from increasing the likelihood of conflicts of interest between the venture's line of business and the Japanese partner's, this requirement may result in preserving the essence of present controls in a different form. The Japanese partner is to be the watchdog of national policy and protect the framework of cooperation in the industry. He will be a member of the industry association. One of the countermeasures recommended by MITI is to enhance the strength and ability of associations to counter foreign capital advance. The potential Japanese partner will have to answer to the association and MITI in working out its arrangements with the foreign interest. Most associations cooperate in these matters very closely with MITI. It is likely therefore that MITI can achieve through the association substantially what it now achieves through the case-by-case approach with the added advantage however of being less directly responsible. From the foreign investor's point of view the rules for successful entry into any given field may be more difficult to determine than under the previous approval system.

In addition to limiting the scope of the liberalized categories and attaching preconditions to them, the government incorporated in its plan the complete proposal for immediate countermeasures submitted by a Committee of Experts to the Foreign Investment Council. Four of these measures are recommended for immediate implementation and three for later development. Two of the immediate measures are designed to restrict or control the technical or other competitive capacity of new foreign ventures. The extent and impact of these can only be judged in their implementation. However, the provision calling for restrictions on foreign-controlled Japanese companies and branches of foreign companies in respect to acquisitions in yen of shares of other Japanese companies has an immediate impact on many existing enterprises in Japan. This measure is questionable on several grounds. It means a new control on existing foreign enterprises in Japan which runs counter to the provisions of the U.S. Japan Treaty of Friendship, Commerce and Navigation and the OECD Code of Capital Liberalization. Existing enterprises are already substantially controlled by restrictions on their access to foreign finance and technology. Such a new control is not necessary in respect to liberalized investments since new ventures are required to obtain new approval before entering fields in Japan other than the liberalized category into which they were permitted to enter automatically.

If this provision is implemented, the negative effect on existing foreign enterprises may exceed the positive and limited effect of the liberalization side of the plan.

In the final analysis no plan of course can be evaluated except in the implementation and much remains to be seen in respect to this plan. Among the questions to be answered are the following:

How much new direct foreign capital will actually enter Japan under the automatic approval procedures? How rapidly will the number of industries in the liberalized categories, particularly the 100% category, be expanded? To what extent will approval procedures be simplified and speeded up in practice and will the process of review prior to formal filing of applications actually cease? What use will be made of the pre-condition to automatic approval that a new venture must not have exceptionally harmful effects on Japan's interests? What shape will countermeasures take and how will they be used? And finally, will there be any liberalizing of the underlying ideas of the plan?

The plan and its progress will be studied and followed closely by Japan's OECD partners and by many others. It is hoped that time will not be lost in expanding the scope of liberalization and strengthening Japan's endorsement of the liberal principles on which expanding international economic cooperation depends. It is encouraging to note that the Foreign Investment Council intends to take up immediately the question of liberalizing additional industries and to develop measures to liberalize the induction of foreign know-how.

In a bulletin published by the Executive Board of the Liberal Democratic Party on June 6th it was stated that the government should take every possible measure with regard to public relations and publicity in order to promote deep understanding and cooperation of the people in the execution of capital liberalization. This statement goes to the heart of one of the major obstacles to progress in capital liberalization: the great preoccupation in most sectors of Japanese opinion with feared adverse consequences of liberalization and the lack of understanding of the objectives and benefits of liberalization as seen and experienced by the advanced countries of the free world. This problem has been clearly evident for some time to those in the foreign community who have discussed the issue with Japanese officials, business associates, and friends, and have followed Japanese press comment. A positive program to overcome this problem will do more to advance capital liberalization in Japan than any other single measure.

INERTIAL GUIDANCE TO SAFETY

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, circumnavigation of the earth on the sea, in the air, and through space at ever-increasing speeds has posed heavy demands for fast, efficient aids to navigation.

AC Electronics of Milwaukee, Wis., has met the challenges of those demands through technological advance and conscientious efforts in the field of inertial guidance systems. Last month AC produced its 10,000th gyro. As the company noted:

Building 10,000 of anything over a span of 15 years in this era of mass production is not usually considered a noteworthy milestone.

However, the company did use the occasion to demonstrate through public information the meaning that inertial guidance has to the safety of millions of American high-speed travelers every day.

I ask unanimous consent that this in-

formation be printed in the RECORD so that readers will have an opportunity to learn of the technological advance in this scientific field.

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

AC PRODUCES 10,000TH GYROSCOPE

MILWAUKEE.—General Motors' AC Electronics Division has reached a memorable aerospace milestone by producing its 10,000th gyroscope.

Building 10,000 of anything over a span of 15 years in this era of mass production is not usually considered a noteworthy milestone. But 10,000 gyros is another matter, because no manufactured device requires more exacting human skill, finer precision facilities and equipment or greater design ingenuity than the gyros used in an inertial guidance system.

AC manufactured its first gyro instrument in 1952. Since then, high-precision AC gyros have been at the heart of inertial guidance systems which have guided some of this country's best-known aircraft, missiles, and spacecraft including the Thor and Titan II ballistic missiles, the B-47 and B-52 long range bombers, and most recently the Titan III space launch vehicle and the Apollo lunar mission spacecraft.

The miniature gyroscopes and accelerometers used in today's guidance systems are the results of continued research and development efforts during these years by AC engineers and manufacturing experts. AC has been a pioneer in applying advanced gyro technology using exotic lightweight materials and developing inventive assembly techniques and machinery to produce high-precision inertial instruments for guidance and navigation systems.

The newest and most advanced AC gyro will be a part of AC's Carousel IV inertial navigation system which will be used by commercial jet aircraft including the giant Boeing 747 which will go into airline service in 1969.

This gyro history began when GM's AC Spark Plug Division in Flint, Mich., evolved into building gyros from its World War II success in manufacturing aircraft equipment, including autopilots, gunsights, bombsights, and bombing navigational computers. As AC needed additional facilities, the Milwaukee plant was opened in 1948. This organization grew steadily as AC's aerospace operation and was made a separate division of General Motors in 1965.

In the early 1950's, AC engineers began doing considerable work with engineers of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology's Instrumentation Laboratory and Dr. C. Stark Draper developing a Stellar-Inertial Bombing System (SIBS), intended as a navigational aid for manned aircraft.

In 1952, in parallel with work at M.I.T., AC developed the first gyro for this pioneering system, a 25-pound instrument called the 75FG (for Floated Gyro). This SIBS system proved conclusively that long-range all-inertial guidance was feasible. The gyros performed beyond original expectations, and the stellar or star-tracking part of the system was considered to be unnecessary for future inertial guidance systems.

Ten 75FG gyros were manufactured for the single SIBS system under contract.

The potential of the gyro inspired AC engineers to forge ahead with research and development programs. The association with M.I.T. and Dr. Draper continued, and in 1955, the Air Force asked AC to develop an all-inertial guidance system for the MACE missile. The next year AC began development of the Thor Intermediate Range Ballistic Missile (IRBM) inertial guidance system.

At the same time, with breakthroughs in inertial instrument and electronic technology and advancements in production techniques

and equipment, AC developed its first mass-production gyro for the world's first mass-production all-inertial guidance system—for the Thor IRBM.

The 10⁴ gyro and the 10⁴ gyro accelerometer were designed for these systems, applying the very latest in gyro technology. These instruments were considerably smaller and lighter than the SIBS 75FG gyro, but both were made from aluminum, which was then the best material available.

For the Thor and Mace systems, AC produced 2,170 of the 10⁴ gyros and 1,422 of the 10⁴ accelerometers.

While this production was going on, AC's research in gyro technology was investigating beryllium's potential as a substitute for aluminum. Its light weight and extreme stiffness make it a first-class gyro manufacturing metal. But solutions had to be found for machining problems posed by its hardness. Those who worked with it had to observe special medical precautions because of possible toxic effects of beryllium chips and dust.

In 1959, AC was ready to use beryllium and began supplying gyros and accelerometers for the Navy's Polaris missile. AC has since delivered 3,297 instruments to the Navy, including the first instruments to use beryllium, the 25 PIG (Pendulous Integrating Gyro) and 25 IRIG (Inertial Reference Integrating Gyro) gyros and the 16 PIGA accelerometer.

Also in 1959, AC was selected by the Air Force to produce an all-inertial guidance system for the Titan Intercontinental Ballistic Missile using the 2FBG (Floated Beryllium Gyro).

During this period AC also began supplying inertial reference units to the Air Force for aircraft used in the Airborne Long Range Input (ALRI) program for a defense warning system. The Titan and ALRI programs both used 2FBG and 25 PIG gyros along with the 25 PIGA (Pendulous Integrating Gyro Accelerometer). The combined manufacturing total for these instruments was 2,102.

Later, 95 MK VII and MOD VIII gyros were built by AC to Navy specifications for a Ships Inertial Navigation System (SINS).

The Air Force Minuteman ICBM's also carry AC gyros. In 1963, delivery started on the 16 PIGA MOD G accelerometer, and to date about 500 instruments have been produced for this program.

The next major gyro technology breakthrough occurred in the early 1960's with the development of the gas bearing gyro.

The Apollo Guidance and Navigation systems, which AC is now delivering to NASA for use in the Command and Lunar Module spacecraft, use the Apollo I and II IRIG gyros. So far, over 350 gyros have been produced for the Apollo program.

AC reached its 10,000 milestone this summer as the manufacturing of Apollo gyros and the newest members of AC's family of inertial instruments—the AC-641, AC-651, and AC-643—pushed the production total over the mark.

And the future? The end is not in sight for the fast-moving gyro technology; the vocabulary of AC research engineers today includes words like tuned gyros, electric vacuum gyros, Laser gyros, and even nuclear spin gyros.

"PRICE CONTROL" PLOY

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, a recent issue of the National Association of Manufacturers Reports contained a most thoughtful article on a strange and novel requirement by the Department of Defense. The association has, I believe, performed a notable public service by detailing the demands of procurement officials in this case.

I ask that the article be reprinted in the RECORD at this point.

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

"PRICE CONTROL" PLOY: SALES OF CATALOG ITEMS TO DEFENSE DEPARTMENT LEADS TO DEMAND FOR FULL COST RECORDS

Taking a completely novel tack, the Comptroller General of the United States has demanded from the Hewlett-Packard Company all "books, documents, papers or records" relating to the cost of producing the standard commercial articles called for under four firm-fixed price contracts negotiated with the government. Adding shock to novelty, the Comptroller General's announced purpose was not to determine whether the contracts had been performed according to their terms, but simply to collect cost data so that it could be disseminated as a guide in future contract procurements.

The present controversy began when government procurement officials approached Hewlett-Packard on four separate occasions during the period March 1959 through January 1961, to buy quantities of instruments which the company regularly produced and which, with one exception, had been in their catalogs together with its published list price for a minimum of three years. Owing to the number of instruments desired, the government asked for and received a quantity discount—in one case eleven percent. The result is that in exchange for negotiating with the government concerning a reduction in price for standard commercial articles sold in quantity to the general public, the contractor is now faced with the very real threat of having to reveal cost of production data—data which is clearly considered highly confidential in a competitive industry.

This all came about when an authorized representative of the Comptroller General, having been permitted access to the company books and records regarding sales prices of the various items, thereupon demanded to know how much it had cost to produce these same items. Hewlett-Packard refused the information, and the fight was on. Both parties agreed that the contracts in question contained, as part of their general provisions, an Examination of Records Clause put there in compliance with the statutory mandate of 10 USC 2313(b) which states:

"(b) Each contract negotiated under this chapter shall provide that the Comptroller General and his representatives are entitled, until the expiration of three years after final payment, to examine any books, documents, papers or records of the contractor, or of any of his subcontractors, that directly pertain to, and involve transactions relating to, the contract or subcontract."

What both parties could not agree on was the usual, ordinary meaning of the italicized words. Even consulting the same dictionary did not seem to help. (Attorneys for the company reluctantly consented to follow the government's lead in consulting the Second Edition of Webster's New International Dictionary "instead of the more recent Third Edition".) Hewlett-Packard argued that since the statute itself did not define, as a matter of law, what kind of data is "directly pertinent" or what are "transactions relating" to the contract, this determination must be made on basis of the terms and conditions of the particular contract and the circumstances relevant to its negotiation. Not so, said the government. In their view the legislative purpose in enacting the statute here discussed is abundantly clear. Congress intended to provide the Comptroller General with a tool whereby his representatives could bring about the disclosure of prices which are "unreasonable" in relation to costs and also to effectuate a tightening up in procurement procedures. This may be true enough in instances where the contractor is to be reimbursed for his total cost of

production plus a fixed fee, the company could agree, but the Congress itself has recognized the special status of standard commercial articles.

These have been exempted from the price controls of renegotiation, and permissive exemption is provided under the Truth in Negotiations Act (Public Law 87-653). "This is convincing evidence," to quote the Hewlett-Packard brief, "that the Congress did not intend to control profit margins on standard commercial articles and certainly did not intend that such profit control should be undertaken by the Comptroller General through a procedure of gathering cost data as to standard commercial articles and then disseminating that cost data for use in future government procurement of such articles." "These are obviously makeweight arguments," the government attorney counters. The company knew, or should have known, about the mandatory provisions of the statute (10 U.S.C. 2313(b)) and voluntarily contracted to make direct labor, direct material and overhead cost records available. This despite the fact that the Comptroller General has been unable to point to a single published report in which the General Accounting Office has exerted the "right" to examine cost records relating to a firm fixed-price contract for standard commercial articles negotiated on the basis of established market prices without consideration of cost data during the negotiations.

To avoid the kind of pitched battle here being waged and to insure the inviolability of cost of production information, one might ask, why not simply have the parties agree at the outset that cost data is not pertinent to the contract and thereby insure that neither party relies on this type of information in striking the bargain. The short answer is that this is precisely what transpired in the case at hand. The government's request for proposal which was later incorporated into the contract contained a provision which, is applicable, would have required Hewlett-Packard to submit a detailed cost breakdown. But it was not made applicable and no such cost information was either requested or supplied. The government brushed aside this argument by stating flatly that the contract signed by Hewlett-Packard did contain the Examination of Records clause (set forth above) and that this specifically provides for post-audit by the Comptroller General of "directly pertinent records involving transactions related" to the contract.

The ebb and flow of argument in this well-briefed and hard-fought case proved overpowering to the U.S. District Court Judge who said at the close of initial proceedings, "I am just as uncertain at this point as to the appropriate disposition of the motions as I was at the start of the arguments. That is the nature of things, I guess." And then, in a somewhat astonishing and at the same time whimsical move, he invited himself to be overruled by saying, "The decision here is not going to be final, and I leave it to the wiser and better-paid judges on the Court of Appeals to reach the ultimate decision. Under the circumstances, I can see little harm in granting the government's motion at this point. . . ."

Hewlett-Packard did indeed appeal, and the case was heard in the United States Court of Appeals (Ninth Circuit-California) on July 7, 1967. No decision has as yet been handed down. The reason the outcome of this particular case is of importance to the entire industrial community is perhaps best stated in the words of the attorneys representing Hewlett-Packard, Robert M. Brown and Francis M. Small, Jr., who argued, "This suit must be recognized as an assertion by the Comptroller General that he has the broad right to investigate 'the reasonableness of prices' in every negotiated purchase, regardless of the presence of adequate competition, previous price experience or well

established market prices for standard commercial items. As the examination of records clause 2313(b) must be inserted in all contracts and subcontracts (of \$2,500 or over), this is in reality an assertion by the Comptroller General of a sweeping price control function over all American industry through examination of the books and records establishing the costs of production of practically all standard commercial products. And the purpose of this sweeping power is not to determine that government appropriations have been expended in accordance with law and regulation, but is to gather cost information to be disseminated for use in future procurements."

Should the position of the Comptroller General prevail, any business desiring to safeguard the confidentiality of its cost figures on particular standard commercial articles would have to refuse to negotiate with the United States concerning those articles. Such an absurd result can hardly be in the public interest. And, in the event the provisions of the Defense Production Act are brought into play to meet a particular situation—such as the government's inability to locate any other supplier—the contractor may find that even the right to refuse to negotiate is no longer his.

RICHARD GODOWN.

YOUTH WANTS TO KNOW

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, we are often deluged with talk about the errant ways of America's youth. Claims are made that youth today are not prepared to meet the adult challenges of tomorrow. One of the difficulties, it seems to me, is that many people treat the so-called youth problem as they might the weather—they talk about it but assume little can be done about it.

One notable exception is the well-known, award winning public affairs television program "Youth Wants to Know," created and produced by Mr. Theodore Granik. To my way of thinking, "Youth Wants to Know" is an outstanding and constructive use of the television medium.

This program brings leaders from government, business, science, education, and the arts before a panel of teenagers, who, with disarming candor, ply them with penetrating and provocative questions about national and international problems. It has been my privilege to appear as a guest on the program several times over the past few years, and to experience this vigorous, searching inquiry.

A new series of excellent "Youth Wants to Know" television broadcasts is being made available over WETA-TV, the educational station in our Nation's Capital, through a grant from Mrs. Allie S. Freed, president, Buckingham and Claremont Communities of Virginia.

I sincerely hope that this generous contribution will stimulate interest by other business organizations to support programs of this type which help to arouse public interest in the issues concerning all thoughtful Americans. At the same time, contributions of this kind serve to present to the Nation the real face of American youth, aware, concerned and responsible.

DR. CHARLES W. JEFFREY, WYOMING'S LIVING LEGEND

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the RECORD an article concerning Dr. Charles W. Jeffrey, of Rawlins, Wyo., a living legend, which was published in the Empire magazine of the Denver Post for August 27, 1967.

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

DR. JEFFREY, WYOMING'S LIVING LEGEND
(By Jack Guinn)

One day back in the spring of 1933, during the Great Depression when hardly anybody had any money, an oil driller named A. B. Cobb asked his physician, Dr. Charles W. Jeffrey of Rawlins, Wyo., to put up \$5,000 to form an oil exploration partnership. Dr. Jeffrey told Cobb, who was a personal friend, that he ought to have his head examined.

Dr. Jeffrey, who will be 84 years old Nov. 2, says there are some things he doesn't remember with absolute clarity, but his recollections of the conversations with Cobb are vivid:

"I told him I never made a nickel investing in anything. I told him, hell, I'm a doctor and I don't want any part of the damned oil business.

"He came back a second time and I turned him down again. Then he went up to northern Montana and got a lease and came back the third time. I didn't have any money, but I borrowed some and we went into the oil business as A. B. Cobb and Company. He wanted to make it Cobb and Jeffrey, but I told him I'd rather be the 'and Company.'

"Cobb was some man. He was six foot five and weighed 265 pounds. He was a cousin of Ty Cobb, the great baseball player. And he knew the oil business. The first well he drilled in the Cutbank field was a success."

By 1947 A. B. Cobb and Company had 200 producing wells, 500 miles of pipeline and 50 filling stations. That same year the whole thing was sold to the Phillips Petroleum Co. for \$5 million.

This transaction made Dr. Jeffrey far richer than he had ever dreamed possible in the hardship years of his boyhood in Nebraska, medical school in Illinois, and the struggle to establish a medical practice in Wyoming. Perhaps those memories inspired the generosity that has made him known as one of Wyoming's greatest philanthropists.

Nobody knows for sure how much money Dr. Jeffrey has given away or invested in good works, but rough addition of known amounts puts it around \$2,800,000. The largest long-term gesture was recent establishment of a scholarship fund for the University of Wyoming which, through revenues from property under a 94-year lease, will produce \$2,200,000.

He paid \$40,000 for the big Abraham Lincoln monument, the work of Sculptor Robert I. Russin, which stands on the summit just off Highway 30 between Laramie and Cheyenne. It was erected in 1959 to commemorate the sesquicentennial of Lincoln's birth.

The same year he donated \$10,000 to Children's Hospital in Denver.

In 1953 he invested \$200,000 to finance construction of a hospital in his old hometown of Osceola, Neb.

Not counting the country doctor's disregard of the financial condition of people needing medical care, Dr. Jeffrey's philanthropies began in 1940 when he bought the city of Rawlins a \$37,500 fire truck. The latest was the gift to the people of Rawlins and Carbon County of a community center which cost \$310,000.

To provide a setting for formal acceptance and dedication of the building, the citizens of Rawlins staged "Dr. Jeffrey Day" on July 19. The structure was christened "Charles W. Jeffrey M.D. Carbon County Memorial Center" but before the paint was dry on the new sign people were already referring to it simply as the "Jeffrey Memorial Center."

More than 650 persons turned out for a banquet at which various speakers told anecdotes about Dr. Jeffrey's colorful career as physician, legislator, football fan and bon vivant. It was the kind of a testimonial affair that probably could take place only in Wyoming, with nice ladies and proper gentlemen applauding in delight as the speakers pictured Dr. Jeffrey as a combination of saint and whiskey-drinking, poker-playing, fun-loving old man. And he loved every minute of it.

He was touched by the display of affection. When he rose to present to the county the deed to the new building, he said:

"Thank you all. It is a pleasure for me tonight. . . ." His voice broke, and the audience waited in silence for several moments. Then there was a roar of laughter and applause when he regained his composure and said: "I ought to have a drink."

Charles W. Jeffrey was born on a farm five miles west of Osceola, in Polk County, Neb., on Nov. 2, 1883. His mother was a practical nurse and one of his heroes was the local physician, Dr. David Jackson Smith. As well as he can recall, he decided at the age of seven that he was going to be a doctor.

He was captain of his high school football team in 1902, his senior year, despite the fact that he weighed only 140 pounds. After graduation, he and other former high school players who were working in Omaha formed a "professional" team.

"There were only 12 of us," he remembers, "but we played anybody who wanted to play. The only time I was ever hurt playing football was with this team. We were playing a team from Fort Crook, a bunch of soldiers who practiced all the time. They were tough and we were all office workers. I was playing left tackle and on one play I raised up just as their center passed the ball and I think that whole army team walked on me.

"I was playing opposite a fellow named Sergeant Davis. He was a big man and I only weighed 148 pounds, but after the game I saw him walking along all bandaged up. He pointed at me and said, 'You see that little s.o.b. over there? He's the one who broke my collar bone.'"

Young Jeffrey lived in Omaha three years, working as a records clerk for the Union Pacific Railroad. While at this job he took a business school course, learning shorthand and typing, and then went to Ames, Neb. to work as a stenographer in a sugar factory.

In 1906 he heard that some land near Riverton, Wyo. had been opened up for homesteading and he headed West. He homesteaded on 160 acres although he had to borrow the \$1.50 an acre to pay for it.

"You won't believe this, but I'll tell you anyway," he says, "My place was three miles from Wind River and twice a week I'd take my dirty clothes and go down to the river, walk that three miles with two pails, wash my shirt and take a bath and then carry two pails of water back three miles."

At that time he was 23 years old. He built a house on his homestead and then took a job on the nearby Shoshoni reservation as timekeeper and supply clerk for a government crew digging irrigation ditches. In the winter he went up in the mountains to cut timber.

He saved his money and in 1911, when he figured he had enough for a year of college, he went to Chicago and enrolled in the medical school of the University of Illinois, where his friend Dr. David Jackson Smith was periodically a lecturer.

The next seven years of medical school and internship were on a near-starvation basis and Dr. Jeffrey's account of this miserable time is colorfully descriptive.

He has a talent for profanity, which the people of Rawlins have come to accept as part of his charm. As a matter of fact, he can succinctly describe the questionable antecedents of some fellow in the presence of dignified ladies and they seldom notice the

precision of the phrasing; if they do, it is very likely they consider the experience of his 84 years and assume that he has made a fair assessment of character. But that is Wyoming, where people are more inclined to be realistic and less inclined to strike poses than in other parts of the country.

"When I got off the train in Chicago," he remembers, "I had \$496 and two suits of clothes. I got a job working for American Express at 35 cents an hour, which was enough money to live on, and I made the first year fine. I paid for the second year with some building and loan stock I bought when I was selling newspapers as a kid back in Osceola, but the third year I couldn't pay all my tuition.

"These medical schools are damn tight, you know. I owed them \$40 and they took me off the rolls. But my mother owned a little house and she mortgaged it and sent me \$150, so I made it through the third year, but I didn't know what the hell to do about the fourth year. So I asked Dr. Smith for the money and he loaned me \$500."

After medical school he interned in the city hospital at St. Louis for eight months and then returned to Chicago's Lying-In Hospital where for seven months he did nothing but deliver babies.

"Obstetrics is my religion," he says. "I haven't got any other religion. My mother was a Methodist. She told me one time she wasn't baptized until I was in high school. She always said, 'Whenever you get ready to join a church, pick the one you want and join it.' I never found it."

Dr. Jeffrey served throughout World War I as a medical officer with the 19th Infantry. After the war the army was reluctant to speed up the discharge process, so Dr. Jeffrey had to resort to political string-pulling. He had friends who appealed to Wyoming's U.S. senators, who got him out of the army in two weeks.

In 1919, Dr. Jeffrey went to work for a doctor in Lander, Wyo. at \$250 a month, but was fired by the doctor's wife because he upset her firm direction of her husband's affairs. The dispute arose over money, for which the lady had a high regard, as evidenced by the fact that she came down town at the end of each day to personally collect whatever the medical practice had earned. According to Dr. Jeffrey's painful memory:

"The office was two flights up from the street and since she never left a penny to make change I had to walk up and down those stairs nearly every time somebody gave me a \$5 or \$10 bill for a \$2 office call. Finally I got to the point where I said, hell, I'm not going to do this anymore. So I started putting part of the money in the old rolltop desk and part of it in my pocket to make change. I kept an accurate accounting of it.

"But pretty soon she discovered she wasn't getting the amount of money she was supposed to every day. Every day! My God. So she asked me if I had any of the doctor's money and I said I did. I told her I wasn't going to walk up and down that hellish long stairway every time somebody came in with a \$5 bill. Right after that I was canned, not by the doctor but by his wife. He wanted to give me a month's pay but she wouldn't let him."

Dr. Jeffrey went to Rock Springs and Evanston, decided against settling at either place, and in the latter part of 1919 moved to Rawlins, a flourishing railroad, trade and livestock shipping center once described by Charlie Siringo, the famous cowboy detective, as a place where half the men work for the Union Pacific and the other half herd sheep.

He worked for a Rawlins physician until 1922 when he established his own practice.

Dr. Jeffrey was married in 1919 and divorced 10 years later. He never re-married and for many happy years enjoyed what the society editors like to call eligible bachelor status.

In the late 1930s Dr. Jeffrey was named defendant in a suit charging alienation of affections. In 1941, as a member of the Wyoming House of Representatives from Carbon County, Dr. Jeffrey introduced a bill outlawing such suits—including all those pending, such as his—and proudly posed with Gov. Nels H. Smith when the bill was signed.

While climbing up and down stairs in Lander resulted in one of the few incidents in which Dr. Jeffrey was ever a loser, similar stairs in Rawlins brought about a turn of events which has provided Rawlins people with one of their most delightful Doc Jeff stories.

There is a clinic in Rawlins which was built by one of Dr. Jeffrey's friends, an older physician who has since died, and two young doctors, both of whom left Wyoming for further training in specialized fields. Two more young doctors then took over and at this point Dr. Jeffrey decided he was tired climbing stairs to his office and would like to move into quarters on the ground floor of the clinic.

"My legs are going bad on me," he says. "I asked them if I couldn't have one of those offices. They turned me down. Said they were going to get a new man from some place to come out here.

"Well, I called up the real estate man and I told him to find out from those two young fellows who owned the building, the ones who moved away, how much money they wanted for it. He came and said they wanted me to make an offer. I said to give 'em \$125,000. They took it.

"So now I own a clinic. And I've also got an office in it, by God. A big office. Right on the ground floor where the old ladies can come in and sit down and talk about their pains."

Another of Dr. Jeffrey's memorable clashes came in July 1955 when he was a physician at the Wyoming State Penitentiary at Rawlins. On July 16, a Saturday, about 100 of the prison's 277 convicts launched a riot that lasted 15 hours, ending early Sunday. They held three guards as hostages until state officials agreed to meet prisoners' demands which included better food, better medical treatment, investigation of the prison welfare fund and the firing of two guards who were accused of cruelty.

The way Dr. Jeffrey remembers it, his conflict in the affair was over his reluctance to place himself in what he sincerely believed was a dangerous position.

One of the hostages had been hurt and the warden told Dr. Jeffrey to go in and see what he could do for the injured man.

Even today, the doctor's narrative tone shows that he considered the request incredible: "I said, 'You want me to go in there?' He said he did. I said, 'All right, I'll go, but I want two men with automatic rifles and I want an automatic rifle myself.' He said no guns. I said, 'Well, then, why don't you go in there yourself? The prisoners don't like you any more than they like me and I sure as hell won't go in there without a rifle.'

"The warden said I was going to be fired and I said he couldn't can me because I was appointed by the board. (The Board of Charities and Reform consists of the governor and other elected officials.) So when he went out I called Milward Simpson (governor at the time) and he said, 'What the hell you want that job for anyway?'

"I said I didn't, not that particular job especially; I just wanted something to do."

Dr. Jeffrey was 71 years old at the time and the fear of idleness, which bothers him a lot these days, was just beginning to plague him.

"I love medicine," he says. "I always have. I used to have a hell of a practice up here, but not anymore. I don't do much of anything anymore. Too damned old."

He may not practice medicine beyond, as he says, listening to old ladies talk about

their pains, but Dr. Jeffrey has other interests. He is president and chairman of the board of Rawlins Federal Savings and Loan Association, he is a member of the board of directors of Western Nuclear Inc., one of the nation's most successful uranium mining companies, and, of course, he's pretty busy, in season, attending University of Wyoming football games.

At the "Dr. Jeffrey Day" ceremonies in July, Glenn J. (Red) Jacoby, athletic director at Wyoming, recalled some highlights in a long happy association with Dr. Jeffrey. For example:

"About 20 years ago we were privileged to have Dr. Jeffrey as our team physician at the 'Gator Bowl game at Jacksonville, Fla., against Washington and Lee. And I wondered about this old guy because he had on a pair of cowboy boots, and he had a pint of bourbon shoved down in each one.

"And I can remember very well the national radio show we had in the roof garden of a very famous hotel in Jacksonville. Doc Jeff was throwing silver dollars out with both hands and plying the Floridians with bourbon on the side. Everybody had a great time, I'll tell you that."

So many stories about Dr. Jeffrey are in circulation that it is difficult sometimes to separate fact from legend, says Jim Moran of Denver, general counsel for Western Nuclear, also a speaker at the ceremonies.

One of these concerns a loan of \$250,000 made by Dr. Jeffrey to his friend Bob Adams, a Rawlins restaurant owner who got into the uranium business and now heads Western Nuclear. Originally the company was named Lost Creek Oil and Uranium Co. When Adams wanted to expand in 1955, which involved paying for a processing mill, he went to Dr. Jeffrey for a loan. Dr. Jeffrey promptly wrote him a check. Says Moran:

"The story goes that the check for \$250,000 was written as a counter check. It was presented to a Denver bank for payment, or at least for credit to the account of Lost Creek Oil and Uranium. The teller at the window was amazed to see a counter check come in for this amount of money. So he picked up the telephone and called a vice president and asked if a check from somebody in Rawlins, Wyo., named C. W. Jeffrey was any good. The vice president said of course it was good.

"The teller then asked, 'How much is it good for?' And the vice president is said to have replied: 'For whatever amount he wrote it for, young man.'

(The Wyoming town which subsequently grew up near the Western Nuclear mill, 66 miles northwest of Rawlins, was named Jeffrey City.)

"Later, in 1957, when the company had presented its picture to the New York banks and they were willing to enter into some of this speculation out here in the wild and woolly West, we had the closing in Rawlins. There was a long table filled with papers in neat piles and there were New York lawyers and New York bankers running around, passing out papers, signing this, applying seals to that.

"Finally the time came when one of the New York lawyers, with a rather extravagant flourish, displayed a check for \$250,000 and said, 'Now, Dr. Jeffrey, if you will surrender the note that you have from the company, I will give you this check in payment.' To which Dr. Jeffrey replied, as I have heard the story:

"'What the hell note? I don't have any note. Bob and I just shook hands. He needed the money and I gave it to him.'

"As I say, legends grow up around a man like Dr. Jeffrey, and I can't vouch for all of them. But I can tell you one story I know for sure is true.

"Not long ago, maybe a year or so ago, we had a directors' meeting in Denver and after the meeting one of the directors took us out

to the Cherry Hills Country Club for a banquet.

"It so happened that my wife was seated between Dr. Jeffrey and another very wealthy man about half Dr. Jeffrey's age and she was entranced by the idea of sitting between such men of wealth. After the evening was over she told me:

"'You know, I don't think I ever attended a dinner where I sat between two wealthy men like that, one over 80 and the other under 40, but the thing that I can't understand is that the one over 80 had more life, and more hands, than the one under 40.'"

The audience at the "Dr. Jeffrey Day" dinner applauded enthusiastically and Dr. Jeffrey, seated at the right of the speaker, smiled knowingly at all his friends and admirers, a picture of benign rascality.

Dr. Jeffrey won't deny that he has had a full and thoroughly enjoyable life and, although age has naturally brought its infirmities, he'd like to stay under a while longer:

"I still want to live, damn it to hell. But I'm just asking for four more years. My grandfather on my mother's side lived to be 88 and my grandfather on my father's side lived to be 85. I want to even up with or get ahead of those old devils."

If determination is needed, he may make it. If appreciation for life's joys counts for anything at all, he's certain to achieve his goal.

THE ANTIMISSILE QUESTION

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, it was my pleasure recently to address the national convention of Young Americans for Freedom. I talked in depth with them about the Nike X and the general antimissile problem confronting our Nation.

Since a number of my colleagues have asked me for my views on this situation, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my speech be printed in the RECORD so that my position on the antimissile question may be readily documented.

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

THE ANTIMISSILE QUESTION: HOW LONG WILL AMERICA WAIT?

It's a very great pleasure for me to be here and to address you key members of YAF.

Today the United States Senate finds itself worrying about the *problems and challenges* of the age. There are problems enough to go around: riots, war, inflation, high living costs, spiraling taxes, increased education costs—all of them compounded by an Administration *leadership-gap*, particularly in the Department of Defense.

It's this leadership-gap that bothers me especially. And, because of my special responsibilities as a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, I want to discuss tonight some thoughts that have been troubling me for many weeks.

If you will permit me, I want to talk about the *Nike-X anti-missile defense system*, and about the indecision and vacillation of the Defense Secretary which have thus far prevented our nation from protecting itself against the major communist strategic threat of the future.

I choose this forum for these remarks because those of you here are particularly concerned about the future—and this problem of strategic nuclear deterrence is going to be *your* problem long after Vietnam and a tax hike and current city rioting have faded into the past.

This Nike-X business has been simmering on the back-burner for years.

Like a bunch of grade-schoolers watching

an ant farm under glass, U.S. defense planners have been watching for five years while the Russians struggled to build a defensive missile shield against American intercontinental ballistic missiles. From out in space our satellites have sent us a virtual television documentary of Russians at work—bulldozers scraping launching pads, excavators digging cable trenches, concrete being poured on access roads. To the mosaic confronting our wondering eyes our electronic eavesdropping lookouts have added the sounds of Soviet testing and deployment.

And, finally, from this multitude of secret and semi-secret data our key defense planners have become convinced that the Soviet Union is deploying an antiballistic missile system.

That decision is *not* unanimous.

The *Joint Chiefs of Staff* are convinced. The *Secretary of the Army* is convinced.

So is the *Navy Secretary*; and the *Air Force Secretary*.

The *senators* on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy are convinced.

So are my colleagues on the *Armed Services Committee*; and the *Appropriations Committee*.

Members of the *House of Representatives* feel likewise.

But it is *not* unanimous.

The *Secretary of Defense* **DISAGREES.**

The *Secretary of Defense* has counseled us against moving now to thwart the Soviet missile advances. He apparently has convinced the President. And he and the President have asked the Russians to let us *talk to them* about it before we decide to do anything about it.

I'm not sure why the President takes Mr. McNamara's advice. After all, McNamara is the one who advised the President American boys would be coming home from Vietnam by Christmas 1964; he is the one who advised the President he could build one airplane called the TFX to do the job of two; and he is the one who advised the President to send the carrier JFK to sea without nuclear power.

In each instance the President has taken Mr. McNamara's advice, and has reaped an Edsel.

But this *anti-missile* problem is of a magnitude to make those other mistaken advisories pale into insignificance. What we are facing with the anti-missile-missile is a force that can *reverse* the scales of deterrence which have kept the Russians at bay for 20 years.

Ever since World War II—ever since 1945, the heart and core of American strategic foreign and military policy has been one of *deterrence* of Communist aggression.

This we have accomplished thus far by maintaining a retaliatory strike capability that could *withstand* a surprise attack and still retain the ability to devastate the Soviet Union.

Two things have been essential to this defense thesis.

The first is that the U.S. will *not* strike the first blow.

The second, flowing from the first, is that our retaliatory force *must be secure* and able to *survive* a first-strike by the enemy.

At the beginning of the period we had a relatively simple problem. The U.S. had a monopoly of nuclear weapons and their aircraft delivery systems. But, the problem got complicated more quickly than anyone foresaw. The Soviets broke the nuclear monopoly. Then the intercontinental ballistic missile entered the equation and upset it; because the ICBM could *not* be defended against like an airplane. That threatened security of the U.S. second-strike force and forced us away from "soft-configurations" into a "hardening" of our forces in airborne alerts, and missile silos and submerged submarines.

And, all through the period until just months ago, the strategy was based on a

simple, *bi-polar* confrontation. It was a game that only the U.S. and the USSR were equipped to play. Red China's entry has now thrown a real crimp into things.

The point I want to make is just this: *Because of Red China and because of the Soviet Missile defense system, for the first time since 1945 the security of our second-strike deterrent force is seriously endangered by advances in enemy technology.*

Technology, the great destabilizer, has done it again.

What the American public must now begin to realize—and what the President and Defense Secretary should be telling the public—is that our multibillion-dollar, long-range rocket systems are not weapons to end all weapons, their *invulnerability*, which is the key to their deterrent effectiveness, is rapidly *decreasing*.

As a result, the whole strategic war picture could, and probably will, change rapidly in the coming few years. *Five* major developments, made possible by technological breakthroughs, are critical to our future national security posture. These five things lay to rest what has been called the "myth of technological stalemate."

First. We know now that very large nuclear weapons could form the basis of a *screening-type missile defense*—a shield of X-rays and high-energy particles protecting a target nation against ballistic-missile attack.

Second. Missiles, now deployed in hardened underground silos, can be made *obsolete* by development of extremely accurate ICBM's that, shot from the other side of the world, hit within a couple of football fields of their target—an accuracy *ten times* that once thought the ultimate.

Three. Satellites, using *multi-spectral* reconnaissance systems, soon will be able to "see" missile-bearing submarines hiding many fathoms beneath the sea.

Four. New, lower-cost rockets and missiles raise the probability that many *less-advanced nations* can acquire ICBM, nuclear attack forces.

And, *Five.* Advanced nations now are able to make sophisticated systems to *defend against ICBM's*. The Reds are. We can, but we aren't.

Almost everybody except Mr. McNamara thinks we are making a grave mistake. *I, for one, think we must start deployment of an anti-missile defense force right now.*

We must do it so that we can guarantee the safety of our people against a *limited, irrational* missile attack from some nation such as Red China—so that we can have protection against a *mistakenly launched* Russian missile—and so that we will have a base for *increasing that defense system* later if necessary to guard against the Soviet Union's missiles.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff, our most expert and talented military leaders, strongly advise that we begin implacing a NIKE-X missile defense system.

The Joint Chiefs make this recommendation now because the Soviet ability to destroy our population and our industry is *constantly growing* and also because the research program on our NIKE-X missile system has reached a point where the system is ready to be deployed.

Here is the way the nation's military experts described to the Armed Services Committee the current situation:

Since American intelligence has found that the Soviet Union is deploying an anti-missile defense system around Moscow, we also must expect the Soviets will extend their defense throughout their country. Thus they are increasing their defenses.

In addition, the Soviet Union is increasing its offensive missile capabilities by speeding up deployment of ICBM's.

Our experts do *not* know whether the Russians are aiming at nuclear equality with us,

or whether they are deliberately working toward nuclear superiority. *We do know* the Soviets want to reduce our ability to threaten their people and industry. And, they want to complicate the targeting problem for our missiles—to reduce our confidence in our ability to penetrate their defenses—and to ultimately achieve such a nuclear stalemate or superiority that they will be free to pursue their national goals without fear of U.S. power.

Secretary McNamara says we can gain nothing by deploying our own missile defenses, since the Soviets would simply put in more ICBM's and overcome our defenses.

Our Joint Chiefs disagree. They think it is far from guaranteed that the Soviets would or could offset our *defensive missiles*. For one thing, it would cost the Russians a very great deal of money, and they would have to divert efforts from such other priority projects as their Space program. Their economy may *not* permit them to do that.

Our Joint Chiefs believe deterrence is what keeps the peace between the Soviet Union and the United States. And, they believe deterrence is both military forces in being and a *state of mind*.

For instance, should the Soviets come to believe that their missile defense, coupled with a surprise nuclear attack on the U.S., would limit damage to the Soviet Union to an acceptable level, then our forces would no longer deter.

The Joint Chiefs also point out that if we have no missile defense while the Russians do, a third power might touch off a major nuclear war by firing a missile at us on purpose or by accident.

Our top military men believe an American anti-missile system will limit in a meaningful way damage to the U.S. from a nuclear strike. They believe Nike-X could save up to *50 million lives*—a number that would make it far more likely our nation could survive nuclear war.

Let me summarize:

The Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Armed Services Committee believe a deployed Nike-X defense would do these things:

One. Limit damage to the U.S.

Two. Prevent an under-estimation of U.S. strength by the Reds.

Three. Maintain the world nuclear balance and thus maintain deterrence.

Four. Show the world we are interested in defense and not just in offensive missiles.

Five. Deny to the Soviets a capability to exploit their strength in such situations as Cuba and Hungary.

There are the reasons we need the Nike-X.

A decision on Nike-X deployment is crucial now because in *October* the Army will present to Mr. McNamara a detailed series of recommended *deployment levels* for U.S. missile defenses. Immediately after that Mr. McNamara and the President will have to decide *whether or not* to include deployment in the their defense budget for next year.

Thus, if we are *not* to lose another year to the Russians, the time for decision is only a month away.

In preparation for this decision crisis, the Administration has made an effort to get the Russians to call the whole thing off. President Johnson asked at the Glassboro summit talks for joint U.S.-Soviet talks on the matter. Premier Kosygin was vastly unenthusiastic. No talks have begun. Soviet construction of missile bases continues.

Unfortunately, unless and until the Administration makes a decision to *deploy* the NIKE-X the opportunity still will be open to the Soviets to make a massive public announcement that it is taking the President up on his invitation. In that event sudden Soviet willingness to talk could be cast as a victory for the McNamara viewpoint.

The prospect is not a happy one.

Talks would go on, and the Soviets would remain busily engaged in building an anti-

missile system to protect their nation and reverse the international balance of power to their favor. It would be hardly surprising that they were willing to talk, and to talk for a long time.

I find little comforting in the Defense Secretary's apparent hope that he can talk the Russians out of doing something they already are doing by promising that the U.S. will continue to do nothing.

In fact, if we really want the Soviets to pay attention to what we are saying, we should start work immediately on deployment of a U.S. anti-missile system. Only when such work is underway will the Soviets think seriously about any advantages to them of deployment limitations.

Defense experts more attuned to advancing technology than the Defense Secretary are aware of a key point which he seems to miss—a new era is opening in which the U.S. and USSR are going to be increasingly equal in military technology. And the environment of near parity promises to be extremely unpredictable, marked by much apprehension, accommodating of much less flexibility, and subject to miscalculations of tremendous significance.

Our 1950's advantage in defense technology is steadily being narrowed. It is being narrowed because the Soviet Union has been running harder than we have. We have deliberately limited our efforts. We have been telling the Russians that we won't do it if they won't. The McNamara theory of a plateau of technology has been preached. A stalemate psychology has spread. A test-ban treaty disadvantageous to the United States has been accepted by the Soviets. Reductions have been made in the size of U.S. aircraft and missile forces. U.S. research and development efforts have been stabilized.

We have lost the initiative to the Soviets. We have stood still. They have pressed ahead with renewed vigor.

We know that the Soviets today are engaged in a massive program of defense research and development. It is a program of great scope, and the possibility of technological surprises or dramatic breakthroughs cannot be overlooked, particularly when such surprises could erase the margin of U.S. strategic superiority.

In short, the Soviet Union has maintained a dynamic view of military capability and strategy in contrast to an essentially static U.S. position. All close observers of Soviet affairs know that the strategic deterrence between our nations depends not only on existing forces, but also on the adversary's state of mind. This very rationality of Soviet thought, which the U.S. relies upon to restrain Red attack, could find in an advancing Soviet technology the incentive to gamble on a first strike against America.

The intentions of secretive Soviet leaders always will be uncertain. But it is certain that they are methodically altering the existing balance of strategic forces that now favors us, and they are doing it at a rate that startles American planners.

From an annual rate of about 80 in 1962, Soviet production of ICBM's has spurred ahead to an annual rate of some 120. Within a year they could match our 1,000 Minuteman missiles, and there is no reason to think they will stop there—even though we have already stopped there.

This rapid growth in numbers is not, however, nearly so important as the Soviet jump in quality. They have placed in service two new missiles, the SS-9 and the SS-11.

The SS-9 is about the size of our Titan II, but it carries a warhead twice as heavy at about 20 megatons. The SS-11 is smaller and carries a Minuteman-like, one-megaton warhead. These missiles, equipped with advanced guidance systems, will soon become a real threat to our own supposedly-hardened Minuteman force. Up until now we have felt that the Soviets could not knock out any significant number of our missiles on

the ground. But, they soon may be able to do so, making much simpler any subsequent interception task for their missile defense system.

In addition, we are now entering the period of the multiple-warhead missile. We can do it. We have no reason to think the Soviets cannot. But, if our smaller missiles can boast multiple warheads, then the Soviets larger missiles can lift even more warheads. Once again, their ability to attack our deterrent force increases.

The Soviet SS-9 could be fitted, at least in theory, with more than 10 individual warheads which could be accurately guided to different targets hundreds of miles apart.

Here's what that change could mean.

For years, the Soviets have deterred us by aiming a few unstoppable missiles with huge warheads at our population centers. They have abdicated the ability to strike first, because they have not been able to eliminate our own missile force. But, by suddenly adding masses of additional warheads they can approach a point at which they might wipe out our land based missiles with a first strike. Then, having deployed anti-missile defenses, they might be able to ward off what seaborne missiles we have left.

Thus, they might be able to win on a first strike and might be tempted to try it.

That's why their anti-missile defenses are so important. And that's why we must have a missile defense of our own if we are to maintain the balance of deterrence.

There is little question that an area-defense, anti-missile system now defends Moscow. It has an underground command center with radar scanners and computers. We have seen one large phased-array radar northwest of Moscow and smaller tracking radars at other points.

In addition, a similar system has appeared in an arc extending along the northwestern border of the Soviet Union. It is known to us as the "Tallin line," after the Estonian city where one of its sites has been detected. The Joint Chiefs are convinced this Tallin line is an anti-missile deployment, and they note that it sits athwart the principle "threat corridor" of land-based U.S. missiles aimed toward Russia.

A great deal of similar activity is reported elsewhere in the Soviet Union. Some of it is in the South and appears oriented against the attack corridors of Polaris missiles from Mediterranean based U.S. nuclear submarines. Some of it is along the Ural Mountains facing Red China.

The missile we see connected with such systems is comparable to the Spartan missile we would use, if ever we got a Nike-X system in operation. We do not know for sure how good a missile it is, but then, we do not know a lot of things the Soviets do know about how good such a missile needs to be.

We simply have not explored or experimented as much as they have in the near-space environment where such anti-missiles are called upon to do their work.

The Russians, during their massive 1961-62 test series exploded numerous nuclear weapons in this space environment. Among their 71 tests were proof tests, weapons-system tests, effects tests and radar tests. On two occasions during the tests the Soviets launched an ICBM, intercepted it with a nuclear blast, and then fired a second missile to determine how its guidance and warhead were affected by the effects of the first explosion. They also studied the blackout effects of the blasts on their ground radar and electronic communications.

We have done no such testing of such magnitude. There had been a de-facto test-moratorium on when the Red tests broke it in 1961. We then carried out a politically-limited test series, but we started behind and stayed behind. Then came the test-ban treaty and we have been able to add only bits and pieces to our knowledge by underground testing.

What we are afraid we know the least about is the so-called "shield" effect caused by near-space, nuclear explosions. This is the tremendous surge of "hot X-rays."

The Armed Services Committee has been told about the phenomena. In lay-terms it works something like this. Nuclear explosives have a very small surface area. When they release their energy they get very, very hot and radiate energy away at temperatures in the X-ray region. This radiation flashes unhindered across space. Within the kill-radius of anti-missile weapons these thermal X-rays deposit their immense energy inside any unshielded object, such as a missile warhead, causing its components to explode internally.

Thus, it is likely that an anti-missile defense using the X-ray effect can provide what defense planners call an "area" defense covering many square miles with relatively few nuclear blasts.

In addition, such X-rays cause problems for the guidance systems of incoming missiles. If a guidance radar beam passes through the X-ray ionized region, it is deflected or totally reflected or echoed back in unintelligible bits and pieces.

We know something about these electromagnetic pulse effects of nuclear space explosions. We know enough to be sure that a Nike-X system could stop enemy missiles and save American lives—some 30 to 50 million American lives.

Up to now, the U.S. strategic nuclear deterrent has inhibited the Soviets. They backtracked in Cuba because we held the strategic upper hand. If we allow them parity with us or superiority over us because they can defend their population and we can't, then we must expect them to utilize their deterrence to inhibit our actions, to prevent us from helping our friends, and perhaps to prevent us from defending ourselves.

Already, we must admit that our strategy is affected by the still-limited Soviet defensive missile capability. We are having to spend vastly increased amounts on our offensive missiles right now in order to retain our penetration capability and strategic flexibility.

It is obvious that an anti-missile defense lends itself superbly to bluff and blackmail. It is easy to imagine a suddenly belligerent Soviet attitude toward Western Europe in which an undefended U.S. might not act. It is not beyond reason to imagine a threat aimed at the U.S., perhaps destruction of a single U.S. city, and a U.S. President deprived of options because his other cities lay undefended while Soviet cities were well guarded.

We seem to have reached one of those points in military history in which a deployed defense can hold an upper hand over the current offensive capability.

For all these reasons, I think the case is compelling for a prompt commitment to limited Nike-X deployment. Even though Secretary McNamara has said such a defense could not reduce American casualties—and I quote him—"in any meaningful sense," it seems to me 50 million American lives is a meaningful figure.

And, let me make one important additional point—even if there were no Soviet anti-missile system, it still would make good sense and be meaningful to erect at least a limited U.S. missile defense system to save American lives. Even should later and more complete intelligence convince us that all the Russians have built is a further anti-aircraft missile system, it still would make sense to defend Americans from both aircraft and missile attack in the very best way we know now.

There is a time problem. If we start now it will take five to seven years to get a limited Nike-X system in place. Quite aside from Russia, an unpredictable Red China may not give us that long.

As always there is a cost problem. But the

matter is at least as important as Vietnam, and if we can spend \$25 billion a year there we can find \$4 billion for a light Nike-X defense that could be beefed up later on as necessary.

Such a defense would serve several purposes which I hope you will remember and consider.

It will redress the strategic balance.

It will point out to the Soviets that we are not totally committed to offensive strategy.

It will counter the Red Chinese threat.

It will counter the threat of accidental missile launchings.

It will firm up our friends around the world.

It could provide a defense for NATO that would revitalize that vital Atlantic alliance.

And, most important, it would put the Soviets on notice that the U.S. has not after all *misunderstood* the dynamic force of continuing technology. The world will be on notice that our *will to lead* the technological race remains vibrant and that we intend to remain strong and to use our strength for world *peace and stability*.

"Speak softly and carry a big stick" is still good advice in the face of potential attackers. I am not interested in seeing the U.S. and the Soviets armed with *equal-sized sticks* and *only the Reds* carrying a shield. If there is no U.S. big stick, then we will only be able to say and do *what the Communists* want us to.

I suggest that your generation of Americans hang onto *strategic superiority* and remain *masters of your own destiny*.

SENATOR PROXMIER AND THE HUMAN RIGHTS CONVENTIONS

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, for over 6 months my respected colleague, the senior Senator from Wisconsin, WILLIAM PROXMIER, has spoken daily before the Senate to ask for action which would ratify the Human Rights Conventions.

I have read many of his speeches in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. They now number considerably more than 100. I admire his great tenacity and, I, too, ask why the Senate has not acted on the Human Rights Conventions on Forced Labor, Genocide, Political Rights of Women, and Slavery?

After World War II, our Nation undertook the leadership in establishing the principles embodied in these conventions. It seems to me that the U.S. Senate should debate these issues so that all opinions can be expressed—either for or against the conventions.

I have just received a letter calling attention to the fact that 1968 is the International Year for Human Rights.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement by the International Union of Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

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

INTERNATIONAL UNION OF ELECTRICAL, RADIO, AND MACHINE WORKERS,
Washington, D.C., September 1, 1967.

Senator GAYLORD NELSON,
U.S. Senate,
Old Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: As you know, the United Nations has designated 1968 as the International Year for Human Rights.

This provides the nations of the world who subscribe to democracy and human rights as their cardinal principles to stand

sharply in contrast to those countries where these rights have been abolished or have never had an opportunity to grow.

Certainly, the United States, as one of the oldest democracies of the world and a nation which is the world leader in its espousal of human rights, should be the prime example to the world.

However, unfortunately, our standing before the world in this matter is clouded by the fact that we have failed to ratify United Nations Conventions on human rights, some of them having been before the Senate for nearly ten years.

This includes:

1. Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide.

2. Convention concerning Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organize.

3. Supplementary Convention of the Abolition of Slavery, the Slave Trade, and Institutions and Practices Similar to Slavery.

4. Convention on the Political Rights of Women.

5. Convention concerning the Abolition of Forced Labor.

6. Convention concerning Discrimination in respect of Employment and Occupation.

7. Convention concerning Equal Remuneration for Men and Women Workers for Work of Equal Value.

8. Convention against Discrimination in Education.

9. International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination.

In contrast to our record of having ratified none of them, the following nations have ratified at least seven of the nine.

Argentina	Norway
China	Pakistan
Costa Rica	Philippines
Denmark	Sweden
Ecuador	Tunisia
Ghana	United Arab Rep.
Israel	Yugoslavia
Niger	

Even some of the countries in the Communist bloc have endorsed a number of them.

As the representatives of 350,000 workers in the Electrical, Radio, and Machine Industry, who are proud of our nation and its record, we respectfully request that the ratification of these Conventions be an immediate item of business before the Senate. We hope that we can enter 1968 having demonstrated to the world that we have subscribed to all of these measures that are so vital to the preservation of human rights.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL JENNINGS,
President.

SHARING THE BURDEN IN VIETNAM

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I am extremely disappointed by yesterday's television statements of the new South Vietnamese president about the conduct of the war in Vietnam. I do not believe he understands the concern many of us have about the new government and the war effort in that country.

General Thieu said yesterday that he thought a proper division of the missions of the effort in Vietnam would be for the United States to bear the brunt of the heavy fighting and for the South Vietnamese to carry on the pacification effort.

My own view is that it should be the other way around—and the sooner the better. It is time for the South Vietnamese to begin showing us that they are interested in becoming an independent

nation. Unless they will fight hard, there is little we can do to help the new government to develop.

The fact is that the United States is now fighting most of the war in Vietnam. American troops bear the brunt of the fighting and the casualties, as the weekly listings show so graphically. American planes carry the entire load of attack on supply routes and industrial centers in North Vietnam.

Many Americans have severe doubts about our involvement in Vietnam. Many of the doubts have stemmed in part, I believe, from the minor role of South Vietnamese forces in this major military effort. Many of the questions that have been raised focus on a single concern. How can a South Vietnamese Government mean anything if the South Vietnamese cannot be persuaded to carry on the aggressive military action which their preservation requires?

Mr. President, South Vietnam has just had elections, and more are scheduled. I have looked forward to these elections and the development of a workable South Vietnamese Government.

I believe it is time now to test whether the South Vietnamese commitment is as sincere as the American commitment, which speaks for itself in the dedication of lives, material, and money.

The best interests of both nations require that the South Vietnamese take over more of the military and political initiative of the war. General Thieu should be as much interested in this as any of us.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there is no further morning business, I ask that morning business be closed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

ELECTION REFORM ACT OF 1967

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 500, S. 1880. I do this so that it will become the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1880) to revise the Federal election laws, 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 Rules and Administration, with amendments, on page 2, line 24, after the word "organization" to strike out "which supports a candidate and"; on page 4, line 17, after the word "party" to strike out "in any election" and insert "in connection with any general or special election to any political office, or in connection with any primary election or political convention or caucus held to select candidates for any political

office"; on page 5, line 14, after the word "political" to strike out "committee the sole substantial purpose of which is to support a candidate or candidates." and insert "committee."; on page 9, line 12, after the word "organization" to strike out "which supports a candidate and"; and on page 18, after line 11, to strike out:

The Secretary or Clerk, as the case may be, shall have authority to modify, suspend, or waive by published regulation of general applicability such of the requirements of sections 203, 204, and 205 as he finds to be unnecessarily burdensome to the persons required to report thereunder or not to be necessary to effectuate the purpose of this title.

So as to make the bill read:

S. 1880

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 "Election Reform Act of 1967".

TITLE I

AMENDMENTS TO CRIMINAL CODE

SEC. 101. Section 591 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"§ 591. Definitions

"When used in sections 597, 599, 602, 608, and 610 of this title—

"(a) The term 'election' means (1) a general, special, or primary election, (2) a convention or caucus of a political party held to nominate a candidate, (3) a primary election held for the selection of delegates to a national nominating convention of a political party, or (4) a primary election held for the expression of a preference for the nomination of persons for election to the office of President;

"(b) The term 'candidate' means an individual who seeks nomination for election, or election, to Federal office, whether or not such individual is elected. For purposes of this paragraph, an individual shall be deemed to seek nomination for election, or election, if he (1) has taken the action necessary under the law of a State to qualify himself for nomination for election, or election, to Federal office, or (2) has received contributions or made expenditures, or has given his consent for any other person to receive contributions or make expenditures, with a view to bringing about his nomination for election, or election, to such office;

"(c) The term 'Federal office' means the office of President or Vice President of the United States, or of Senator or Representative in, or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress of the United States;

"(d) The term 'political committee' means any individual, committee, association, or organization which accepts contributions or makes expenditures during a calendar year in an aggregate amount exceeding \$1,000;

"(e) The term 'contribution' means a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money or any thing of value, made for the purpose of influencing the nomination for election, or election, of any person to Federal Office, or for the purpose of influencing the result of a primary held for the selection of delegates to a national nominating convention of a political party or for the expression of a preference for the nomination of persons for election to the office of President, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, express or implied, whether or not legally enforceable, to make a contribution, and also includes a transfer of funds between political committees;

"(f) the term 'expenditure' includes a purchase, payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift of money or any thing of value, made for the purpose of influencing the nomination for election, or election, of

any person to Federal office, or for the purpose of influencing the result of a primary held for the selection of delegates to a national nominating convention of a political party or for the expression of a preference for the nomination of persons for election to the office of President, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, express or implied, whether or not legally enforceable, to make an expenditure, and also includes a transfer of funds between political committees;

"(g) The term 'person' or the term 'whoever' means an individual, partnership, committee, association, corporation, or any other organization or group of persons."

SEC. 102. Section 600 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"§ 600. Promise of employment or other benefit for political activity

"Whoever, directly or indirectly, promises any employment, position, compensation, contract, appointment, or other benefit, provided for or made possible in whole or in part by any Act of Congress, or any special consideration in obtaining any such benefit, to any person as consideration, favor, or reward for any political activity or for the support of or opposition to any candidate or any political party in connection with any general or special election to any political office, or in connection with any primary election or political convention or caucus held to select candidates for any political office, shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both."

SEC. 103. Section 608 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"§ 608. Limitations on political contributions and purchases

"(a) It shall be unlawful for any person, directly or indirectly, to make a contribution or contributions in an aggregate amount in excess of \$5,000

"(1) during any calendar year, or

"(2) in connection with any campaign for nomination for election, or election, to any political committee or candidate, to two or more political committees substantially supporting the same candidate, or to a candidate and one or more political committees substantially supporting the candidate: *Provided, however,* That the term 'person' as used in this subsection shall not include a political committee.

"(b) (1) It shall be unlawful for any political committee or candidate to sell goods, commodities, advertising, or other articles, or any services to anyone other than a political committee or candidate.

"(2) It shall be unlawful for any person, other than a political committee or candidate, to purchase goods, commodities, advertising, or other articles, or any services from a political committee or candidate.

"(c) Whoever violates subsection (a) or (b) of this section shall be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

"(d) Subsection (b) of this section shall not apply to a sale or purchase (1) of any political campaign pin, button, badge, flag, emblem, hat, banner, or similar campaign souvenir or any political campaign literature or publications (but shall apply to sales of advertising including the sale of space in any publication), for prices not exceeding \$25 each, (2) of tickets to political events or gatherings, (3) of food or drink for a charge not substantially in excess of the normal charge therefor, or (4) made in the course of the usual and known business, trade, or profession of any person or in a normal arm's-length transaction: *Provided, however,* That a sale or purchase described in paragraph (1), (2), or (3) shall be deemed a contribution under subsection (a) of this section.

"(e) For the purposes of this section, a contribution made by the spouse or a minor

child of a person shall be deemed a contribution made by such person.

"(f) Nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to prohibit any contribution to a candidate by the spouse or a child, grandchild, parent, grandparent, brother, or sister of the candidate.

"(g) In all cases of violations of this section by a partnership, committee, association, corporation, or other organization or group of persons, the officers, directors, or managing heads thereof who knowingly and willfully participate in such violation shall be punished as herein provided."

SEC. 104. Section 609 of title 18 of the United States Code is repealed.

SEC. 105. Section 611 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"§ 611. Contributions by Government contractors

"Whoever, including a corporation, entering into any contract with the United States or any department or agency thereof, either for the rendition of personal services or furnishing any material, supplies, or equipment to the United States or any department or agency thereof, or selling any land or building to the United States or any department or agency thereof, if payment for the performance of such contract or payment for such material, supplies, equipment, land, or building is to be made in whole or in part from funds appropriated by the Congress, during the period of negotiation for, or performance under, such contract or furnishing of material, supplies, equipment, land, or buildings, directly or indirectly makes any contribution to any person, association, or organization for the purpose of influencing the nomination for election, or election, of any person to any public office, or to any political party, committee, or candidate for any public office for any political purpose whatever; or

"Whoever knowingly solicits any such contribution from any such person during any such period—

"Shall be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both."

SEC. 106. So much of the sectional analysis at the beginning of chapter 29 of title 18 of the United States Code as relates to sections 609 and 611 is amended to read:

"609. Repealed.

"611. Contributions by Government contractors."

TITLE II—DISCLOSURE OF FEDERAL CAMPAIGN FUNDS

SEC. 201. DEFINITIONS.—

When used in this title—

(a) The term "election" means (1) a general, special, or primary election, (2) a convention or caucus of a political party held to nominate a candidate, (3) a primary election held for the selection of delegates to a national nominating convention of a political party, or (4) a primary election held for the expression of a preference for the nomination of persons for election to the office of President;

(b) The term "candidate" means an individual who seeks nomination for election, or election, to Federal office, whether or not such individual is elected. For purposes of this paragraph, an individual shall be deemed to seek nomination for election, or election, if he (1) has taken the action necessary under the law of a State to qualify himself for nomination for election, or election, to Federal office, or (2) has received contributions or made expenditures, or has given his consent for any other person to receive contributions or make expenditures, with a view to bringing about his nomination for election, or election, to such office;

(c) The term "Federal office" means the office of President or Vice President of the United States; or of Senator or Representa-

tive in, or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress of the United States;

(d) The term "political committee" means any committee, association, or organization which accepts contributions or makes expenditures during a calendar year in an aggregate amount exceeding \$1,000;

(e) The term "contribution" means a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money or any thing of value, made for the purpose of influencing the nomination for election, or election, of any person to Federal office or as presidential and vice-presidential electors, or for the purpose of influencing the result of a primary held for the selection of delegates to a national nominating convention of a political party, or for the expression of a preference for the nomination of persons for election to the office of President, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make a contribution, and also includes a transfer of funds between political committees;

(f) The term "expenditure" includes a purchase, payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift of money or any thing of value, made for the purpose of influencing the nomination for election, or election, of any person to Federal office, or as presidential and vice-presidential electors, or for the purpose of influencing the result of a primary held for the selection of delegates to a national nominating convention of a political party, or for the expression of a preference for the nomination of persons for election to the office of President, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make an expenditure, and also includes a transfer of funds between political committees;

(g) The term "clerk" means the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States;

(h) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Senate of the United States;

(i) The term "person" includes an individual, partnership, committee, association, corporation, labor organization, and any other organization or group of persons;

(j) The term "State" includes the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and any territory or possession of the United States.

ORGANIZATION OF POLITICAL COMMITTEES

Sec. 202. (a) Every political committee shall have a chairman and a treasurer. No contribution and no expenditure shall be accepted or made by or on behalf of a political committee at a time when there is a vacancy in the office of chairman or treasurer thereof. No expenditure shall be made for or on behalf of a political committee without the authorization of its chairman or treasurer, or their designated agents.

(b) Every person who receives a contribution for a political committee shall, on demand of the treasurer, and in any event within five days after the receipt of such contribution, render to the treasurer a detailed account thereof, including the amount, the name and address of the person making such contribution, and the date on which received. All funds of a political committee shall be kept separate from other funds.

(c) It shall be the duty of the treasurer of a political committee to keep a detailed and exact account of—

(1) all contributions made to or for such committee;

(2) the full name and mailing address of every person making any contribution, and the date and amount thereof;

(3) all expenditures made by or on behalf of such committee; and

(4) the full name and mailing address of every person to whom any expenditure is made, and the date and amount thereof.

(d) It shall be the duty of the treasurer to obtain and keep a receipted bill, stating the particulars, for every expenditure made

by or on behalf of a political committee of \$100 or more in amount, and for any such expenditure in a lesser amount, if the aggregate amount of such expenditures to the same person during a calendar year exceeds \$100. The treasurer shall preserve all receipted bills and accounts required to be kept by this section for periods of time to be determined by the Secretary or Clerk, as the case may be.

REGISTRATION OF POLITICAL COMMITTEES; STATEMENTS

Sec. 203. (a) Each political committee which anticipates receiving contributions or making expenditures during the calendar year in an aggregate amount exceeding \$1,000 shall, within ten days after its organization or, if later, ten days after the date on which it has information which causes it to anticipate it will receive contributions or make expenditures in excess of \$1,000, file with the Secretary or Clerk, as the case may be, a statement of organization. Each such committee in existence at the date of enactment of this Act shall file a statement of organization with the Secretary or Clerk, as the case may be, at such times as he prescribes.

(b) The statement of organization shall include—

(1) the name and address of the committee;

(2) the names, addresses, and relationships of affiliated or connected organizations;

(3) the area, scope, or jurisdiction of the committee;

(4) the name, address, and position of the custodian of books and accounts;

(5) the name, address, and position of other principal officers, including officers and members of the finance committee, if any;

(6) the name, address, office sought, and party affiliation of (A) each candidate whom the committee is supporting and (B) any other individual, if any, whom the committee is supporting for nomination for election, or election, to any public office whatever; or, if the committee is supporting the entire ticket of any party, the name of the party;

(7) a statement whether the committee is a continuing one;

(8) the disposition of residual funds which will be made in the event of dissolution;

(9) a listing of all banks, safety deposit boxes, or other repositories used;

(10) a statement of the reports required to be filed by the committee with State or local officers, and, if so, the names, addresses, and positions of such persons; and

(11) such other information as shall be required by the Secretary or Clerk.

(c) Any change in information previously submitted in a statement of organization shall be reported to the Secretary or Clerk, as the case may be, within a ten-day period following the change.

(d) Any committee which, after having filed one or more statements of organization, disbands or determines it will no longer receive contributions or make expenditures during the calendar year in an aggregate amount exceeding \$1,000 shall so notify the Secretary or Clerk, as the case may be.

REPORTS BY POLITICAL COMMITTEES AND CANDIDATES

Sec. 204. (a) Each treasurer of a political committee supporting a candidate or candidates for election to the office of President or Vice President of the United States or Senator, and each candidate for election to such office, shall file with the Secretary, and each treasurer of a political committee supporting a candidate or candidates for election to the office of Representative in, or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress of the United States, and each candidate for election to such office, shall file with the Clerk, reports of receipts and expenditures on forms to be prescribed or approved by him. Such reports shall be filed on the 10th day

of March, June, and September, in each year, and on the fifteenth and fifth days next preceding the date on which an election is held, and also by the 31st day of January. Such reports shall be complete as of such date as the Secretary may prescribe, which shall not be less than five days before the date of filing.

(b) Each report under this section shall disclose—

(1) the amount of cash on hand at the beginning of the reporting period;

(2) the full name and mailing address of each person who has made one or more contributions to or for such committee or candidate (including the purchase of tickets for events such as dinners, luncheons, rallies, and similar fundraising events) within the calendar year in the aggregate amount or value of \$100 or more, together with the amount and date of such contributions;

(3) the total sum of individual contributions made to or for such committee or candidate during the reporting period and not reported under paragraph (2);

(4) the name and address of each political committee or candidate from which the reporting committee or the candidate received, or to which that committee or candidate made, any transfer of funds, together with the amounts and dates of all such transfers;

(5) each loan to or from any person within the calendar year in the aggregate amount or value of \$100 or more, together with the full names and mailing addresses of the lender and endorsers, if any, and the date and amount of such loan;

(6) the total amount of proceeds from (A) the sale of tickets to each dinner, luncheon, rally, and other fundraising event; (B) mass collections made at such events; and (C) sales of items such as political campaign pins, buttons, badges, flags, emblems, hats, banners, literature, and similar materials;

(7) each contribution, rebate, refund, or other receipt of \$100 or more not otherwise listed under paragraphs (2) through (6);

(8) the total sum of all receipts by or for such committee or candidate during the reporting period;

(9) the full name and mailing address of each person to whom an expenditure or expenditures have been made by such committee or candidate within the calendar year in the aggregate amount or value of \$100 or more, and the amount, date, and purpose of each such expenditure;

(10) the full name and mailing address of each person to whom an expenditure for personal services, salaries, and reimbursed expenses of \$100 or more has been made, and which is not otherwise reported, including the amount, date, and purpose of such expenditure;

(11) the total sum of expenditures made by such committee or candidate during the calendar year;

(12) the amount and nature of debts and obligations owed by or to the committee, in such form as the Secretary or Clerk may prescribe;

(13) such other information as shall be required by the Secretary or Clerk.

(c) The reports required to be filed by subsection (a) shall be cumulative during the calendar year to which they relate, but where there has been no change in an item reported in a previous report during such year, only the amount need be carried forward. If no contributions or expenditures have been accepted or expended during a calendar year, the treasurer of the political committee or candidate shall file a statement to that effect.

REPORTS BY OTHERS THAN POLITICAL COMMITTEES

Sec. 205. Every person (other than a political committee or candidate) who makes contributions or expenditures, other than by contribution to a political committee or candidate, aggregating \$100 or more within

a calendar year shall file with the Secretary or Clerk, as the case may be, a statement containing the information required by section 204. Statements required by this section shall be filed on the dates on which reports by political committees are filed, but need not be cumulative.

FORMAL REQUIREMENTS RESPECTING REPORTS AND STATEMENTS

SEC. 206. (a) A report or statement required by this title to be filed by a treasurer of a political committee, a candidate, or by any other person, shall be certified by the oath or affirmation of the person filing such report or statement, taken before any officer authorized to administer oaths.

(b) A copy of a report or statement shall be preserved by the person filing it for a period of time to be designated by the Secretary or Clerk, as the case may be, in a published regulation.

(c) The Secretary or Clerk may, by published regulation of general applicability, relieve any category of political committees of the obligation to comply with section 204 if such committee (1) primarily supports persons seeking State or local office, and does not substantially support candidates, and (2) does not operate in more than one State or on a statewide basis.

(d) The Secretary or Clerk, as the case may be, shall, by published regulations of general applicability, prescribe the manner in which contributions and expenditures in the nature of debts and other contracts, agreements, and promises to make contributions or expenditures shall be reported. Such regulations shall provide that they be reported in separate schedules. In determining aggregate amounts of contributions and expenditures, amounts reported as provided in such regulations shall not be considered until actual payment is made.

REPORTS ON CONVENTION FINANCING

SEC. 207. Each committee or other organization which—

(1) represents a State, or a political subdivision thereof, or any group of persons, in dealing with officials of a national political party with respect to matters involving a convention held in such State or political subdivision to nominate a candidate for the office of President or Vice President, or

(2) represents a national political party in making arrangements for the convention of such party held to nominate a candidate for the office of President or Vice President, shall, within sixty days following the end of the convention (but not later than twenty days prior to the date on which presidential and vice-presidential electors are chosen), file with the Secretary a full and complete financial statement, in such form and detail as he may prescribe, the sources from which it derives its funds, and the purposes for which such funds were expended.

DUTIES OF THE SECRETARY AND CLERK

SEC. 208. (a) It shall be the duty of the Secretary and Clerk, respectively

(1) to develop prescribed forms for the making of the reports and statements required to be filed with him under this title;

(2) to prepare and publish a manual setting forth recommended uniform methods of bookkeeping and reporting for use by persons required to make such reports and statements;

(3) to develop a filing, coding, and cross-indexing system consonant with the purposes of this Act;

(4) to make the reports and statements filed with him available for public inspection and copying during regular office hours, commencing as soon as practicable but not later than the end of the second day following the day during which it was received, and to permit copying of any such report

or statement by hand or by duplicating machine, as requested by any person, at the expense of such person;

(5) to preserve such reports and statements for a period of ten years from date of receipt, except that reports and statements relating solely to candidates for the House of Representatives shall be preserved for only five years from the date of receipt;

(6) to compile and maintain a current list of all statements or parts of statements pertaining to each candidate;

(7) to prepare and publish an annual report including compilations of (A) total reported contributions and expenditures for all candidates, political committees, and other persons during the year; (B) total amounts expended according to such categories as he shall determine and broken down into candidate, party, and nonparty expenditures on the National, State, and local levels; (C) total amounts expended for influencing nominations and elections stated separately; (D) total amounts contributed according to such categories of amounts as he shall determine and broken down into contributions on the National, State, and local levels for candidates and political committees; and (E) aggregate amounts contributed by any contributor shown to have contributed the sum of \$100 or more;

(8) to prepare and publish from time to time special reports comparing the various totals and categories of contributions and expenditure made with respect to preceding elections;

(9) to prepare and publish such other reports as he may deem appropriate;

(10) to assure wide dissemination of statistics, summaries, and reports prepared under this Act;

(11) to make from time to time audits and field investigations with respect to reports and statements filed under the provisions of this title, and with respect to alleged failures to file any report or statement required under the provisions of this title;

(12) to report apparent violations of law to the appropriate law enforcement authorities; and

(13) to prescribe suitable rules and regulations to carry out the provisions of this title.

(b) In the performance of their duties under this Act, the Secretary and Clerk shall coordinate their activities with the activities of the Comptroller General under the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act of 1966.

STATEMENTS FILED WITH CLERK OF UNITED STATES COURT

SEC. 209. (a) A copy of each statement required to be filed with the Secretary or Clerk by this title shall be filed with the clerk of the United States district court for the judicial district in which is located the principal office of the political committee or, in the case of a statement filed by a candidate or other person, in which is located such person's residence. The Secretary or Clerk may require the filing of reports and statements required by this Act with the clerks of other United States district courts where he determines the public interest will be served thereby.

(b) It shall be the duty of the clerk of a United States district court under subsection (a)—

(1) to receive and maintain in an orderly manner all reports and statements required by this title to be filed with such clerks;

(2) to preserve such reports and statements for a period of ten years from date of receipt, except that reports and statements relating solely to candidates for the House of Representatives shall be preserved for only five years from the date of receipt;

(3) to make the reports and statements filed with him available for public inspection

and copying during regular office hours, commencing as soon as practicable but not later than the end of the second day following the day during which it was received, and to permit copying of any such report or statement by hand or by duplicating machine, as requested by any person, at the expense of such person; and

(4) to compile and maintain a current list of all statements or parts of statements pertaining to each candidate.

PROHIBITION ON CONTRIBUTIONS IN NAME OF ANOTHER

SEC. 210. No person shall make a contribution in the name of another person, and no person shall knowingly accept a contribution made by one person in the name of another person.

PENALTY FOR VIOLATIONS

SEC. 211. Any person who violates any of the provisions of this title shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

STATE LAWS NOT AFFECTED

SEC. 212. (a) Nothing in this title shall be deemed to invalidate or make inapplicable any provision of any State law, except where compliance with such provision of law would result in a violation of a provision of this title.

(b) The Secretary and Clerk shall encourage, and cooperate with, the election officials in the several States to develop procedures which will eliminate the necessity of multiple filings by permitting the filing of copies of Federal reports to satisfy the State requirements.

PARTIAL INVALIDITY

SEC. 213. If any provision of this title, or the application thereof, to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the title and the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

REPEALING CLAUSE

SEC. 214. The Federal Corrupt Practices Act and all other Acts or parts of Acts inconsistent herewith are repealed.

CITATION

SEC. 215. This title may be cited as the "Campaign Funds Disclosure Act of 1967."

TITLE III

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS AND EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 301. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 302. This Act shall take effect January 1, 1968.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the previous order with respect to the recognition of the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] be modified to permit the Senator from Oregon to proceed, at any time when ready, for a period not to exceed 1 hour.

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

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. 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.

SUBMISSION OF THE VIETNAM ISSUE TO THE UNITED NATIONS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, as modified, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, as I have informed my friend the distinguished Senator from Oregon, I shall not be able to hear his speech, but I have read the resolution which I understand he will offer, and I believe that he is presenting a very important matter to the Senate.

The proposal of the distinguished majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD] to submit the issue of Vietnam to the United Nations has received wide support in the Senate, and indeed throughout the country, and all of us have been heartened by the reported decision of the President of the United States to support, as he did in 1966, the submission of the issue of Vietnam to the Security Council of the United Nations.

I believe that, implicit in the submission of this issue to the United Nations, is an undertaking of the United States that it will work for the development of procedures in the Security Council to bring about a cease-fire and negotiations and will also be willing to accept a fair settlement of the issue.

It is in this context that I must say I was quite disappointed by the statements made by the Secretary of State during his press conference last Friday.

I think it is quite evident that it is unlikely that the Security Council will accept jurisdiction of this issue or that it will reach any meaningful recommendations for the settlement of the war in Vietnam if all belligerent parties adhere to inflexible and fixed positions.

It seems to me that the Secretary of State emphasized adherence to fixed and inflexible positions which seem to represent the policy of our country.

I have several times raised the question of the cessation of bombing as a test of the possibility of negotiations. I think it very possible, if the Security Council accepts jurisdiction of the issue and makes any recommendations which would lead toward a cease-fire, and negotiations, that it will recommend a cessation of bombing. I would much prefer that our country made the decision for a cessation of bombing than to have the decision made by the Security Council or other countries. So, today I want to point out that the resolution of the Senator from Oregon presents to the Senate a vital issue. I hope that the resolution will receive thorough consideration of the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the comments just made. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] has been among a group of us who for a long time past have taken the position that the war in Vietnam should be submitted to the United Nations either by our country or some other country through a resolution that is subject to a veto.

The resolution which the United States has submitted to the United Nations is not a resolution that is subject

to veto. It is simply a resolution in which the United States asks the Security Council to put the problem on the agenda. Some years ago they did this, and that is where it will stay.

One of the points of my argument today is that the United States has not really carried out its obligations under the charter and will not carry out these obligations under the charter until it submits a resolution under the terms of which it pledges to commit itself to abide by the jurisdiction of the United Nations. That is the commitment we made when we signed the charter, and that is the commitment that every other signatory to the charter made.

I think it is time for the United States to fish or cut bait on this issue. It is time for this administration to carry out its obligations. It is time for the United States to send to the United Nations, in view of the fact that every other signatory to the charter has not been carrying out its obligations either, a resolution whereby we pledge that we will cooperate to support the Security Council or, if necessary, the General Assembly in enforcing the peace in Vietnam. That means that we commit ourselves to stopping war and the slaughter of American boys in South Vietnam in support of a shocking dictatorship that we are more responsible for creating in the first place than any other force in the world.

We should commit ourselves to saying to the world that we are now ready to turn the matter of the ending of this war and the enforcing of the peace that is called for over to the United Nations.

I think there is no other way. I think that if we follow the procedure the United States has been following, we will slaughter American boys for the next many years in South Vietnam by the increasing thousands and run the great risk of killing them by the millions if our course of action leads to a third world war, which it very well can do.

That is why I incorporate, by reference, every word I have spoken on this floor for the last 4 years in my unalterable opposition to the U.S. outlawry in South Vietnam. Oh, my critics do not like to hear it, but the fact is that from the very beginning we have been an outlaw nation in Vietnam. We, to all intents and purposes, have torn up the United Nations Charter and, of course, we have treated sections of the Constitution of the United States as but scraps of paper. We have heard the Deputy Secretary of State, the Under Secretary of State, the former Attorney General of the United States tell the American people before the Committee on Foreign Relations that article I, section 8, of the Constitution is outmoded.

Think of it. Did any Member of the U.S. Senate think he would live so long as to hear a Cabinet officer of the United States say that a single word of the Constitution of the United States is outmoded?

That is why I said on the floor of the Senate the other day that I would like to hear my administration tell me what other parts of the Constitution it thinks might be outmoded. This is the talk of men who practice government by man rather than by law. This is the talk of

proponents, not of constitutionalism, but of a government in the United States of executive supremacy, and a government by executive supremacy means government by mere men, with all their human weaknesses, to rule a supposedly free people by the arbitrary, capricious power of a chief executive of the land. Why, we fought that battle centuries ago against a British Crown that sought to impose upon our forefathers the arbitrary, capricious discretion of a king.

I have cited to the Senate time and time again in the last 4 years—and incorporate those remarks by reference in my speech today—the purpose for article I, section 8 that now the Under Secretary of State—I suppose speaking for the President—says is outmoded.

Let them read their Jefferson and their Gouverneur Morris and Hamilton and Madison as to what they said was the purpose of article I, section 8 of the Constitution. It was to save the people of the new Republic from the arbitrary, capricious control of a British monarch for, as they said in those great constitutional debates, that British king sent British subjects out onto the battlefields to be slaughtered in accordance with his decision as to what war was to be fought. They made it perfectly clear in the constitutional debate that that autocratic government by mere man was not to prevail in this Republic.

If I had had the Under Secretary of State, the former Attorney General of the United States, in my constitutional law advanced course, I would have flunked him if he had given me, in a final examination, a statement of such ignorance of American constitutional law as Mr. Katzenbach demonstrated when he testified that article I, section 8 of the Constitution is outmoded. I am glad, at least, that he is not Attorney General.

Mr. President, that is merely a preface to my discussion of the resolution.

I thank the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] for his kind remarks.

Mr. President, today, I am submitting a concurrent resolution calling upon the United States to submit the Vietnam war to the United Nations for settlement. I offer it rather than a resolution seeking to repeal the Tonkin Gulf resolution, because it is evident that something much more than that is needed. It is time for Congress—yes, for the American Government—to embark on a new direction insofar as the course of the Vietnam war is concerned. That new direction is what my resolution seeks to provide.

Few foreign policy statements in the history of the republic have failed more completely in their purpose than the Southeast Asia resolution of 1964, known as the Tonkin Gulf resolution. Its purpose was to demonstrate national unity in face of an exchange of gunfire in the Gulf of Tonkin between American destroyers and North Vietnamese PT boats.

Although the President had full powers as Commander in Chief to respond to any attack upon American property, he sought a statement from Congress endorsing that action. It is my opinion that in a moment of irresponsibility, Congress approved language in it that went far beyond the circumstances of that engage-

ment, language that referred to "preventing aggression," with no definition of where, when, or by whom.

The Tonkin Gulf resolution was touted at the time as one that would notify North Vietnam of our determination to resist their PT boat attack and convince them that all future military operations against American forces, and presumably against South Vietnamese forces, were futile. The resolution was supposed to avoid war through a show of national strength and unity of determination.

It was adopted by an overwhelming vote in Congress. Certainly, it demonstrated all the unity that the administration could ask for it. But I shall always be proud to have my descendants read that I was one of the two Senators who refused to vote for what I have said many times was clearly an unconstitutional resolution, was really a resolution in regard to which Congress did not have the constitutional authority to pass if Congress wanted to stay within the framework of the Constitution itself.

Yet, as a means of avoiding war, that resolution, of course, has itself been a disaster. It has served instead as the platform from which the largest war since World War II has been launched by the United States. Despite the fact that the naval incident of August 1964, is no longer relevant to the situation, the Tonkin Gulf resolution has continued to serve as the foundation for American enlargement of the conflict.

And what an enlarged conflict it has become. We are engaged in the largest air war in all our history. For many, many months—and this is the Department of Defense testifying, may I say, in essence—we have dropped more tons of bombs per week on Vietnam than we dropped in World War II in any week, including both the European and the African campaigns. This fact needs to be pointed out over and over again. The war now has been enlarged in the South to the point where we have over a half million men in the fighting areas. We have lost over 12,000 men in war action. We have more than three times that number seriously wounded. We have total casualties—including killed, seriously wounded, and wounded—approaching 90,000.

This is no brushfire war. This is no border incident. This is war—a major war, with all the horrible and ugly realities of war.

I plead once more—as I raise my voice again today in the cause of peace—for my country to return to the framework of its ideals, to demonstrate that it is willing to exhaust all the peaceful procedures available to it under international agreements and international law for enforcing a peace, which means to stop making war. That is what my resolution seeks to do so far as its essential thrust is concerned, as I shall describe in the course of my remarks.

We should have recognized that the Tonkin Bay resolution would only be productive of war. We had a form of national unity resolution in the case of Mexico; it, too, authorized the President to take certain military action that was supposed to frighten off Mexico. But it

did not. It led straight to war. And the historians are still writing their condemnation of us for that war. People are inclined to forget, so some of us have to refresh their memories, as we have discussed the Mexican War in connection with the Vietnamese war, as the senior Senator from Oregon has quoted time and time again on the floor of the Senate the opposition to the Mexican War by a dissenter of his day, a man named Abraham Lincoln, a Congressman from Illinois, who forthrightly and courageously spoke out about the illegality of the Mexican War, about the immorality of the Mexican War, about the lack of justification for involving the American people in the Mexican War.

Mr. President, that great speech of Abraham Lincoln in the House of Representatives stands as one of his many deserved monuments in the history of the Republic.

So, too, was there a resolution in the case of Cuba in 1898. We heard it said in Congress at that time that a show of national unity would frighten Spain out of Cuba. But it led to war with Spain, instead.

One of the comments of the so-called war advocates in regard to both the Mexican War and the Spanish War is that we won both of them.

Oh, Mr. President, so often what a sting there is in victory. The fighting in those two wars stands as despoiled pages on the record of American history. Victory does not make right. We can commit enough inhumanity against both our men and the enemy to force a surrender. Some will call it victory, but history will record it as a great defeat because we will have defeated so many of the ideals of our Nation.

That has been our experience with the Tonkin Gulf resolution. It has been productive of more war and ever more war in Asia. If it had any effect upon North Vietnam at all, it was to prod that country into new and more carefully organized military and political activity for her own defense.

If one can find any comfort in our experience with this resolution, it is that no future resolutions of this kind will be accepted by Congress so long as anyone is here who went through the Tonkin Gulf experience.

NEW RESOLUTION NEEDED

Although I have always believed that resolution was a mistake, and that it should be rescinded, yet it is obvious that much more is needed.

I tried to rescind it, as will be recalled, a year and a half ago, and the course of action was to lay my proposal on the table. Whereas there were only two votes against the resolution in August 1964, being the votes of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] and the senior Senator from Oregon, we had five votes against the motion to lay on the table, and everyone in the Senate knew what they were voting on. They were voting not on a motion to lay on the table, except in technical form; they were voting on whether or not they wanted to go on record on the floor of the Senate contrary to the position many of them take on the other side of those two doors. When many of them

are out in the cloakroom, they freely admit they made a mistake when they voted for the Tonkin Gulf resolution in the first place, but not here on the floor of the Senate are they willing to admit they made a mistake by a vote to repeal. So they voted for the motion to lay on the table, many of them thinking they could explain it by saying it was a vote on a procedural matter. But the country knew it was a vote on a substantive matter.

I say respectfully to my beloved friends in the Senate that it is easy to make speeches here and elsewhere in the country raising regrets and doubts of the wisdom of passing the Tonkin Gulf resolution in the first instance, but I know of no gymnastic ambivalence that is going to enable any politician in the Senate or the House of Representatives to be on both sides of this issue. If they try to do that, I think the voters will catch up with them, and well they should.

I would that the resolution could be repealed or rescinded. I am enough of a political realist to know that the probabilities of that happening are so remote that there is a greater chance for a frozen snowball to remain frozen in an oven of 150 degrees Fahrenheit. Therefore, my approach today is somewhat different from my approach of February 1966, when I sought to rescind the Tonkin Gulf resolution.

Although the administration takes the view that what Congress thinks is irrelevant, I believe the kind of resolution that is needed is a statement of congressional policy on how a major war in Southeast Asia should be dealt with by the United States. Such a resolution is needed because our previous policy of the Tonkin Gulf resolution has failed totally to arrest the size and scope of the conflict.

We need a resolution that recognizes that in acting unilaterally, the United States has not been able to stop the fighting, and that it has in fact grown into a major war that threatens the peace not only of all Asia, but of the entire world. It should recognize that the naval incident of August 1964, is no longer relevant to the situation, and the action that Congress anticipated at that time against North Vietnamese PT-boats has long since been carried out. The resolution I am offering today is based on these facts.

It expresses the sense of Congress that the President and his administration act as we are required to act under the charter of the United Nations. It states that the President should request the Security Council of the United Nations to meet on the subject of the entire Vietnamese war, and asks that he call upon the Security Council to issue a call for a cease-fire by all parties on all fronts of the fighting.

One of the essential provisions of my resolution is that we must propose and be willing to comply with a cease-fire order. We have got to stop the killing, and we have got to stop the sending of our young men to Southeast Asia to be slaughtered in a war that is unjustifiable, illegal, and immoral. That is the test of our ideals. It means, as I said in my colloquy with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], that we must submit a resolution to the U.N. that is subject to a veto or adoption.

We must submit a resolution in which we pledge that we will accept the jurisdiction of the United Nations and comply with its orders. That is what the charter provides, and that is what we have never been willing to do. Until we do it, and I speak most respectfully of my President, all of his talking about being willing to go to the United Nations is empty semantics.

The language we must use and the pledge we must make is that we will abide by the jurisdiction of the procedures of the charter. The first thing we have to be willing to commit ourselves to is that we will support a cease-fire order. That will stop the killing. Of course, as I shall point out later, it calls for enforcement, but that is what the United Nations Charter was set up to do.

That is why I have been heard to say so many times in these historic debates in the Senate that the sad thing is not a single signatory to the United Nations Charter, including the United States, has ever carried out its solemn commitment vis-a-vis the war in Vietnam. That goes for our neighbor to the north—Canada—for Great Britain, the Scandinavian countries, France, Russia, Italy, Japan, India, and the Latin American countries. Every signatory has failed to carry out the clear obligation that their signature to the charter imposed upon them when they signed it.

If the charter is becoming a dead letter, as some critics of the United Nations declare, that is only because the signatories to it no longer seem to honor their signatures in a great world crisis such as this.

It further urges that the United States ask the Security Council to take whatever steps necessary to enforce that cease-fire, and it states that whatever action the Council decides to take under article 25 will be accepted and carried out by the United States.

The resolution states further that if the Security Council fails to act to assert jurisdiction over the war, the President should pursue the same course of action in the General Assembly, just as we did in the case of the Congo when the Security Council failed to act and the General Assembly acted instead to prevent a colossal confrontation among nations warring for control of central Africa.

When it is India, Pakistan, Israel, or Egypt, or the Soviet Union that is involved in warfare, the United States has always insisted that the United Nations act to take jurisdiction and to move in and settle the dispute.

Senators have heard me discuss many times the situation involving the Cyprus problem, when Great Britain and the United States attempted, behind the scenes, to work out an understanding to get NATO to move in on the Cyprus issue.

As the RECORD will show, 10 days before I had the slightest idea of what Russia and France were planning in regard to Cyprus, I took the floor of the Senate and made a major speech calling for United Nations action on the Cyprus problem. I pointed out that there was not a scintilla of legal basis for NATO involvement in Cyprus, but that the United

Nations Charter cried out for United Nations intervention.

Later, we were told that the Pentagon, the State Department, and the CIA were not aware of what Russia and France were up to at the time, I said during that debate that it was nothing new for the Pentagon, the State Department, or the CIA to be caught flatfooted. But, 10 days later, Russia and France showed their hands, for they had gone about lining up a large number of nations for United Nations intervention in the Cyprus issue; and then, to the everlasting credit of my Government and the British Crown, both nations joined in the march toward peace in Cyprus through United Nations intervention—and a war was prevented, then and since. For how long, we can only hope—but I am hopeful; although, as I have said, and repeat, would it not have been paradoxical if Greece and Turkey had gone to war against each other, each side 100 percent equipped with American military aid and materiel?

What has happened to our morality?

What has happened to the American people, that they would permit their Government to go around the world, equipping with American military equipment, nations having great conflicts and controversies with their neighbors, thereby increasing—not decreasing—the possibility and probability of war? That is why I offer no apology for my consistent votes against military aid of this kind.

Military aid to maintain internal order is quite different, because it involves entirely different equipment from military aid which can be used only for external wars.

Mr. President, I do not accept the argument that the United Nations cannot work. I point out only that it cannot work unless the signatories to the charter are willing to make it work. If they are not willing to make it work, then let me say to all the signatories to the charter whom I have already mentioned and to the rest whom I have not that they must assume not only the moral responsibility for the war in Vietnam but also the responsibility for what I consider to be a violation of their legal obligations under the charter, to do what they can to insist that the charter shall be applied to the war.

Mr. President, the record is clear that, more often than not, when the U.N. has intervened, it has been able to stop war. But when the United States is involved massively in war in Vietnam, we have not once asked the U.N. to take effective action to stop or to settle the dispute.

OBJECTIONS TO U.N. ACTION UNCONVINCING

People say: "But isn't the U.N. too divided, too weak to handle a big war like this?"

My answer is: "It is the job of the U.N. to keep peace. The United States set out to keep peace alone. Instead of bringing peace to Vietnam, we have contributed more than our share to the steady enlargement of the war, the steady increase in death and destruction. We cannot keep peace acting alone, as the course of this war amply demonstrates. We cannot keep peace as policeman to the world because the world does

not accept one country's idea of what the peace should be, any more than the world accepted Britain's idea of world order, or Germany's, or Napoleon's. The United Nations deserves a chance. It cannot do worse than we have done in bringing peace to Vietnam."

A single world power "enforces" peace by waging war against those who have a different idea of what the peace should be. What a far cry that is from self-defense. What a far cry from protecting the lives and safety and liberty of the American people.

Every day this war continues, we are jeopardizing the lives of young Americans still in high school who will be sent into that conflict if it is not brought to a conclusion soon. Every day it continues, we have less control over its scope, less control over the responses of North Vietnam, the responses of Russia and China, who have an even more direct stake than we do in what happens in Southeast Asia.

Every day it continues we are sucked further into the land mass of Asia, which has swallowed up multitudes of outsiders—even from Japan—who believed they were powerful enough to control Asia.

Just as I am unimpressed by our self-flattering theory about serving as policeman to the world, so I am unimpressed by the timid voices at the United Nations who prefer to shun their responsibilities under the charter simply because it is the United States that is involved in the war. We are the world's most powerful nation, and we are by far its wealthiest. Apparently, no one wants to reprimand or chastise or bring under international control the goose that lays the golden egg.

We are pouring out aid totaling billions of dollars. It has totaled over \$121 billion since 1946 into some 93 nations.

That is why I say I think it is simply unrealistic to assume that the United Nations will take jurisdiction unless the United States is willing to make the pledge that my resolution calls for; unless my country is willing to offer a resolution that calls for a cease-fire order by the United Nations; unless my country is willing to submit a resolution that calls upon the United Nations to enforce the peace and pledges that we will abide by its determination. We will have our share of the voice in helping to frame the determination, but whatever the determinations are, we ought to make clear, before the fact, that we will abide by the adjudication, so to speak, of the United Nations.

I have heard it said that U Thant thinks the U.N. has no role to play in the Vietnam war. My answer is that Thant is not the United Nations. The members comprise the United Nations, the Secretary General is naught but an agent of the United Nations. Yet we have permitted to be developed, by way of rationalization, the false premise that if U Thant says we should not do it, then we should not do it. I have great respect and high praise for him with regard to many of his recommendations and actions; but, in my judgment, it is for the United Nations to determine the course of action; and if

U Thant thinks he cannot cooperate to carry out those decisions, then let us have a new Secretary General of the United Nations, for the members constitute the organization, not the Secretary General.

At the time of the Middle East crisis, the Senate heard me declare what I considered to be a usurpation of power on the part of the Secretary General when, without getting approval of his principals, he proceeded to yield to Nasser in the withdrawal of United Nations forces. May I say I think it is regrettable that all the United States did at that time was make some statements in the United Nations expressing concern about it and disagreement with the exercise of his discretion. The issue should have been drawn with U Thant, and it should have been made perfectly clear to the Secretary General that he is a servant of the United Nations, not its controller, not its policymaker. He has a right to make recommendations, and I give great respect to his recommendations, but it is one thing to make recommendations and it is another thing to proceed to determine policy.

Those who are mentioning U Thant's position with regard to a Security Council or United Nations intervention in South Vietnam are, in my judgment, looking for excuses, not reasons, for our not doing what the charter places upon every signatory the clear legal obligation to do.

More important, may I say, why does not the United Nations have a role to play? It had a role in the war between India and Pakistan; it had a role in the Middle East; it has a role wherever its members decide it has a role.

Of course, as the Senate knows, as I have made clear in some of my discussions on the Middle East problem, it did not carry out its role in the Middle East, but at least it recognized that it had a role.

I shall never accede to the idea that Thant or any other Secretary General has a veto power over the United Nations.

No one regrets more than I that the United States has never accepted the first recommendation that Thant has made for bringing the war to a negotiated settlement. His first recommendation is that the United States stop bombing North Vietnam. And I think it should, and I have pleaded for it time and time again here on the floor of the Senate and from the platforms of America. His first recommendation, as I have said, is that we should stop bombing North Vietnam, and I think he is right. We have had our little "pauses." But that is all they ever were. They were "pauses," and we have called them pauses in full knowledge that they constituted more of an ultimatum to negotiate promptly—"or else"—than a true cessation in bombing.

But the real point I am making is this: There never will be a bona fide cessation in the bombing of North Vietnam until the nations of the world compel it.

I would it were not true, but I am satisfied it is. The United States will never reduce its use of military power simply on the basis of its own initiatives. It will only reduce its use of military

power upon the severe protestations of other countries, either acting directly or through the medium of the United Nations.

If a halt is desired in the bombing—and I think it is—the way to get it is to have the Security Council of the United Nations demand it, as part of a general cease-fire. If Great Britain thinks a stop in the bombing will be helpful in bringing about negotiations, why does she continue to give lipservice to American conduct of the war? If Russia thinks the bombing of North Vietnam should stop, why does she shrink from seeking a Security Council decision to that effect?

If opinion in Scandinavian countries, and elsewhere in the world, is opposed to the bombing of North Vietnam, why do not these countries take the one means they can take of stopping it—by a Security Council resolution, or by a General Assembly resolution?

If the United States is in violation of the U.N. Charter in our bombing policy, so is every signatory that has done nothing to institute U.N. action to take jurisdiction over the war.

There are many forms that jurisdiction could take. The Security Council could reconvene the Geneva Conference. It could reconvene the same membership, or it could expand the participation to include whatever countries it thinks appropriate. Or the Security Council could refer the matter to the General Assembly, if it is stymied, itself, by a veto.

More important, the United States itself must insist that the General Assembly act if the Security Council fails to do so.

Before leaving this portion of my speech, I wish to refer to the fine letter in the New York Times of this morning from Congressman JONATHAN BINGHAM, of New York. Congressman BINGHAM also makes the point that American references to its past "bombing pauses" have been barren and will continue to be barren of results so long as they are not accompanied by practical steps to bring political pressure upon Hanoi to negotiate. I ask unanimous consent to have Congressman BINGHAM's letter printed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

AMERICAN TRUST IN WAR POLICY DIMINISHING

Mr. MORSE. I believe it is important for this country to put the whole Vietnam war before the United Nations in good faith, and to do it now. The dominant fact in American political life today is the war in Vietnam. It occupies the attention of our President and much of his administration; it is the sword that hangs over the head of every public works project, every farm program, and every education bill that comes before the Congress; it may soon reach into the pocketbook of every taxpayer for more tax money; it governs the lives of the half a million young men who are serving in it, and the future of every lad in his teens who must plan his education and his career around the likelihood of 2 years' service in Asia.

The origins of American involvement

date back to World War II, and are too complex to deal with in the short time I have today. So, too, are the various and shifting reasons given for our interest in the Vietnam complex. But they do not go to the people of Vietnam. They go to the fear the United States has for China, and our desire to hold territory around Chinese borders.

The election recently held in South Vietnam was democratic in exactly the same way every Communist election is democratic. All the candidates were screened by the military junta and those who did not pass its political test were not permitted to run at all. The most popular political figure in South Vietnam—one of our ex-junta leaders, General Minh—was not even granted permission to return from exile, much less run for the presidency.

It is the view of many that one of the reasons that the military junta did not want General Minh to return to Vietnam and run for the presidency was not only because they feared he might be the most popular public figure in South Vietnam but also because he has given indication that he does not reject the idea that some form of a coalition government may have to be worked out with the Vietcong and some form of unification with North Vietnam. Of course, in South Vietnam today, even advocating any form of neutralism is a crime subject to imprisonment upon conviction, and the very thought of a possible recognition of the Vietcong for purposes of peace negotiations would disqualify anyone for public office on the part of the military dictators of South Vietnam.

Yet the Vietcong have wide support among the South Vietnamese people. It is so hard to get that fact through to the American people. But interestingly enough, it is known everywhere else in the world.

That is why the moment we withdraw American bayonets from South Vietnam, the mass of the people will overrun the dictatorship we are supporting, and there will be a shocking slaughter and massacre, possibly unequaled in human history—unless we follow a course of action such as I am suggesting today, whereby other nations will move in, under international law, to enforce a peace, not make war, and to exercise control for that period of time necessary for a viable government to be established and for agreements to be reached.

Then perhaps we will recognize that there is a Vietcong; and will recognize what this administration just never wants to bring itself to recognize: That we are in the midst of a civil war in Vietnam, and we have no business in it. It does not involve the slightest interest of the United States.

That is why so many of the world authorities on Southeast Asia are so emphatically critical of the policy that the United States is following there.

Mr. President, I repeat, in South Vietnam today it not only is a crime to advocate coalition and neutralism, but it will disqualify anyone running for public office, at least it would have if he sought to run for public office in this last election. Mr. President, that also is interest-

ing proof of what we are supporting over there. We are supporting a dictatorship.

More and more of our fellow American citizens are coming to realize that we are sending American soldiers to their deaths on the battlefields of South Vietnam in an undeclared war in order to maintain in power the military dictatorship now headed by Generals Thieu and Ky, and our continued participation in the war is becoming more and more unacceptable, in our country and around the world.

In spite of all the propaganda and alibis that are being put out by Secretary Rusk in Washington, D.C., and Ambassador Bunker in Saigon, seeking to create in the minds of the American people the impression that the recent elections were democratic, the fact is that they were elections dictated by the military junta.

Also contrary to the propaganda that we have engineered the first election in Vietnam, this is not the first time that such controlled elections have been held in South Vietnam. We should not forget that Diem, our first puppet, was proclaimed by us to have been elected at the ballot boxes of South Vietnam in 1955. That election was in fact limited and restricted to our selected puppet candidate Diem, who in what amounted to a mock election, ran against Bao Dai, the Emperor, who everyone knew was to all intents and purposes out of office before the election was held insofar as keeping any real power was concerned.

The election of Diem was but a charade to give the false impression that he had been legitimized as the head of state. Most of the world knew that he was the illegitimate offspring of the U.S. State Department, as far as his diplomatic and governmental standing was concerned. We gave him birth as far as political power is concerned. Do not forget that Diem was a South Vietnamese exile in the United States, who had never fought the French 1 hour. He ran out of Vietnam and came to the United States, and John Foster Dulles, the American Secretary of State, took him over, they indoctrinated him down at the CIA, the Pentagon, and the State Department, and then we in the United States took him back to Vietnam. We set him up in power. We financed him. We militarized him. We directed him.

We have directed every military junta puppet ever since. Most of the world knows it, but still many Americans do not seem to know it.

Mr. President, I say further that this is part and parcel of the credibility gap that has developed in this country, between the shocking falsity of the propaganda of recent administrations, and fact. One of our great problems is to obtain an enlightened public understanding of the basis for the war, to get these facts understood.

I happen to be one Senator, as my fellow Senators know, who has rejected the argument, every time it has been made, that it does not make any difference how we got in—we must now win and get out.

It makes all the difference in the world how we got in, because the world understands how we got in; and until we correct the mistakes involved in our going in, we will not be able, Mr. President, to

obtain the support of the world for our course of action.

I believe the best way to obtain that support is for us now, at long last, to say to the United Nations, "We call upon you to take jurisdiction, and we will abide by the results." That is what my resolution proposes.

The election of Diem was but a charade, as I say, inflicted upon the American people by the State Department. The 1967 election has only brought us back to where we were in Vietnam 12 years ago, under Diem.

Every Communist country has elections, too. The party puts up the candidates and the people turn out up to 95 percent to vote for it. They call that democracy, and the sad thing is that we are beginning to call it democracy, too. Thus are our standards corrupted every time we accept the standards of our enemy—be it a military junta or a Communist state. Freedom is as lacking in a junta state as in a Communist state.

As one who has been in the forefront of the debate over Vietnam policy since 1954, I want to point out one notable change in official attitudes toward it. The change was inevitable, and was predicted and anticipated by Senator GRUENING and myself from the very beginning. It is the dramatic change from the position that the United States would wage war patiently, without seeking victory, and for 5, 10, 20 years or however long it might take to win in South Vietnam.

That is no longer the dominant official attitude. Today, the attitude is one of impatience, even urgency, that the war be wound up quickly—at least before the political conventions of next summer. Today, it is the political climate in the United States that is dictating our military moves in Vietnam, because every citizen in the land knows that the American people are not going to support a low-level war for 5, 10, 20 years or however long it takes.

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon may proceed for 7 additional minutes.

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

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President the concept of indefinite war abroad was unrealistic from the very beginning. Anyone who went through the Korean war knows it. The old British colonial experience of fighting perpetual and indecisive warfare on the far borders of India, against the French in colonial America, and on the fringes of the upper Nile—wars without beginning or end, wars whose objectives were buried in the financial affairs of private corporations and glorified to the people with the pageantry of imperial Britain—such wars are not for Americans.

We have the greatest military machine ever assembled in the history of the world. Our gross national product of \$775 billion a year compares with North Vietnam's gross national product of \$1 billion a year, and that was before the bombing began. It is no wonder that Americans ask why we have been un-

able to drive North Vietnam into surrender, for if we cannot do so in this vast mismatch of military power, just how much good is military power, anyway.

The longer the war drags on, the more it challenges all our assumptions of the supremacy of military power; the more it costs us in friendship and support among the people of other countries; the more money, energy, and creativity it drains away from the urgent needs of American society.

I do not believe the people are going to allow it to drag on, and I believe the administration now recognizes that it cannot allow it to drag on and still remain in office.

The question is, What next step should we take? I believe my resolution is a step that would be welcomed by the world and by the American people when they come to understand its import and its content.

Mr. President, I now submit a concurrent resolution and ask unanimous consent that it be, printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the concurrent resolution will be printed in the RECORD, as requested by the senior Senator from Oregon.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 44) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 44

Whereas the United States is now fighting a major land war in Southeast Asia which threatens to widen into World War III and a nuclear holocaust which could destroy civilization; and

Whereas the primary purpose of the United Nations is to maintain international peace and security and to take collective measures to remove threats to world peace; and

Whereas in ratifying the Charter of the United Nations the United States undertook a solemn treaty commitment to settle international disputes by peaceful means; and

Whereas under the Charter the Security Council has primary responsibility for the maintenance of peace, which devolves to the General Assembly when the Council is unable to act; and

Whereas the United States has failed to take effective steps to bring about United Nations involvement which would bring an end to the conflict in Southeast Asia: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that—

1. The President should request an emergency meeting of the United Nations Security Council to consider all aspects of the conflict in Vietnam and to act to end the conflict, pledging the United States in advance to accept and carry out any decision on the matter by the Council, in accordance with article 25 of the Charter.

2. If the Security Council is unable to act, the United States should take all steps necessary to assure action on the issue by the General Assembly.

3. The United States objectives in the United Nations should be to obtain—

(a) support for an immediate cessation of hostilities by all parties, and

(b) recommendations for appropriate measures, such as the convening of an international conference, for reaching a permanent settlement which will assure a lasting peace for Southeast Asia.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have summarized the resolution during the course of my speech. I want to make it very clear that the thrust of the resolution is that we call upon the United Nations, either through the Security Council or the General Assembly, to take jurisdiction over the war and that we pledge to abide by the decisions it reaches and the orders it issues.

The concurrent resolution calls for the United Nations to proceed to ask for a cease-fire, which means an attempt to bring to an end the killing.

Here is a resolution, in my judgment, that is a very appropriate course of action for us to follow. I consider it really supplementary to the resolution that the Foreign Relations Committee now has under consideration, submitted by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], which resolution seeks to place long overdue checks upon the exercise of executive discretion in the field of foreign policy.

This resolution, I think, is another important step that ought to be taken to return the American people once again within the framework of the U.S. Constitution and the United Nations Charter.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the New York Times, Sept. 11, 1967]
TOWARD NEGOTIATIONS WITH HANOI
To the Editor:

As your excellent editorial "Generals Out of Control" [Sept. 1] recently pointed out, it is gravely disturbing that our top military men are being encouraged to contradict their civilian superior on a major policy question: whether to escalate further our air war against North Vietnam.

But I beg to differ with your suggestion that another "bombing pause" should be undertaken, as "an indispensable precedent to opening negotiations with Hanoi for a political solution." I fully agree that Hanoi will not negotiate, or promise to negotiate, so long as our bombing of the North continues, but I doubt the usefulness of another, obviously temporary, "pause."

If Hanoi were eager to start negotiations, even a pause might give it the opportunity. But if, as seems more likely, Hanoi believes it is winning and has no desire to negotiate, then it will scoff at any pause, as it has in the past.

It seems to me that if we really want negotiations (and no other road to a speedy end to the war seems open), we must try to find a way to make it impossible for Hanoi not to negotiate. The first step would be to remove altogether what U Thant and the East European Communists and many non-aligneds—and Hanoi itself—have said is the fatal obstacle to talks, without attempting to obtain a prior commitment from the other side.

OFFICIAL STAND ON BOMBING

The coming United Nations General Assembly offers an opportune occasion to make maximum use of such a decision. If, for example, President Johnson were to announce our willingness to stop the bombing and were at the same time to invite a group of neutral nations to arrange a time and place for negotiations, the whole political atmosphere would change. Hanoi would then be under tremendous pressure to enter into negotiations, pressure that hopefully would be enough to overcome the steady counter-pressure from Peking.

As Secretary McNamara's fact-filled analysis of the bombing in the North makes clear, the military advantages of the bombing are not compelling, and the disadvantage of a cessation would be manageable. Indeed, there can be no certainty that Hanoi would re-

spond to cessation by stepping up the flow of men and supplies to the South, as the generals so positively predict. The response of Hanoi might just as well be the contrary: the flow might be cut back to the pre-February 1965 level when we started the bombing.

In any case, whatever the short-run military result of cessation, if such bold action on our part were to open the way for negotiations and an end to the fighting, the saving of lives would be tremendous. Do we have available to us a better method of achieving peace?

JONATHAN B. BINGHAM,
Member of Congress,
23d District, New York.

WASHINGTON, October 1, 1967.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 163. An act for the relief of CWO Charles M. Bickart, U.S. Marine Corps (retired); and S. 636. An act for the relief of Mrs. Chin Shee Shiu.

PANIC WILL NOT SOLVE UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, an old proverb says that if you give a man a fish you feed him for a day, but if you teach him to fish, he can provide for his lifetime.

In modern America, with the impact of changing technology visible throughout our society, this proverb has an exceedingly poignant message for all of us.

In the wake of one of the worst summers ever endured by this Nation—in the wake of rioting, of abject poverty and unemployment and miserable housing conditions—there are those today who seek quick, easy solutions. There are those who say, in effect, that we must give the inhabitants of our ghettos a fish, rather than teaching them to fish.

Specifically, they are urging that we create—on a crash basis—millions of new jobs to alleviate the problems in our slums.

But, Mr. President, like so many suggestions which are born out of panic, this plan of action ignores the facts. And the facts are these: There is no shortage of jobs in America today; there is a shortage of trained manpower to fill them.

At the end of July, for example, there were 343,100 unfilled openings listed at the 2,200 State public employment offices across the country. And, as recently as June 1, nearly 200,000 of these openings had been unfilled for over 30 days.

These figures do not include the large number of openings not listed with the employment service. The real figure of unfilled jobs is probably above the million mark.

The fact of the matter is that most of these unfilled jobs require a higher measure of skill than the hard-core disadvantaged now possess. And it is obvious that there is only one realistic solution: Seeing that the jobless and the underemployed are prepared to fill those jobs.

Nearly 3 million Americans are now unemployed, and millions of others share serious employment problems—poverty-level wages, involuntary part-time work, dead end jobs. For many of these, the future is bleak.

What these disadvantaged citizens need is not just a job, but a job with a bright future. In the words of the proverb, they need to learn to fish for themselves—for a lifetime.

The 1960's have been marked by unprecedented national action to wipe out poverty, bigotry, and disease—all those factors that put some citizens at a distinct disadvantage in employment.

In the past 5 years alone, the Congress has enacted the most impressive array of social and economic legislation ever produced over a comparable timespan. Millions are benefiting from these new laws.

Included in this mighty harvest of new legislation is a series of laws geared to help solve the long-term problems of the disadvantaged: the Manpower Development and Training Act and its amendments; the Economic Opportunity Act and its amendments; the Elementary and Secondary Education Act; the Vocational Education Act; the Civil Rights Act; and the Fair Labor Standards Act amendments, which include a higher minimum wage.

Most wisely, these laws allow a large body of citizens who once lacked hope to build for the future. As Jose Ortega Gasset once said:

Nothing has any sense for a man except insofar as it is directed toward the future.

This is no less true in America today.

As we seek ways to provide every American with a decent job at a living wage, it will not impede our progress to look at the substantial gains we have made in recent years under a human reclamation program without parallel in world history. What has taken place over the past 5 years represents the most glowing social chapter in U.S. history.

By this summer, for example: 979,000 training opportunities for the unemployed and underemployed had been opened up under the Manpower Development and Training Act; some 1,013,000 impoverished boys and girls had received fresh starts in life through enrollment in the Neighborhood Youth Corps; 300,000 young men and women, who might have been driven out of school for lack of funds, had continued their all-important education through the college work-study program; 169,000 needy persons, most family breadwinners, have benefited from the work-experience and training program; thousands of poor youths, many of whom could barely read and write had received training and employment through the Job Corps; Nearly 2.4 million youngsters had been served by neighborhood youth opportunity centers across the country. They received counseling, testing, and placement in jobs or suitable training or were

referred to agencies that could provide services needed to increase their employability; about 61,000 unemployed and underemployed persons in 19 cities and two rural areas were slated to receive whatever job assistance they require under the concentrated employment program.

In the past 3 years alone, we have made landmark advances toward providing full opportunity for every citizen. For example: Between 1½ and 2 million people are in school, training on jobs because of these newly developed programs. Otherwise, they would be out of school and out of work; the number of long-term or "hard-core" jobless—persons out of work 15 weeks or longer—has been cut by more than half—from 929,000 in August 1964 to 441,000 in August 1967.

These strategic programs hold long-term promise not only for the once-forgotten disadvantaged who are now able to lift themselves, but for the Nation as a whole which benefits from their new skills.

This promise is evident in the fact that three out of four trainees who complete their classroom work under MDTA move on to regular employment and nearly nine out of 10 who complete on-the-job training become gainfully employed. Under this vital program, workers once handicapped by lack of skill are now living and working in self-respect as machine operators, clerk-typists, combination welders, nurse's aides, automobile mechanics, automobile body repairmen, practical nurses, and trained salespeople. Others face the future with bright career hopes in several hundred other occupations.

It is most heartening news that the Federal Government is beginning to get back through taxes what it pays for training.

President Johnson has said, for example:

The average trainee in on-the-job training programs developed by the Labor Department is returning the total cost of his training to the Treasury in less than two years. There will continue to be dividends for many years to come.

The fact is that an average on-the-job trainee repays the Federal Government over half of its investment in him in his first year of training. By the time the second year of training is over, the Government has been repaid in full.

The promise of these programs is also evident in the cases of great numbers of Neighborhood Youth Corps enrollees—in urban as well as rural areas—who have prepared for permanent careers by serving as aides in schools and libraries, parks and hospitals, cafeterias, and museums. These young people are building for their own future as they help improve their communities.

Individual cases, not statistics, best tell the success stories being written under these programs every day in cities and towns across the Nation.

In St. Albans, Vt., a father of four lost his job as a member of a labor gang with a railroad company because of a reduction in force. Unskilled, he was jobless for nearly a year before enrolling in a

cook's course under MDTA. But after 19 weeks of training, he was rehired by that same railroad company—as a cook with a starting wage of \$3 an hour.

In Jacksonville, Fla., a 17-year-old 11th grade dropout could not find a job anywhere. A member of a family that had been on welfare for three generations, she wanted to get off welfare at any cost. She joined the Neighborhood Youth Corps and was placed as a nurse's aid at a home for the aged. Because of bad health, she had to quit after 6 months. But she returned to the NYC and would not give up. She finished high school at night last June and the hospital rewarded her efforts by hiring her as a full-time nurse's aid. She is now being groomed by the hospital for a scholarship to study to be a registered nurse.

Down in Louisiana, a 25-year-old Negro woman, abandoned by her husband and supporting four small children on welfare, could not even get a job as a domestic in her small town because of a surplus of labor. But she enrolled in an MDTA secretarial course and is now a secretary in New Orleans. On receiving her first check, she beamed:

This is the first time I've ever seen my name on a paycheck. It's so beautiful I'd like to frame it. Now I'm a taxpayer.

There are literally hundreds of thousands of similar stories unfolding across the country. Graduates of these training and educational programs are now better equipped to enter the world of work.

It is obvious that maximum preparation is the key to getting ahead today—and every citizen should have full opportunity to make as much sense out of his life as possible.

Certainly, the mistakes, oversights, and general apathy of more than a century will not be righted by pat or short-cut solutions. We must continue to strengthen those programs that prepare the disadvantaged to make their way alone.

Makeshift jobs are not the answer. The rapid advance of modern technology is leading to fundamental changes in the occupational structure. These changes will spell an increasingly grim employment outlook for the ill-prepared worker over the long run.

Consequently, education and training are essential if a person is to have prospects for the jobs of the future. Over the next 10 years, for instance, the fastest growing occupations will be in the professional, technical, and kindred categories. While total employment is expected to grow about a quarter between 1964 and 1975, it is anticipated that the number of white-collar jobs will increase by nearly a third and blue-collar jobs by a fifth. So by 1975, it is expected that white-collar jobs may constitute nearly half of all employed workers, compared with slightly more than two-fifths in 1964.

Unemployment will continue, then, to fall most heavily on the least educated and least prepared for work. Young workers with less than 8 years of schooling, for example, will have seven times the jobless rate of college graduates and, tragically, laborers, the least

skilled group, are seven times more likely to be out of work than professional workers.

The urgency for maximum preparation is emphasized by the probability that American workers may face numerous job changes during a career. A 20-year-old man today, for instance, could be expected to change jobs six or seven times during his worklife expectancy of 43 years. This speaks loudly for a background that will enable a person to adapt to the training and retraining necessary to permit a change of jobs.

Being thrown out of work because your employer closes shop is tough enough when you're young—

Said one man who learned the hard way—

But, when you're over 50, it's murder. No employer would ever consider hiring me at my age.

President Johnson captured the essence of what must be done in his March 14, 1967, message to the Congress on urban and rural poverty:

Let it be said that in our time, we pursued a strategy against poverty so that each man had a chance to be himself.

Let it be said that in our time, we offered him the means to become a free man—for his sake, and for our own.

Shortcut solutions to the complex employment problems in our changing society are not the answer. Rather, the answer lies in providing each citizen with the opportunity to prepare himself for existing jobs—meaningful and rewarding jobs. Makeshift work will not solve the problems of the unskilled man or woman. It only forestalls his or her day of reckoning. Every American needs full opportunity, not public doles.

I urge every Member of the 90th Congress to support the strengthening of those programs that are helping so many fellow citizens break the shackles of poverty. Nothing less will do.

NEW TOOLS FOR SOCIAL PROGRESS

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, there is now pending before the Subcommittee on Government Research of the Committee on Government Operations the Full Opportunity and Social Accounting Act of 1967, S. 843.

This historic proposal, authored by the junior Senator from Minnesota, and coauthored by 10 other Senators, including myself, is aimed at establishing order among often competing and overlapping governmental programs in the social field.

The Subcommittee on Government Research, of which I am chairman, recently completed 5 days of hearings and a day-long seminar on this legislation. The Full Opportunity and Social Accounting Act has won wide support from social scientists, Federal governmental agencies involved in social programs, civil rights leaders, social workers, and officials at all levels of government.

In the September issue of the Progressive magazine, there appears an article by Senator WALTER F. MONDALE, explaining in cogent, convincing terms the need for this act.

I ask unanimous consent that the article, "New Tools for Social Progress," by Senator WALTER F. MONDALE, of Minnesota, be printed in the RECORD.

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

NEW TOOLS FOR SOCIAL PROGRESS

(By Senator WALTER F. MONDALE)

Early this year, the National Committee Against Discrimination in Housing charged that for the past three decades, good intentions notwithstanding, various Federal programs had fostered racial segregation and consequently trapped Negroes in slum ghettos.

Their specific criticisms attacked a broad range of programs and policies, among them urban renewal, transportation, and public housing. Some of the programs the Committee cited sought to improve American society generally; others, such as public housing, aimed at improving the condition of the poor. Of urban renewal, the Committee charged that the programs "have consistently violated the rights of Negro Americans and other minorities by forcing their continuous upheaval and relocation in racially segregated areas to accommodate local community prejudices."

Because the main target of the criticism was the Department of Housing and Urban Development, HUD Secretary Robert C. Weaver prepared an eight-page response which said, generally, that the Department was doing the best it could under current laws but stronger legislation was needed.

There the matter rests, and as a United States Senator who has voted for some of the programs, or supported others enacted before I came to the Senate, I am perplexed and troubled.

As the situation now stands, there is no prospect for an accurate and public accounting of the extent of racial segregation in the United States that would enable us to determine whether government programs are cures or contributors to the perpetuation of this social cancer.

The lack of verifiable, public information exists in a number of broad areas: physical health and mental illness, the quality of education, the effect upon society of a gradually deteriorating natural environment.

Unhappily, we have had a whole summer of unprecedented violence in our cities that revealed glaringly the shocking lack of knowledge of the nature and extent of the social ills that plague our rich nation. The proliferation of ad hoc committees at the national, state, and local levels to determine the causes of rioting in the urban ghettos is ample evidence of the need for an on-going, permanent coordination of these social indicators. In these cases violence serves as a measure of the lack of jobs, poor health care, inferior educational opportunity, de facto segregation, and the multitude of other burdens that grind upon the poor and those discriminated against by the majority.

There certainly must be more peaceful ways than riot, and hopefully more precise methods, too, to measure our failures and document the considerable successes of governmental efforts to improve the quality of American life. Obviously, we need better indicators. For America to approach the future unequipped to evaluate and plan effectively is to invite chaos.

One of the social sciences, economics, has proven that by carefully measuring and watching various indicators such as retail sales volume, amount of new investment, and levels of gross national product, we can take action to head off economic disaster. What do the social sciences have to offer in noneconomic areas of the human condition? Very little of a solid or continuous nature. We now have no comparative system that will alert

us to social disaster—a system of social indicators, widely broadcast, by which we could keep watch in a general way on the social processes in our nation and plan of society's orderly development.

Instead, we undertake ambitious and laudable programs, and watch in shocked amazement when the reaction is different from what we expected. Then we scramble to try to ascertain the facts, often with dubious success.

Take urban renewal, for example. For a decade, urban renewal has been held high as the salvation of our rotting cities, and damned as merely exporting the poor to new ghettos.

In my files are two magazine articles published within three months of each other in 1965. One of these, a critical article, cites a 1961 report that sixty per cent of the displaced poor were relocated in new slums while high-income families occupied the handsome new glass and steel towers. The other article, on the optimistic side, reported a 1964 finding that only eight per cent of displaced slum families remained afterward in substandard housing. The three-year time difference between the studies could account for at least some of the disparity—perhaps all. But in any case there are no clear, current, public, well-announced figures available to refute or support either claim. The two articles punctuate our ignorance about the real effects of one of the most ambitious and promising Federal programs. We know we are building new buildings, but what are we doing to people?

The absence of adequate, publicly-announced indicators can also veil our successes and encourage mistaken exploitation of surface indications of failure, whether it be the testing of new educational techniques, methods of fighting crime, or the administration of welfare funds. As *The Progressive* noted in its June issue, White House aide Joseph Califano had performed the distinct service of coordinating welfare data revealing that only 50,000 of the 7.3 million persons receiving welfare throughout the nation are actually capable of being trained to hold jobs. This data, pulled together for the first time, effectively refutes the conservative bugaboo that, as *The Progressive* put it, "Americans on public welfare rolls are lazy bums leeching on society . . ."

What I am suggesting is that as our present programs continue in their sometimes uncertain way, we must undertake to devise statistical and analytical methods to help us find out what we have done and what we ought to be doing. To say that our social programs may be imperfect and sometimes miss the mark is not to say, of course, that we should halt all attempts toward social betterment. But perhaps we can find ways to get more done at less cost and with less waste motion.

Beyond the establishment of social measures, there should be persistent and perceptive and continuing high level analysis of our social processes, their problems and possibilities, such as is provided for the President by the Council of Economic Advisers in the economic field.

Man's oldest method of self-education is trial and error, but it is also the least efficient. Try we must, but there are ways of reducing the margin of error.

Incessant trial and error and the absence of accurate measurement sap public confidence in otherwise highly desirable programs, and this perhaps is the core of disagreement about many programs designed to improve the public welfare: programs encompassing health, education, transportation. How do we measure success in terms that reflect impact on individuals? By amount of money spent? This may be a measure of effort, but not of effect.

To be sure, there are many surveys and abundant statistics. There are thousands of

statisticians at work in Washington alone, and thousands more working for public and private agencies across the nation. And despite the fact that we do collect mountains of statistics, as the 1,000-plus pages of the *Statistical Abstract of the United States* attest, there remain frightening gaps in information essential for accurate evaluation. Much of the statistical information we now collect is incoherent; that is, it bears no readily apparent relationship to other data which, taken all together, would allow reasonable conclusions.

In other instances, the information is available from widely different agencies, but few people know where to get it. A social scientist doing some post-Watts research told me recently that all the statistical indicators warning of the impending explosion were available before the outbreak. Unfortunately, there was no one to gather and analyze them and no agency existing with the prestige and attention-getting devices to warn the public and government officials.

It would be an oversimplification, of course, to imply that social indicators can magically reveal the "truth" in every case in which an effect is disputed, or alert us to every impending crisis. But it cannot be denied that a system of statistical indicators, measured regularly and watched constantly, and not the least important, available for easy public examination, can yield invaluable guidance for future action. Such a system might make it possible to avoid the risk of dangerous sociological backlash.

The riots in Watts have been partially blamed on the frustrations that arose because of the transportation success of the Los Angeles freeway system. When public transportation withered as automobile travel became more and more convenient, the impoverished Watts residents without cars were effectively isolated from job opportunities and from state and local facilities where they could receive aid.

Columnist Joseph Kraft blames unfortunate consequences like this on our "innocence." Kraft laments that "Lack of regular information fosters an innocence and irresponsibility that is positively terrifying. City after city launches urban renewal drives only to discover—belatedly and with surprise—that poor people are being driven from their homes. County after county launches drives for new industry only to learn—also belatedly and with surprise—that it is polluting the atmosphere. State after state pushes highway projects, only to realize—with astonishment—that the result is impossible congestion in city streets."

This may be "innocence." It is also appalling ignorance.

We were once just as ignorant of the consequences of economic policy. We used to thrash around making decisions on the basis of untested theories and inadequate information, assuming that cyclical waves of boom and bust were inevitable.

But with the enactment of the Employment Act of 1946 establishing the President's Council of Economic Advisers, the Council fostered the refinement of the abundant economic statistics into a reasonably accurate measurement of the nation's economic health. These indicators provide the basis for analysis and planning that have been remarkably effective.

The valuable lessons learned over the past two decades regarding economic indicators suggests that if we had more and better data on social conditions, and if these could be molded into a coherent system of social indicators comparable to their economic counterparts, we would be able to do a far better job of decision-making regarding social programs.

The tantalizing prospect of social measurement was suggested by Gunnar Myrdal in his *American Dilemma*, written in 1944. He wrote, "We should . . . have liked to present in our study a general index, year by year or

at least decade by decade, as a quantitative expression of the movement of the entire system we are studying: the status of the Negro in America."

In 1962, the Behavioral Science subpanel of the President's Science Advisory Committee acknowledged the benefits of systematic gathering of economic data, and commented: "We call attention to the great advance over the past generation in the quantity and quality of our information about the economy and the effective use that is now made of such information in formulating and administering national economic policy. Similar benefits would flow from a corresponding advance in the quantity and quality of information about non-economic aspects of behavior."

Another appeal for a social accounting appears in "Technology and the American Economy," the report of the National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress, submitted last year. In its chapter on "Improving Public Decision Making," the Commission declared:

"The American commitment is not only to raise the standard of living, but to improve the quality of life. But we have too few yardsticks to tell us how we are doing. A system of social accounts would seek to set up 'performance budgets' in various areas to serve as such yardsticks. A series of community health indexes would tell us how well we are meeting the needs of our people in regard to adequate medical care. A national 'housing budget' would reflect our standing in regard to the goal of a 'decent home for every American family.'"

A system of social auditing or accounting would serve five purposes:

It would sharpen our quantitative knowledge of social needs.

It would allow us to measure more precisely our progress toward our social objectives.

It would help us to evaluate efforts at all levels of government.

It would help us determine priorities among competing social programs.

It would encourage the development and assessment of alternative courses without waiting until some one solution had belatedly been proved a failure.

I have introduced legislation in the Senate designed to accomplish these aims. The Full Opportunity and Social Accounting Act (S. 843) is an attempt to elevate social evaluation to as influential a position as is now occupied by economic measurement.

Modeled after the Employment Act of 1946, the legislation contains four key sections:

One—It establishes full social opportunity for all Americans as a national goal.

Two—It establishes a three-member President's Council of Social Advisers and charges them with devising a system of social indicators, and with appraising governmental programs and advising the President on domestic social policy.

Three—It requires the President to submit an annual Social Report, comparable to the Economic Report, disclosing the indicators for public examination, and giving them wide exposure.

Four—It establishes a Joint Congressional Committee on the Social Report, which could hold hearings and subject the President's Social Report to critical analysis.

When the nation's population was widely dispersed on farms and small hamlets, the rate of social change was slow. Much of the social adjustment to sickness, unemployment, disability, old age, broken homes, poverty, and crime was handled within the local community. In 1890, half of our people lived on farms and many of the rest in small towns. Today, something like five per cent of our people live on farms and practically all population increase is taking place in the large metropolitan areas. With people so concentrated, social change can be rapid, the

sense of responsibility for one's neighbors is diminished, and the impact of a catastrophe is so overwhelmingly large that no neighborhood—however well-intentioned—can possibly cope with it.

Urban concentration has made necessary large technological projects in transportation, water, sewage and waste disposal, as well as housing construction and renewal. The pace of technological adaptation of man to his environment has certainly increased.

At the same time, we have—if anything—impaired our ability to identify and deal with the inescapable social dislocations that accompany new urban technology. The burgeoning growth of social programs at Federal, regional, state, county and municipal levels has already created a cats-cradle of inter-governmental authorities. Partial data of varying quality are pouring out to confuse us. Large projects employing "systems" techniques are taking into account social impacts related to their own construction, but cannot hope to coordinate with similar social impact analysis of other projects.

Clearly, in the collection, management, and evaluation of sociological data, the qualitative evidence points without exception to our large and growing deficiency. William Gorham, Assistant Secretary for Program Coordination in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, said last year that, "When it comes to planning for the efficient allocation of national resources against competing social needs, the United States is an underdeveloped country. We have neither a planning board examining possible futures nor a central statistical agency gathering the data necessary to evaluate possible ways of getting there."

Gorham's chief, HEW Secretary John W. Gardner, has given this glum appraisal of past practice: "We have a great and honored tradition of stumbling into the future. In management of the present, our nation is—as nations go—fairly rational, systematic, and orderly. But when it comes to movement into the future, we are heedless and impulsive. We leap before we look. We act first and think later. We back into next year's problems studying the solutions to last year's problems. This has been true as long as I can remember."

Two reasons are sometimes advanced for our past unwillingness to take the necessary steps to prevent future chaos. Long range social planning is supposed to be expensive, and to be restrictive of freedom. It can be both; I suggest that it need be neither.

Long ago, John Dewey pointed out the essential distinction between planning in a dictatorship and planning in a democracy. Dictatorial planning sets fixed time goals over long periods and rigidly programs actions to achieve them. Democratic societies must plan continuously, modifying programs and even objectives flexibly as circumstances change. Technology and the planning for its use become our servants, not our masters.

In a seminar late in June this year and formal hearings on "The Full Opportunity and Social Accounting Act" during July, forty-two witnesses were heard. They came from a wide array of posts in government, the academic world, and public and private efforts to deal with social change. They were unanimous in endorsing the principle on which this legislation is founded—the need for better information and coordinated efforts to improve the social health of the nation. Senator Fred Harris of Oklahoma, Chairman of the Subcommittee on Government Research which conducted the hearings, said at the close of the session, "It is perfectly clear that this Act, with refinements, should become law."

Today our country is confronted with an issue that may be as dangerous to national stability as was the Civil War. As we at-

tempt to face that issue we know too little about the causes of ghetto upheaval and the forces at play in the current crisis.

We would know more now if we had been working at it harder in the past. That is what the "Full Opportunity and Social Accounting Act" is all about. It could provide expert knowledge at the highest level of visibility. It could give the social state of the nation the kind of analysis it must have. Perhaps it could present alternatives to violence for the President, the Congress, and the American public to consider.

Unless we provide government with new modern tools we are likely to waste more and more of our resources in crash programs without knowing what will result, a process both wasteful and dangerous.

CONFERENCE OF WORLD PEACE THROUGH LAW

Mr. NELSON, Mr. President, earlier this summer, from July 11 through July 14 the Conference of World Peace Through Law was held in Geneva, Switzerland.

Mr. James B. Brennan, U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Wisconsin was present at the Conference, in his role as an observer for U.S. Attorney General Ramsey Clark.

The presence of distinguished citizens of nations throughout the world made a great impact on the Conference and its work.

Recently, Mr. Brennan sent a report to the Attorney General containing his reactions and impression of the Conference's work.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Brennan's report be printed in the RECORD, so that the Senate can benefit by Mr. Brennan's observations.

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

U.S. ATTORNEY,

Milwaukee, Wis., August 18, 1967.

HON. RAMSEY CLARK,
Attorney General,
Department of Justice,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR GENERAL: Thank you for granting me the observer's role at the World Peace through Law Conference in Geneva July 11 through 14. I enjoyed being part of the conference and was honored to be one of your information gatherers.

The fledgling World Peace Through Law organization, age four, met at Geneva, Switzerland. Over one hundred countries were represented. The opening sessions of the conference were held at the Palais Des Nations. The Palais was constructed to house the old League of Nations a half a century ago. The work sessions of the conference were held at the Hotel Intercontinental in Geneva.

The opening statements, 14 of them, made the case for world peace through law. One of the most arresting speakers was the Honorable René Cassin of France, who is the president of the European Court of Human Rights. This octogenarian who presided at the cornerstone-laying ceremony for the Palais Des Nations 50 years ago has been in the fight for peace through law since then. His effort indicated his enthusiasm and drive has not been contained. He told us that in spite of the setbacks to the concept of resolving international disputes by law instead of war, he felt that the League and its successor, United Nations, have made great strides.

The Swiss speakers recalled their unique position in the world of peace with a 150 year record going for them.

Chief Justice Earl Warren set the pace for the conference. He zeroed in on the fact that international law works well when universally accepted. He gave several examples. He then made the point that the United Nations, although it is not a legislative body, has decided on many treaties which would be of benefit to the world. He then stated, and I quote from his speech:

"Instead of matching each other soldier for soldier, plane for plane, bomb for bomb and missile for missile, let us create a new kind of competition, a new kind of rivalry, let us match each other law for law, treaty for treaty, until all contacts and relationships in the world community are covered with law; law which prevents disputes or law which channels disputes into law institutions for peaceful decision. Let us concentrate on creation of so much law that controls so much of mankind's interdependent, transnational contacts, that disputes large enough to cause war will be guided into courthouses and away from battlefields. Thus can we render war obsolete in the 'law-full' world we must have if humankind is to survive the power nations now possess."

After urging international dialogue and agreement, the Chief Justice told us that world lawyers could make this effort reality if each in his own way attempted to engage his own country in international dialogue, dialogue that would eventually cover the friction spots of international relations. It was a wonderful talk. It was well received and put the prestige of American Jurisprudence on the side of the valiant souls who fight to resolve world conflicts by means consistent with our dignity as persons.

Harold Stassen made two points of note in his address. His talk was well received. One point was that the United Nations should include all nations; the second, realizing that some countries are hung up on the point of admitting certain nations to the U.N., that body should amend its charter. The charter is now 22 years old and according to Stassen, it should be amended to insure dialogues among all countries of the world.

The working sessions of the conference discussed peacekeeping, disarmament, space law and international communications, legal information, research by computers, patents, international trade and investment, housing and urban development, development of law by international organizations, impact of science and technology on law, legal aspects of peaceful cooperation among nations, human rights, research and legal education. The working sessions would begin with comprehensive work papers by legal giants who would thoroughly discuss, digest and conclude.

The peasants such as me in the audience were impressed by the background of the speakers and the wealth of material they had on the subjects. I was surprised that there was so little participation by the general convention delegates. There was some good discussion.

One African delegate criticized the remarks of Kataro Tanaka of the International Court of Justice. Judge Tanaka made the point in his work paper that few people know where the Court of World Justice is, and fewer know its jurisdiction. The African delegate told him and the other delegates that the residence of the Court should be kept a secret. He told of a case his country brought before the international tribunal. The matter was before the Court for five years, only to be dismissed for want of jurisdiction.

Another spark of life for the convention was an Australian delegate who argued against one of the resolutions before the conference. That resolution, Number 15, urged granting to the United Nations the resources of the High Seas for its control. The Australian asked that the resolution be

defeated until all nations were in the United Nations.

The working session that I liked the best was the impact of science and technology on law. The work paper was offered by C. Wilfred Jenks. This Mr. Jenks is quite a fellow. I am going to enclose his remarks with my report. He is very quotable. He is the recipient of the Outstanding Legal Scholar Award of 1967 given by the conference. His talk took the lead from Justice Warren, that the more international dialogue the better. He urged continual renewal by lawyers. He said international law must be raised substantially because of the great stakes that are involved. He pointed out that law cannot be static. He said that we stand on others' shoulders and that we must improve the law as given to us. He said, "... the status quo is change... law is the orderly discipline of change." He said our role is "... transforming the law of nations as we have inherited it into the common law of mankind." Speaking of the peril of our times in that we have not enough international dialogue, he said, "While the time grows late, we are not yet forfeit to the furies." He urged the quest of the ages beginning with Plato, making philosophers of kings and kings of philosophers, so that a wise interrelation of justice and power would exist. He referred to the Herman Melville classic, *Billie Bud*, in these terms, "... We must strive for the interplay of the warm hearts and the cool heads." I thought his proposal at the end of his work paper calling for a declaration of general principles dedicating science and technology to the service of man a prime target. He spoke of the goal of every man in these terms, "... Justice and welfare are the rewards of courage and magnanimity."

The convention did realize that the charge of a debating society as leveled at the United Nations was not without merit. Peace keeping by the United Nations and the League of Nations has seen a few successes. The speakers at the conference did not try to argue this point. They did state that while the success of peace keeping has been limited, so too, is our venture into world peace organization. We have only 50 years experience. Wilfred Jenks states that we "... stand on others' shoulders and are better off for the League and the United Nations existence. It is for us to build on."

The human rights working session heralded the culmination of 20 years' work in the United Nations of the declaration of human rights. This rather meager effort represents the difficulty of international agreement. The declaration is, and I quote, "As a common standard of achievement for all peoples and all nations, to the end that every individual and every organ of society, keeping this declaration constantly in mind, shall strive by teaching and education to promote respect for these rights and freedoms and by progressive measures, national and international, to secure their universal and effective recognition and observance..."

This declaration is but the start. We must move to the specifics of racial discrimination, religious discrimination and discrimination of thought and conscience. Further work remains in the obvious area of implementation of these ideals.

My particular interest was the area of criminal law. The drafting of a bill outlawing crimes against humanity is being considered by a committee headed by Julius Stone of Australia. It is necessary that such law be written, promulgated and ratified. This will take some doing and time. The criticism of Nuremberg was leveled at the fact that we did not have such a law. Our effort, if successful, based on the Nuremberg principle and precedent would negate any future attacks of the Ex Post Facto type.

The conference was a great lesson to me. It showed the blending of idealism with the practical beginning steps of the world trying

to rid itself of one of its worst sicknesses. Steps while slow and halting are sure and taken by men of dedication, intelligence and sacrifice. I was fortunate to be on hand.

Thank you again for the encouragement and opportunity to attend. I hope my worm's eye view will whet your appetite for the next conference. I know that you would be able to contribute much in ability and prestige and shorten the time to the goal of all men—world peace through law.

Please accept my sympathy for your father's sickness. With our prayers and good Texas blood on his side, the stay in the hospital will be short.

Sincerely,

JAMES B. BRENNAN,
U.S. Attorney.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider a treaty on the Executive Calendar.

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

TREATY OF AMITY AND ECONOMIC RELATIONS WITH THAILAND

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Senate, pursuant to the order of August 28, 1967, will proceed to vote on the resolution of ratification of Executive P (89th Cong., second sess.), the Treaty of Amity and Economic Relations between the United States of America and the Kingdom of Thailand.

The question is on agreeing to the resolution of ratification. 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. BIBLE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANFIELD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the

Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. PAS-TORE and Mr. PELL], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] would each vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 69, nays 0, not voting 31, as follows:

[No. 241 Ex.]

YEAS—69

Aiken	Griffin	Miller
Allott	Gruening	Mondale
Baker	Hansen	Monroney
Bartlett	Harris	Morse
Bayh	Hartke	Morton
Bennett	Hayden	Mundt
Boggs	Hickenlooper	Nelson
Brewster	Hill	Pearson
Brooke	Holland	Prouty
Burdick	Hollings	Proxmire
Byrd, Va.	Hruska	Ribicoff
Byrd, W. Va.	Inouye	Scott
Cannon	Jordan, Idaho	Smathers
Carlson	Kennedy, Mass.	Smith
Clark	Kuchel	Sparkman
Cooper	Lausche	Spong
Curtis	Long, Mo.	Stennis
Dirksen	McCarthy	Talmadge
Ellender	McClellan	Thurmond
Ervin	McGee	Tower
Fannin	McGovern	Williams, Del.
Fong	McIntyre	Yarborough
Fulbright	Metcalfe	Young, Ohio

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—31

Anderson	Jackson	Pastore
Bible	Javits	Pell
Case	Jordan, N.C.	Percy
Church	Kennedy, N.Y.	Randolph
Cotton	Long, La.	Russell
Dodd	Magnuson	Symington
Dominick	Mansfield	Tydings
Eastland	Montoya	Williams, N.J.
Gore	Moss	Young, N. Dak.
Hart	Murphy	
Hatfield	Muskie	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLINGS in the chair). Two-thirds of the Senators present and voting having voted in the affirmative, the resolution of ratification is agreed to.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the

President be immediately notified of the ratification of the treaty.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate return to the consideration of legislative business.

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] is recognized.

ECONOMISTS WHO URGE TAX INCREASE OVERLOOK THE BIG ECONOMIC ARGUMENTS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this morning's newspapers report that a group of some 260 economists have signed a statement urging congressional enactment of a tax increase "along the general lines proposed by the President."

The sponsorship of this statement, Joseph Pechman, Joseph L. Bach, and Walter Heller, is indeed distinguished. These are able, honest, and competent economists. Their conclusions deserve careful and thoughtful consideration by Members of Congress before we act on the tax increase.

Other eminent economists have joined them.

But, Mr. President, as chairman of the congressional Joint Economic Committee and as one who opposes a tax increase, I would suggest these serious reservations on this statement to my colleagues in the Congress:

First. There are over 12,000 members of the American Economic Association, the professional association for economists in this country. Compared to that total 260 is not impressive. It represents less than 2½ percent of the association.

Second. It is disappointing that these economists rest their case on an extremely generalized statement of less than 500 words without a word of economic analysis, and on the simple assumption that "rapidly rising Federal expenditures will be injected into an economy in which total expenditures are moving steadily upward and that the interplay of these increases threatens renewed inflation."

Such a statement at the very least calls for some quantitative assessment of the dimensions and nature of the big Federal expenditures that are likely to be so inflationary and some evaluation of the private expenditures. The economists give us no analysis, not a word. We are apparently to take their assertion on faith.

For the past weeks I have been working with the staff of the Joint Economic Committee on just the kind of assessment the economists fail to make. I have been impressed by the fact that Federal expenditures are not likely to provide the inflationary stimulation, the economists fear.

Indeed, defense expenditures is the one area where most casual observers assume that Government spending is likely to be inflationary and yet this is exactly the sector of the economy that has already delivered its most telling inflationary punch.

Just before the recess I placed in the RECORD the latest defense economic indicators. They showed that while defense spending had climbed in the latest period, new orders from defense were leveling off. And independent analyses of defense prospects suggest that they will level off for some time and then gradually fall, even if the Vietnam war continues.

Other Federal spending increases will also have a relatively modest effect on the economy.

In the private sector the big economic fact is the slowdown in business investment in plant and equipment. For three years, 1964 through 1966, this country saw the biggest and most rapid increase in this accelerator of the economy in our history by far.

But this year the accelerator has slowed down greatly. From a rise of 14 to 17 percent during the preceding 3-year period capital investment will drop to a rise of 3 or 4 percent or less this year. With capacity operations now at 85 percent why in the world should a businessman buy much new equipment or add to plant at such a breakneck rate?

There is still substantial inventory overhang, though this has eased considerably. Consumer spending may increase substantially. But the total expenditures in the economy seem most unlikely to soar and the productive capacity of American industry has so immensely increased that even if we do have sharply climbing demand, it is unlikely to be the principal cause of inflation. Industry is able as never before to meet growing markets.

Indeed, a tax increase by increasing corporate costs contains in itself a substantial contribution to cost-push inflation.

There is no recognition in the economists' statement of the fact that American industry is now trudging along at less than 85 percent of capacity utilization, or that capacity utilization is now below the 1964 level when taxes were reduced for the express purpose of stimulating more production.

There is no recognition of the fact that nearly 3 million Americans are unemployed. They constitute 3.8 percent of the work force. This is substantially above the unemployment level of 3½ percent which the Joint Economic Committee unanimously—Republican and Democratic—recommended as an interim goal with 3 percent as a longer range goal.

There is no recognition of the fact that factory workers continue to work hours that are close to the shortest in 6 years.

There is no recognition of the fact that this economy is unlikely to grow at a rate of more than 3 percent this year, which is far below the rate of growth most of these same economists have repeatedly urged on the Joint Economic

Committee as necessary to achieve full utilization of this Nation's resources and meet the many economic challenges we face at home and abroad.

Third. The absence of analysis is particularly glaring in the brief dismissal of expenditure cuts as a solution to any excessive pressures that develop. With full respect for these economists, and I respect them highly, have they really examined the public expenditure policy, the appropriation process, the powers of the President to hold back expenditures sufficiently to warrant this airy dismissal of expenditure cuts?

And they are dead wrong in identifying cuts with the poverty program. My statements have repeatedly specified other programs that can be reduced, and sharply, without turning our backs on our social responsibilities.

Fourth. In his letter to the chairman of the Committee on Finance forwarding the statement, Mr. Pechman says that the statement urges "prompt" enactment of the tax hike. But the statement itself specifies that the economists, "do not necessarily agree on the timing of the tax increase."

This timing is crucial. Certainly a case can be made for a tax increase for the last quarter of this year. There is growing economic evidence that between October 1 and December 31 demand may cascade. It may not. But there is not the remotest chance that the Congress will complete action on the tax bill until the quarter is half gone. The effective date is unlikely to be before January 1. The situation after January 1 is far more cloudy. To enact a tax increase, as the President is requesting for 2 years, to take effect January 1 could be a serious economic blunder, prompting unemployment, stunting economic growth. It could eliminate a million jobs.

To contend that Congress can quickly reverse the tax increase is to overlook the big political fact that 1968 is an election year. Also we do not serve the interests of the economy by treating tax policy like a yo-yo.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD the statement by 260 economists, together with their names and their associations, and the letter of transmittal from Mr. Pechman to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long] dated September 8, 1967.

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

THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION,
Washington, D.C., September 8, 1967.

HON. RUSSELL B. LONG,
Chairman, Committee on Finance,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am enclosing for your information, and for the information of your Committee, a statement signed by 260 economists urging prompt congressional action to raise taxes. These economists are associated with universities and other organizations throughout the country and represent all shades of opinion within the profession.

The statement was circulated by Joseph L. Bach of Stanford University, Walter W. Heller of the University of Minnesota, and me during the last three weeks. Additional signa-

tures are still coming in and I will forward a complete list to you in the very near future.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

JOSEPH A. PECHMAN,
Director of Economic Studies.

ECONOMISTS' STATEMENT

Two hundred sixty economists today urged prompt congressional action to raise taxes.

"Although we do not necessarily agree on the exact amount or timing of the tax increase, we urge early enactment of tax legislation along the general lines proposed by the President," they declared in a joint statement.

George L. Bach of Stanford University, Walter W. Heller of the University of Minnesota, and Joseph A. Pechman of the Brookings Institution circulated the statement among their academic colleagues. The statement has been submitted to the Chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee, which are responsible for preparing tax legislation.

"... action will soon be needed to restrain the economy in order to maintain orderly growth, prevent a resurgence of inflation, and forestall excessive reliance on tight money," the economists warned. "With government expenditures rising rapidly, the growth of total demand threatens to exceed the capacity of the economy to increase total output.

"In these circumstances, a new round of inflation is likely unless demand is moderated by government policy," the statement continued. "We believe that a tax increase should be a major ingredient of that policy."

The economists added: "... we are in agreement that—given the projected size of military outlays—cuts in federal civilian programs big enough to avert the need for a tax increase are highly unlikely. Many of us feel that, even if they were possible, such cuts would be poor—indeed, dangerous—social policy in the light of the conditions of millions of our citizens living in the ghettos of our cities."

The full text of the statement and a list of its signers are attached.

STATEMENT ON TAX POLICY

Four years ago an unprecedented tax cut of \$11 billion was enacted to accelerate economic recovery and stimulate a high rate of economic growth. It is widely acknowledged that the tax cut served these ends well.

Now the time has come when action will soon be needed to restrain the economy in order to maintain orderly growth, prevent a resurgence of inflation, and forestall excessive reliance on tight money. With government expenditures rising rapidly, the growth of total demand threatens to exceed the capacity of the economy to increase total output.

In these circumstances, a new round of inflation is likely unless demand is moderated by government policy. We believe that a tax increase should be a major ingredient of that policy.

The economic case for a tax increase does not rest on the fear of a large deficit as such—i.e., without regard to other economic conditions—and it rests least of all on fear of a large deficit in the administrative budget. Rather, the case is based on the fact that rapidly rising federal expenditures will be injected into an economy in which total expenditures are moving steadily upward and that the interplay of these increases threatens renewed inflation.

A tax increase is also needed to help avoid the degree of credit tightness experienced a year ago. We are concerned lest monetary conditions become too restrictive unless tax policy is used in conjunction with monetary policy to promote stability.

Our support for a tax increase does not

imply support of all federal policies, foreign and domestic. However, we are in agreement that—given the projected size of military outlays—cuts in federal civilian programs big enough to avert the need for a tax increase are highly unlikely. Many of us feel that, even if they were possible, such cuts would be poor—indeed, dangerous—social policy in the light of the conditions of millions of our citizens living in the ghettos of our cities.

We favor a flexible tax policy, which means raising as well as lowering taxes when needed. Although we do not necessarily agree on the exact amount or timing of the tax increase, we urge early enactment of tax legislation along the general lines proposed by the President.

Adams, Earl, University of Pittsburgh; Albrecht, W. P., University of Iowa; Alexander, A. P., University of California (Santa Barbara); Altman, Stuart H., Brown University; Andersen, Theodore A., University of California (Los Angeles); Anderson, W. H. Locke, University of Michigan; Ando, Albert, University of Pennsylvania; Andron, Mortimer, University of California (Santa Barbara); Asher, Robert E., Brookings Institution.

Bach, George L., Stanford University; Baratz, Morton S., Bryn Mawr College; Barlow, Robin, University of Michigan; Barth, Glenn R., University of Montana; Baumol, William J., Princeton University; Behrman, J. N., University of North Carolina; Behrman, Jere R., University of Pennsylvania; Bell, David E., Ford Foundation; Bell, Phillip W., Haverford College; Bernstein, Edward M., EMB, Ltd.; Bird, Richard M., Harvard University; Bishop, R. L., Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Black, Stanley, Princeton University; Blough, Roy, Columbia University; Bolle, Arnold W., University of Montana; Bonnen, James T., Michigan State University; Bonomo, Victor A., University of California (Santa Barbara); Bowen, Howard R., University of Iowa; Brazer, Harvey E., University of Michigan; Brewer, Michael F., Resources for the Future; Brigham, E. F., University of California (Los Angeles); Bronfenbrenner, Martin, University of Pittsburgh; Brown, E. Cary, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Brownlee, O. H., University of Minnesota; Buechel, Henry, University of Washington; Bunke, Harvey C., University of Indiana.

Cagan, Phillip D., National Bureau of Economic Research; Campbell, Robert, University of Indiana; Capron, William M., Brookings Institution; Caves, Richard E., Harvard University; Chamberlain, Marlam K., Ford Foundation; Chandler, Lester, Princeton University; Chase, Samuel B., Jr., University of Montana; Childs, Gerald L., Dartmouth College; Chinitz, Benjamin, Brown University; Clement, M. O., Dartmouth College; Coen, Edward, University of Minnesota; Coleman, John R., Ford Foundation; Colm, Gerhard, National Planning Association; Colwell, B. Joe, University of Texas; Comanor, William, Harvard University; Cooper, Richard, Yale University; Cross, John G., University of Michigan; Cumberland, John H., University of Maryland.

Daniels, Mark R., Brown University; Darling, Paul G., Bowdoin College; Davidson, Ralph K., Rockefeller Foundation; Davis, Tom E., Cornell University; Dearborn, D., University of North Carolina; de Chazeau, Melvin G., Cornell University; de Janosi, Peter E., Ford Foundation; Denison, Edward F., Brookings Institution; Dobell, A. R., Harvard University; Doeringer, Peter B., Harvard University; Dorsey, John

W., University of Maryland; Dunkman, William E., University of Rochester. Eckaus, R. S., Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Eckstein, Alexander, University of Michigan; Eckstein, Otto, Harvard University; Edens, David G., University of Connecticut; Elteman, David K., University of California (Los Angeles).

Felix, David, Washington University, St. Louis; Fetter, Frank W., Dartmouth College; Frank, Charles R., Jr., Princeton University; Friend, Irwin, University of Pennsylvania; Foster, Edward, University of Minnesota.

Galbraith, John Kenneth, Harvard University; Galenson, Walter, Cornell University; Gerschenkron, Alexander, Harvard University; Geyer, Herbert, Hunter College; Gillingham, J. B., University of Washington; Girard, Richard A., New York University; Goldfeld, Stephen, Princeton University; Goodrich, Carter, University of Pittsburgh; Gordon, Kermit, Brookings Institution; Gordon, Wendell, University of Texas; Grabowski, Henry, Yale University; Green, George D., University of Minnesota; Grossman, Herschel I., Brown University; Grubbs, C. M., University of Texas; Grunwald, Joseph, Brookings Institution.

Hagen, E. E., Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Hall, C., Yale University; Hensen, Alvin H., Harvard University; Harkavy, Oscar, Ford Foundation; Harris, Curtis, C., Jr., University of Maryland; Harris, Edward H., Bowdoin College; Harris, Seymour E., University of California, La Jolla; Hefebower, R. B., Northwestern University; Heliker, George B., University of Montana; Heller, Walter W., University of Minnesota; Henderson, James M., University of Minnesota; Hester, D., Yale University; Hill, Forest G., University of Texas; Ho, Sam, Yale University; Holbrook, Robert S., University of Michigan; Hoover, Edgar M., University of Pittsburgh; Huber, J. Richard, University of Washington; Hunter, Helen M., Swarthmore College; Hunter, Holland, Haverford College; Hurwicz, Leonid, University of Minnesota.

Ishikawa, Mamour, University of Pittsburgh; Jacoby, Henry D., Harvard University; Jacoby, Nell H., University of California (Los Angeles); Johnson, Dudley D., Dartmouth College; Joseph, Hyman, University of Iowa; Juster, F. Thomas, National Bureau of Economic Research.

Kaminsky, Ralph, New York University; Kareken, John, University of Minnesota; Katz, Arnold, University of Pittsburgh; Kawaji, Michael, University of California (Los Angeles); Kayson, Carl, Institute for Advanced Study; Kendrick, David, Harvard University; Kennedy, W. F., University of California (Santa Barbara); Kerr, Clark, University of California (Berkeley); Kiesling, Herbert J., Indiana University; Kindleberger, Charles P., Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Knaverhase, Ramon, University of Connecticut; Krause, Lawrence B., Brookings Institution; Kravis, Irving B., University of Pennsylvania; Krueger, Anne O., University of Minnesota.

Laffer, Arthur B., Brookings Institution; Lebergott, Stanley, Wesleyan University; Legler, John B., Washington University, St. Louis; Leiserson, Mark, Yale University; Lepper, Susan, Yale University; Levin, Charles L., Washington University, St. Louis; Levinson, Harold M., University of Michigan; Lindahl, Martin L., Dartmouth College; Lintner, John, Harvard University; Litvack, J. M., Princeton University; Liu, Ta-Chung, Cornell University;

Lubin, Isador, Twentieth Century Fund.

Machlup, Fritze, Princeton University; Malenbaum, Wilfred, University of Pennsylvania; Mamalakis, M.; Marx, Daniel, Jr., Dartmouth College; Mason, Edward S., Harvard University; Maxwell, James A., Clark University; McCarthy, Michael D., Brookings Institution; McDonald, Stephen L., University of Texas; McKenzie, Kionel W., University of Rochester; McLaughlin, M. M., Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Mead, Walter J., University of California (Santa Barbara); Melder, F. Eugene, Clark University; Menge, John A., Dartmouth College; Mercer, L. J., University of California (Santa Barbara); Mesa Lago, Carmelo, University of Pittsburgh; Mikesell, Raymond F., University of Oregon; Miller, John Perry, Yale University; Miller, Richard A., Wesleyan University; Miller, Taulman A., Indiana University; Miskimin, Harry, Yale University; Morgan, Chester A., University of Iowa.

Morgan, Daniel C., Jr., University of Texas; Morgan, W. Douglas, University of California (Santa Barbara); Morton, Herbert C., Brookings Institution; Munk, Bernard, University of Michigan; Musgrave, Richard A., Harvard University; Muth, Richard F., Washington University, St. Louis; Myers, Charles A., Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Neenan, William B., University of Michigan; Nelson, James R., Amherst College; Oates, W. E., Princeton University; Okner, Benjamin, Ohio State University; Olson, Paul R., University of Iowa; Orhon, Alper Y., Dartmouth College; Orr, Lloyd D., Indiana University.

Palmer, William B., University of Michigan; Pechman, Joseph A., Brookings Institution; Pendleton, William C., Ford Foundation; Perkins, Dwight H., Harvard University; Perlman, Mark, University of Pittsburgh; Perloff, Harvey S., Resources for the Future; Perry, George L., University of Minnesota; Peterson, R. L., University of Montana; Pidot, George B., Jr., Dartmouth College; Pierson, Frank C., Swarthmore College; Podoff, D., University of California (Santa Barbara); Pollak, Robert A., University of Pennsylvania.

Rafuse, Robert W., Jr., Brookings Institution; Rees, Albert, Princeton University; Resnick, Adrian N., Princeton University; Reynolds, Lloyd G., Yale University; Robertson, Ross M., Indiana University; Robinson, Marshall A., Ford Foundation; Rolph, Earl, University of California (Berkeley); Roosa, Robert V., Brown Brothers Hariman and Co.; Rubin, Julius, University of Pittsburgh; Russell, R. Robert, University of California (Santa Barbara).

Salant, Walter S., Brookings Institution; Samuelson, Paul A., Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Sandberg, Lars G., Dartmouth College; Sargent, Albert J., Clark University; Savage, Donald T., Clark University; Schaller, Howard G., Indiana University; Scherer, F. M., University of Michigan; Schupack, Mark B., Brown University; Segal, Martin, Dartmouth College; Shannon, Richard E., University of Montana; Shapiro, H. T., University of Michigan; Shell, Karl, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Shipman, William D., Bowdoin College; Siebert, Calvin D., University of Iowa; Siegel, A. J., Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Simler, Norman J., University of Minnesota; Singer, Arthur L., Jr.,

Carnegie Corporation; Smith, H. M., University of Minnesota; Smith, Keith V., University of California (Los Angeles); Smith, Warren L., University of Michigan; Snavelly, William P., University of Connecticut; Sobel, Irvin, Washington University, St. Louis; Sonnenschein, Hugo, University of Minnesota; Stein, Emanuel, New York University; Stern, Robert M., University of Michigan; Stevens, Guy V. G., Brookings Institution; Straszheim, Mahlon R., Harvard University; Sullivan, James J., University of California (Santa Barbara); Sussna, Edward, University of Pittsburgh.

Taubman, Paul, University of Pennsylvania; Taylor, Maurice C., University of Montana; Taylor, Norman E., University of Montana; Taylor, Philip E., University of Connecticut; Teaf, Howard M., Jr., Haverford College; Teigen, Ronald L., University of Michigan; Throop, Adrian, Dartmouth College; Tiebout, Charles M., University of Washington; Tobin, James, Yale University; Tsiang, S. C., University of Rochester; Turner, Robert C., Indiana University; Ulman, Lloyd, University of California (Berkeley).

Van Tassel, Roger C., Clark University; Votey, Harold L., Jr., University of California (Santa Barbara); Wallace, Nell, University of Minnesota; Wallace, Robert F., University of Montana; Walsh, Cornelius F., Clark University; Weidenbaum, Murray L., Washington University, St. Louis; Weston, J. F., University of California (Los Angeles); Whitman, Marina, University of Pittsburgh; Wicks, John H., University of Montana; Wilcox, Clair, Swarthmore College; Wilde, J. A., University of North Carolina; Williams, Robert M., University of California (Los Angeles); Williamson, Oliver E., University of Pennsylvania; Willis, Robert J., Wesleyan University; Wilson, George W., Indiana University; Wingo, Lowden, Jr., Resources for the Future; Winnick, Louis, Ford Foundation; Witte, James G., Indiana University; Wu S., University of Iowa; Zabel, Edward, University of Rochester.

ASCS PAYMENTS TO MR. R. A. BOATMAN

Mr. MILLER, Mr. President in testimony before the Agriculture Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee on April 7 of this year, the Administrator of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service of the Department of Agriculture listed Mr. R. A. Boatman, of Ida Grove, Iowa, as having received payments amounting to \$11,954. Mr. Boatman subsequently protested this figure, which was reported in the August 13 issue of the Des Moines Register, and claimed that the payments amounted to \$7,212.37. I have received a letter, dated August 31, from the ASCS Washington, D.C., office which confirms Mr. Boatman's statement, and I ask unanimous consent that an appropriate extract from this letter be placed in the RECORD.

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

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., August 31, 1967.

HON. JACK MILLER,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MILLER: Following are the 1966 program payments for Mr. Boatman.

These payments were made under the feed grain program on four farms which are identified with the amounts.

G-12 -----	\$355.77
	1,223.60
B-151 -----	474.68
	1,632.53
B-152 -----	462.17
	1,589.42
B-5 -----	442.10
	1,142.10
Total -----	7,212.37

The above payments agree with the amounts which Mr. Boatman claimed he received as itemized in his letter to you of August 16.

Sincerely yours,

RAY FITZGERALD,
Acting Administrator.

THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, we in Congress who voted to enact the Higher Education Act of 1965, are now able to learn of the dramatic impact it is having on educational institutions throughout all of the States.

Small schools as well as large universities have enjoyed a tremendous upsurge under the programs begun 2 short years ago.

President Richard P. Bailey, of Northland College, Ashland, Wis., recently wrote to the President of the United States to express gratitude for President Johnson's efforts on behalf of this program.

The letter has been reprinted by the Democratic National Committee. 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:

NORTHLAND COLLEGE,
Ashland, Wis.

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PRESIDENT JOHNSON: I have read that you consider your programs of aid to colleges and universities a most important aspect of the Johnson administration. Well you may. Please accept the sincere appreciation of little Northland College in Wisconsin and of its grateful president.

The financial help given us by our government under your administration has meant survival, development, and expanded and improved offerings of higher education to hundreds of students from more than 25 states in the nation.

At our commencement services Sunday (June 11) we graduated 127 seniors. We serve a total student body of 750. Just a few years ago we had an enrollment of less than 400 and a graduating class of 75; we were a struggling college in an isolated area of economic depression with little hope for the future and small reason for continuing the struggle.

Since 1963, by loan and grant, we have received slightly more than two million dollars for capital building expansion.

This year our students have received \$121,000 in loans, grants, and work-study programs; our library has received \$5,000 to improve its holdings; and a self-study program of our curriculum, student admissions, and administration has been funded (under Title III, developing colleges) in the amount of \$73,600.

These funds have not been easily obtained, nor have they been carelessly bestowed. The college has had to prove its eligibility and repay or match the funds made available.

Let me identify just three of our programs which have obtained federal financial cooperation.

(1) *Rustic Log Bridge*.—Under a work-study grant students have constructed a log bridge across a campus creek. Joining the government in this project were a lumberman who supplied the logs, an engineer who designed the project, a hardware supplier who gave us bolts, screws, and plates, and a local utility company which loaned us heavy equipment, and the college itself which paid the salary of a supervisor and 10 per cent of the student-workers' wages. This summer we are building a second log bridge in the same cooperative manner.

(2) *Science Building*.—We used, for the first time last fall, our new \$700,000 science building. The financing of this building started with a federal grant of \$227,000 which we matched with a \$200,000 foundation grant and \$75,000 of the college's funds. We borrowed \$250,000 from the federal government to be repaid over a 30-year period at a low interest rate—and the dream became a reality.

(3) *Self-Study of Curriculum, Students, and Administration*.—Beginning next fall, Northland College will study itself in depth under the supervision and with the advice of the University of Wisconsin. The federal grant of \$73,600 makes this possible. The University of Wisconsin cooperates by making its vast resources, tremendous experience, and qualified faculty members and administrators available to us for assistance. Northland College provides faculty and administrative released time, office space, and secretarial help. As a result of this program we can improve ourselves internally and plot our direction toward excellence for the years ahead.

Every project has been approved only after careful study has been made by the college and a proposal worked out which competes with proposals from all other colleges and universities in the nation. We have been able to show need, development, and wise utilization of funds. We have gained a new pride in ourselves as a small but important part of American higher education. Our relationships with the various officials of the government with whom we deal has been excellent. There have been forms to fill out and reports to be submitted but these have clearly been necessary to prove our original worth and our proper use of grants and loans.

Accept, Mr. President, the thanks of Northland College which exists and reaches toward excellence because of financial assistance provided through the efforts of you and your administration.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD P. BAILEY,
President.

THE PEACE CORPS AND THE ACADEMIC COMMUNITY

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, the Peace Corps, as it enters its 7th year, continues to seek better ways to accomplish its worldwide purposes of being of service and promoting understanding. Last week at the American Psychological Association's annual convention here in Washington, the Acting Deputy Director of the Peace Corps, Mr. Brent K. Ashabranner, presented a speech which stresses the way in which improved training programs are producing better Peace Corps volunteers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Ashabranner's speech be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE PEACE CORPS AND THE ACADEMIC COMMUNITY: A HOPEFUL CASE OF THE 7-YEAR ITCH

In recent months, there have been scattered reports in newspapers and journals which have fed rumors that there might be a rift between the Peace Corps and the academic community.

You may have read, for example, that we disagreed with a leading university about training operations on its campus.

You may have read also that we plan an increased emphasis on training Peace Corps Volunteers in new centers which we will own and operate.

Some may think that for a relatively young institution, which relied heavily on academia in the beginning, we have grown mightily independent.

I am inclined to agree that the honeymoon is over.

But I believe that we are in many ways closer because of our differences. The Peace Corps is entering its seventh year. We are suffering, I think, what marriage counselors might call a "protracted relationship syndrome"; in short, we have a case of the seven year itch.

Since the summer of 1961, nearly 30,000 Americans have served or are serving overseas in the largest international experiment in education in recorded history.

Yet we have failed so far to adequately examine who is giving and who is taking in this fragile relationship built on a hasty marriage—or, indeed, if it should be a case of give and take.

On one level our seven year relationship has gone reasonably well. I believe that the preparation of our Volunteers for effective service has improved greatly during this time. The universities have been with us from the beginning in the training process, and we have learned together.

In the early days, we set out to separate the men from the boys and came up with what one professor called "a testing rather than a learning situation." Early Peace Corps training was an endurance test. We put the trainee in a classroom of precisely the kind most had just escaped from. Then for twelve weeks, from six in the morning until ten at night, we stuffed him with facts—some of which, hopefully, were relevant to what he was going to be doing overseas.

Next it seemed to us a good idea to take the student, fresh from the college dorm and throw him into some physically demanding situations with which he had to cope. Sometimes—supposedly to measure his confidence—we even threw him into a swimming pool with his hands and feet tied—although none of us can quite remember for which country he was being prepared.

That was our "Outward Bound" survival era.

Now we know that the trainee cares greatly about surviving *with people* as well as *in places*. He wants to know from us what and how the Nepali eat and drink and think; how the nomadic people of Botswana carry water and deliver babies; and how the Micronesians spear their food.

We have come to realize that there is negligible interest or value in setting up groups to discuss the anthropological aspects of the Andean Indian when the trainees are bound for Uruguay. We just don't have that kind of time. We must be on target.

We have found language fluency crucial to Volunteer effectiveness. In some of our early programs trainees sometimes had only a hundred hours of language study. Now we devote from 300–400 hours to intensive language instruction.

A few years back, one group of Colombian trainees studied Spanish by listening to—

and reciting with—an inexperienced Colombian student who read to them from the *World Almanac*. Now, trainees are more likely to have a book snatched from their hands. In groups of five or six they work with host country teachers in grueling, around-the-clock activities which emphasize the spoken language rather than literary skill. They are required to think, act, eat, work and play in the 120 languages we teach. And when they get tired of that, they go to the Language Lab.

At Dartmouth this summer, where a pre-training course was held for Volunteers bound for French-speaking Africa, campus police reported trainees headed for the Language Lab at 4:00 A.M. They were going because they wanted to and knew the importance of what they were doing—not because they were told to. And in the emergency room of the local hospital, a trainee for French-speaking Africa refused to register or speak in English to the doctors and nurses who stitched up a minor wound incurred playing soccer with other trainees.

The message has come back from overseas that Volunteers must speak the languages of their host countries, and the message has been heard.

We have made dramatic gains in technical studies. We now actually believe that we can take young men and women from Brooklyn and in three months teach them to raise chickens in India. We believe we can take liberal arts majors and teach them to grow rice in the Philippines or conduct disease surveys in Micronesia.

We not only believe it, we are doing it, with the help of such schools as the University of California at Davis and Fresno State. We cannot produce a farmer in three months, but we can give an intensively interested person what he needs to know about growing hybrid maize in the northwestern part of Mysore State in India.

An important factor in the change and improvement in training has been the returned Peace Corps Volunteers. It has taken us some time to learn how best to use their experience. They have also had to learn that having the experience and being able to transmit it are not the same thing.

But this year between 750-800 returned Volunteers assumed important positions in Peace Corps training programs as language coordinators, job instructors, and leaders of cultural studies seminars.

Recently *The New York Times* reported that the University of Maryland Department of Psychology had reserved five graduate assistantships for returned Volunteers.

According to the department chairman, the decision was made because—and I quote—"Peace Corps Volunteers are not only highly selected, they also display a combination of humanitarianism and hard-headed empiricism that should equip them well for a career in psychology."

Humanitarianism and hard-headed empiricism. These are the qualities that returned Volunteers bring to Peace Corps training.

And need I add that the Peace Corps appreciates such perceptiveness on the part of psychologists?

Another important change has been the move away from the college campus for more and more of our training—leaving the campus but taking the college training staff with us to the depressed rural areas, the urban ghetto, the Indian reservation, or our own camps in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

Moreover, this year, an increasing number of prospective Volunteers—about one in five—will receive a portion of their training in some of the 57 countries in which they will work.

And so training has turned into big business for us. In the coming year, about twenty-five per cent of the Peace Corps budget will go to preparing 11,000 new Volunteers for overseas services.

As we begin the seventh year of our relationship with colleges and universities, we have just begun to find ways to integrate preparation for Peace Corps service with formal degree study.

We are experimenting with five-year degree programs in which two years of Peace Corps service is credited towards a college degree. At the State University of New York at Brockport, for example, students will enter the program after their sophomore year, complete their junior year and two summers, and then be assigned overseas.

Twenty Harvard-Radcliffe seniors interned this summer in Panama, Senegal and Ethiopia. They return to Cambridge this month for continued study during their senior year. We expect to learn a good deal from them about independent study as a training technique.

These are only beginnings. Other models, other patterns must be developed. The Peace Corps will meet academia half way and more.

I am sure we will see in the next few years a sharp decrease in the old pattern of one-shot, *ad hoc*, training programs sprinkled willy nilly around the nation's campuses.

We are going to set up a few more Peace Corps-run training centers—our so-called "in-house" centers—which will concentrate on preparing Volunteers for specific areas of the world. We will certainly continue to need our university friends in these centers.

With a small number of universities I think we will also develop an in-depth relationship. Our current plan with the University of Hawaii may well serve as a model.

In the coming year, the University of Hawaii will train over 1,000 Peace Corps Volunteers for programs in East Asia and the Pacific on an unusual contract basis which provides for a core professional staff.

The University will be preparing and back-stopping our Volunteers who are to work in Malaysia, the Philippines, Thailand and parts of Polynesia. Hawaii will participate in across-the-board, program development stage through training, implementation, overseas support, research and evaluation.

Such an arrangement should make possible the build-up and application of great area expertise. I would hope that the universities with which we develop such plans could almost become or contain Peace Corps academies. In these academies the processes of international communication, understanding, and development would be studied and the results of the studies applied in action.

But I have one concern that I especially want to share with you today.

I am very much afraid that the Peace Corps has not quite been taken seriously by many—if not most—of the senior faculty members on American college and university campuses. I never expect to go onto a campus any more without having at least one professor—or dean—or academic vice president—say to me, "You must remember that the Peace Corps is only one of a great many government activities competing for our time, and the Peace Corps is rather marginal to our institution's basic interests."

This little speech comes forth with such regularity and with such an amazing sameness of wording that in my bleaker moods I suspect its text was agreed upon at some nation-wide secret convention called by academicians for the sole purpose of putting the Peace Corps in its place.

There are of course notable exceptions: I could compile a distinguished list. But it would still be a list of exceptions.

A healthy skepticism is fine. I think most Peace Corps staff members had it in the beginning. I am not talking about that. I am talking about a lack of interest or even a faint hostility which springs from a failure or refusal on the part of many faculty advisors to critically examine the Peace Corps as a valid option for the graduating senior or the master's degree candidate.

Too many students have come to me to say they were interested in the Peace Corps but their senior professor thought they would be wasting their time or should take the departmental fellowship being offered or had better get on with their study program if they expected to be taken seriously by the graduate school.

In some cases the student surely should take the fellowship, but I believe every faculty advisor today has a real obligation to have something more than a superficial understanding of what personal and career values are possible in the experience of being a Peace Corps Volunteer.

I know that the Peace Corps should do more than it has to foster this understanding. A university president—concerned as I am about this matter—recently suggested that on as many campuses as possible seminars be held that would bring together top level Peace Corps officers and faculty members representing the whole range of disciplines. These seminars would explore the Peace Corps experience, its validity for the graduating college student, and the most meaningful relationship between the universities and the Peace Corps.

We would be delighted to participate in such dialogues. We would welcome any other suggestions for the exchange of views and information.

It seems to me that if there was ever a natural partnership it is between the universities and the Peace Corps. I believe that our universities have a fundamental responsibility in helping to solve the world's pressing problems of communication, understanding, scarcity of food, overpopulation, and disease. If we are honest, we must admit that the battle against these problems has barely started.

The time has come to question why—in spite of the wealth and resources of a nation which will educate 60 million people in *our own society* this year—the Peace Corps is still almost the only and certainly is the largest provider of long-term, action-oriented education designed to grapple with the problems of the *world society* in which we live.

But—as yet—not we, nor the development experts, nor the leaders of the developing world have many of the answers. We perhaps have not yet even formulated the right questions.

Some of the best brains in our universities—not enough, but some—are thinking about the questions and the answers. At the same time thousands of young men and women are leaving the campuses to serve in the Peace Corps, to work in parts of the world where the better answers are needed. Other thousands are returning from the Peace Corps to the campuses—and one of the reasons they return to school is that they now know how much more there is to learn.

There has never been anything remotely comparable to the opportunity the Peace Corps has provided for the teachers and those they taught (and from whom they can now learn) to come together and work together with the people of Africa, Asia, and Latin America to find the right questions and to answer them in action. If we do not seize this opportunity, another may be too long and too late in coming.

And so I propose that we work at our partnership and spend the coming year drawing up the questions and beginning our search for the answers.

I am told that people who work at it almost always survive that most dangerous seventh year.

BARRIER ACROSS DEMILITARIZED ZONE

Mr. McGEE, Mr. President, Secretary McNamara's announcement last week that the United States is undertaking construction of a physical barrier across

the demilitarized zone in Vietnam can be viewed as a hopeful sign. It emphasizes the defensive nature of the war in Vietnam and, far from representing a retreat to static defense, it opens up the promise of increased maneuverability, both militarily and diplomatically. There are those, represented well by Chalmers Roberts, of the Washington Post, who have viewed the barrier as a possible route to a peace conference. That, of course, would be a welcome development. But, as the Post said editorially, the barrier is in the nature of an experiment, and as such cannot be accompanied by more than cautious expectations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD Mr. Roberts' column of September 9 and the Post editorial of the same day, entitled "The Barrier."

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

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 9, 1967]
VIETNAM BARRIER COULD BECOME ROUTE TO
CONFERENCE ON PEACE

(By Chalmers M. Roberts)

The electronic barrier that the United States is building across South Vietnam to stop infiltration from the North may knock down the stubborn barriers to the conference table.

About a year ago, when the DMZ barrier was being discussed, a senior official offered the view that it could, if it worked, provide the excuse for the President to halt the bombing of the North.

Since that time, North Vietnam has established the policy that if the United States "really wants to talk, it must first of all stop unconditionally the bombing and other acts of war" against the North. Furthermore, says Hanoi, the United States "has no right to demand any reciprocity whatsoever."

At his news conference yesterday, Secretary of State Dean Rusk stuck to the demand for reciprocity in principle, but tiptoed around it in detail. A growing number of people in Washington believe that in the end the President will have to accept Hanoi's proposal and Rusk seemed to be leaving an out for that possibility.

If the DMZ barrier turns out to be workable, it could provide the reciprocity without any act on Hanoi's part. While Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara said the barrier cannot stop infiltration, its aim is to make infiltration far more difficult.

Thus at a given point the President could announce that the barrier had so cut infiltration that he was prepared to halt the bombing and go to the conference table. In London in February, Soviet Premier Kosygin passed the word to Washington that Hanoi would come to a conference within two or three weeks of the end of the bombing.

A critical point in any such maneuver is timing. McNamara said the barrier is to be initiated late this year or early next year. Thus it could become effective enough, if Washington wants to make that finding, sometime next spring.

By next spring the presidential campaign will be under way and Mr. Johnson will have a better idea of where his prospective GOP candidate will stand on the war issue.

It is not impossible, if the two sides get to a conference table by summer, that the President could be campaigning on a peace platform—and admonishing the Republicans that any attack could upset the prospects for ending the war.

But what of the hawks? Already one of them, Republican Sen. John Tower of Texas, has expressed doubts about "the essentially static policies it signifies." Certainly those

who want to close the port of Haiphong are not going to be happy with the DMZ barrier as an alternate method of cutting infiltration of men and supplies.

However, the evidence is that the Nation more and more wants an end to the war. Both McNamara and Rusk concede a high degree of public frustration. In short, the DMZ barrier may serve to outflank the hawks.

But even if this device should prove to be a means of getting to the conference table, talks between Washington and Hanoi would still have a long, long way to go. Any such conference almost inevitably would immediately be deadlocked on the role at the table of the National Liberation Front, the political arm of the Vietcong.

In short, it is possible and even probable that a Vietnam conference could go on for months or years, as was the case at Panmunjom in the Korean War.

Nonetheless, a solution by conference compromise may be the best the United States can get out of this war. And the DMZ barrier just could be the device leading to the conference table.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 9, 1967]
THE BARRIER

Secretary McNamara's announcement that a physical barrier will be built along the border with North Vietnam follows long months of study and indecision that probably have not yet resolved many military doubts and reservations.

The barrier, involving conventional barbed wire and cleared areas together with more sophisticated obstructions, certainly should not be regarded as an alternative to or a substitute for other military means. The fear that it would be so regarded probably has contributed to the skepticism with which the whole idea has been regarded by many military authorities.

In the early stages of the debate over this proposal the generals came up with an estimate that it would take 500,000 to a million men to make such a barrier effective. But the argument seems to have shifted from a dispute over what could be accomplished by a barrier alone to the discussion of the barrier as a supplement to other means.

To whatever degree it is effective harassing and hindering infiltration from the North it ought to diminish the burden upon ground and air forces engaged in that project now. It is a means of making these operations both more effective and less costly in terms of manpower. The argument for it has been increased, curiously enough, by the success of air interdiction of the inland trails. As these have been made more and more costly, the North Vietnamese have moved more across the demilitarized zone farther East. An effective fixed line of defenses ought to help close this alternative route more tightly.

The very construction of the barrier has some political and psychological advantages. It will dramatize the essentially defensive character of the operations in South Vietnam. It will highlight the North Vietnamese involvement in the war. It will permit the United States and the South Vietnamese to say to critics that the level of warfare is mostly within the control of North Vietnam. It will decline whenever the aggressors stop trying to knock down the door and break into the house. This largely is true already, but it is not as apparent as it would be if the ground fighting took place and the casualties occurred when the North crossed the barrier.

A reasonably effective barrier clearly would give the South Vietnamese and the United States and their allies more military and diplomatic maneuverability, broadening alternatives available and diminishing dependence upon existing resources. The barrier is

in the nature of an experiment. It is an experiment that is well worth trying, if the effort is attended by cautious expectations and no illusory hopes that it is a cure-all or a gimmick that will solve all our military problems in South Vietnam.

PENTAGON ADMITS THAT NAVY FINDS F-111B UNFIT FOR WAR

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, today there is published in the Wall Street Journal an article written by Jerry Landauer, a staff reporter for this publication, entitled "Pentagon Admits Navy Finds F-111B Unfit for War—Asks General Dynamics Penalties."

This article is rather illuminating. I have read it carefully and I find that the facts it reports with respect to the progress or rather lack of progress in the development and procurement of this airplane are substantially correct.

I believe this matter is of such interest that it should be placed in the RECORD, and that every Senator—every Member of Congress especially—should have an opportunity to read it, as well as those who keep up with the proceedings of our Government through the columns of the RECORD. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD.

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

PENTAGON ADMITS NAVY FINDS F-111B UNFIT FOR WAR—ASKS GENERAL DYNAMICS PENALTIES

(By Jerry Landauer)

WASHINGTON.—The Defense Department has acknowledged to Congress that the latest development model of the Navy's F-111B missile-firing interceptor plane is "extremely deficient in combat mission capability," it was learned.

The department also is seeking to assess penalties against General Dynamics Corp. for alleged failure to meet certain contract guarantees or specifications. The company is prime contractor for the craft, once called the TFX, which is being made in Air Force as well as Navy versions.

Despite extremely unflattering reports by Navy test pilots ("The F-111B airplane remains unfit for service use," they declare) and the haggling with General Dynamics, the Navy is still hopeful that scheduled improvements will yet make the plane acceptable as a defender of the fleet against enemy bombers.

"We are taking what we can get," says Adm. David L. McDonald, recently retired Chief of Naval Operations, "because we feel we need this type of capability and we can't get it any other way."

The disappointing test reports are based on flights this summer of development model No. 5. These tests, Deputy Defense Secretary Paul H. Nitze told the House Appropriations Committee on March 5, were expected to "confirm that the plane as we have further decided to modify it will meet the Navy's needs." Mr. Nitze found the confirmation he sought even though the Navy's preliminary evaluation report said the aircraft "was found to be incapable of carrier-based operation."

The F-111B isn't actually to be flown from aircraft carriers until the summer of 1969, three years behind the schedule mapped in 1963; the evaluation reports are based on flights from land and at less than maximum speed. Until the "carrier suitability" tests can take place, Congress is expected to be tight-fisted with money for the plane.

Congressional reluctance to accept Pentagon optimism was demonstrated recently in the Senate. Instead of the \$287 million requested for the Navy plane by Defense Secretary McNamara for the year that began July 1, the Senate yielded \$115 million only to be used for six more test craft, each designed to correct certain of the 104 deficiencies by test pilots.

"The disbursement of funds for the production program is prohibited," said Sen. McClellan (D., Ark.), one of Mr. McNamara's most persistent critics. It seems probable, however, that even Mr. McClellan ultimately will agree to vote production funds if the admirals keep contending that no alternatives appear in sight.

In its haggling with General Dynamics, the Pentagon wants, among other things, to penalize the company \$1,750,000 for turning in a heavier-than-specified airframe. General Dynamics contends that the weight problem isn't exclusively the company's fault.

MAXIMUM PROFIT IS \$65 MILLION

On research and development for all versions of the F111, the company's minimum profit under an incentive contract would be \$17.5 million, even if no performance incentives are earned and all possible penalties are assessed; the maximum profit could range up to \$65 million. In addition, though, the contract requires General Dynamics to absorb the cost of correcting all deficiencies discovered within a specified time after delivery.

As for a recently negotiated production contract, General Dynamics has agreed to a reduction of \$20,058,000 from a "target profit" that had been set a shade higher than \$200,000,000 for building 493 F111s of all types—including Air Force fighter-bomber, Air Force strategic bomber, and those being purchased by Britain and Australia. Penalties are assessed or incentives added to the "target profit" as performance of the plane and ability of the negotiators dictate.

Though General Dynamics and its chief subcontractor, Grumman Aircraft Engineering Corp., may have to accept substantial penalties for failing to match performance with promises, it's expected that both concerns still will profit handsomely.

For one thing, it's generally agreed that the specifications, derived from Mr. McNamara's mating of a low-flying, faster-than-sound fighter-bomber with a high-flying Navy version, were all but impossible to achieve. "It isn't within the realm of being technically possible," Mr. Nitze says.

Assessing cost to the taxpayers is easier than forecasting probable profits of the major contractors. For research and development alone, the originally anticipated expense of \$711.2 million has jumped to a shade more than \$2 billion. These figures aren't necessarily comparable, though, because, among other things, it wasn't contemplated at first that Mr. McNamara would direct the Air Force to develop a stretched version of the fighter bomber and make it a strategic bomber.

COSTLIEST WEAPON

For production of about 1,325 planes, down from early estimates of 1,700, the Government won't pay \$5.8 billion but \$10.4 billion. So at latest reading, the total F111 program is going to cost \$12.4 billion, making it by far the costliest weapon system in the U.S. arsenal.

Against this background, the Navy seems particularly eager to put the best possible face on the disappointing flight-test evaluations. It points out that test pilots' listing of deficiencies "are intended to highlight deviations from a theoretical optimum."

Says Adm. T. F. Connolly, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations for Air: "They write down every single deficiency, large, small, medium." He says, "This gives the Naval Air Systems Command a good lever with which to work on the contractor."

THE CHICAGO CRIME COMMISSION ANNUAL REPORT

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the Chicago Crime Commission recently released its annual report, and it was generally optimistic with the progress being made to combat crime. However, the commission was harshly critical of recent decisions of the Supreme Court. Also, the commission praised efforts by the FBI.

I commend the report to the attention of all Senators, and ask unanimous consent that two articles, appearing in the Chicago Tribune and the Chicago Sun-Times, both dated August 11, be inserted in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

[From the Chicago Tribune, Aug. 11, 1967]

U.S. LAW UNITS PRAISED IN CITY CRIME REPORT

(By Thomas Powers)

The Federal Bureau of Investigation, the internal revenue service, and United States Atty. Edward V. Hanrahan were praised for "noteworthy" performance yesterday in the annual report released by the Chicago Crime Commission.

Virgil W. Peterson, executive director, said in his review of 1966:

"The record of federal convictions during the last several months has been the most impressive in Chicago history. This successful battle against organized crime has been made possible thru the outstanding investigative work of the FBI and IRS. Cooperation of the federal agencies with local law enforcement has been effective. In numerous instances FBI agents have developed evidence of gambling operations . . . and turned it over to local police officials for action."

PRAISE CITY POLICE

The crime commission also had praise for the Chicago police department, Illinois Supreme Court Judge Daniel P. Ward, and County Board President Richard B. Ogilvie.

Former Police Supt. O. W. Wilson's leadership continued to strengthen the department and instill public confidence in the force, the commission said. The quick solution of the murder of the eight nurses and the apprehension and conviction of Richard Speck was declared "commendable."

OGILVIE REVAMPS FORCE

Ogilvie, as sheriff of Cook county, revamped the sheriff's force and made it the most effective in history, the commission noted.

Ward, as state's attorney of Cook county, was praised particularly for obtaining the convictions of six defendants for four gangland murders.

The commission was harshly critical of recent United States Supreme court decisions.

[From the Chicago Sun Times, Aug. 11, 1967]

CRIME UNIT HAILS WAR ON MOB HERE

(By Ray Brennan)

Chicago is in the midst of the most successful crusade against organized crime in the city's 134-year history, the Chicago Crime Commission reported Thursday.

The nonpartisan civic agency gave praise in particular to the federal government for smashing big-money rackets and sending top Mafia gangsters to prison.

The syndicate's former huge profits from illegal gambling have been cut to a dribble, the commission stated in a report on Chicago area crime for 1966.

Along another line, deployment of hun-

dreds of policemen to control racial disturbances hindered Chicago's general law enforcement in 1966, the report said.

The commission went on to blast certain Cook County Circuit Court judges in the sentencing of criminals and to censure U.S. Supreme Court rulings on police treatment of arrested persons.

And, in an unusual switch, the commission gave recognition to contributions of an admitted law breaker—a former attorney turned informant—to the cause of justice.

The ex-lawyer, Frederick P. Ackerman, has been called "the most accurate and talkative stool pigeon of modern times" by Charles Siragusa, executive director of the Illinois Crime Investigating Commission.

SYNDICATE SECRETS

Ackerman has spent 18 months revealing crime syndicate secrets and testifying in court against old-time gangster pals, fellow lawyers and political fixers after being persuaded by Siragusa to talk.

Among Mafia terrorists he helped to convict, in an interstate money order forgery case, were James (Cowboy) Mirro, Americo (Pete) DePietto, Ernest (Rocky) Infelice and Frank Santucci.

The commission's executive director, Virgil W. Peterson, gave special mention in the report to victories by U.S. Atty. Edward V. Hanrahan and his staff in prosecuting gangsters.

Local and federal investigators also built up cases against the Grieco brothers, Donald and Joseph; Marshall Califano, Fiorvante (Fefe) Buccieri, Sam (Teetz The Man) Battaglia, William (Wee Willie) Mesino, Felix (Milwaukee Phil) Alderisio, Benjamin R. Stein and other hoods, it was pointed out.

PRODUCTIVE RAIDS

Raids on mob gambling centers with use of search warrants obtained by FBI agents have been highly productive, Peterson declared. In former times, the racketeers almost always were acquitted on grounds that the raiders lacked proper search warrants.

But the commission was less than enthusiastic about the conduct of judges in gambling cases.

Of 397 gambling racket defendants indicted in 1966, only four were sentenced to state prison, Peterson related. The others got off with brief jail terms, small fines, probation or acquittals, the records showed.

The report also criticized Circuit Court judges for ignoring the widely recommended "three-year spread" in sentencing convicted felons to indeterminate prison terms.

If there are fewer than three years between the minimum and maximum of any sentence, the defendant has less than sufficient time to find his way back into a productive, law abiding life under parole, authorities generally have agreed.

Cook County judges ignored that important factor in 45.5 percent of their 1966 cases, a tabulation showed.

Readers noted with interest that, for one of the few times in the commission's 48 years of life, the annual report had nothing to say in favor of the death penalty in Illinois. The commission observed that 13 states have abolished capital punishment.

"In Cook County, there were no executions in 1966 and no death sentences were imposed," Peterson noted. "For many years, the number of executions has been extremely small in relation to the total murder problem."

Even at trials involving the murders of three Chicago policemen, where death penalties once were a foregone conclusion, juries refused to recommend the electric chair, the report showed.

One Chicago case, the murders of eight hospital nurses, ended in death sentences for Richard F. Speck, 26. However, a jury at Peoria fixed the punishment, rather than one in Chicago.

POLICE COMMENDED

In a foreword to the 134-page printed report, William B. Browder, commission president, commended the police for control of racial disturbances. Browder wrote:

"In general, the police department deserved credit for the restraint it displayed and the fair and evenhanded manner with which it met extremely difficult and emotion-charged situations.

"The necessity to deploy large numbers of officers to troubled spots in the city at times overtaxed police strength and left some communities without sufficient police protection."

Chicago justice continues to be hampered by U.S. Supreme Court guidelines requiring policemen to inform arrested persons of their constitutional rights and to help provide defendants with attorneys, Peterson said.

He quoted First Asst. State's Atty. Louis B. Garippo in reporting a significant drop in the numbers of accused persons making confessions to crimes.

THE 1962 FIGURES

In 1962, there were confessions in 65.4 per cent of criminal cases, the Garippo figures showed.

But, with policemen and prosecutors being required to inform defendants of their right to remain silent, the percentage fell to 31.8 in 1966. Numbers of murder suspects and others have been freed in court on grounds that admissions of guilt were improperly obtained, Peterson pointed out.

In summing up, the commission warned against complacency about crime—be it of the individual, street mob or of Mafia syndicate variety. Sharply critical of Chicago law enforcement in other years, Peterson remarked in general:

"Although law agencies in the Chicago community were confronted with tremendous problems in 1966, their performance was commendable."

ELECTION REFORM ACT OF 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1880), to revise the Federal election laws, and for other purposes.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada will state it.

Mr. CANNON. Is the pending business Calendar No. 500, S. 1880, the Election Reform Act of 1967?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada is correct.

Mr. CANNON. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, every Member of this distinguished body knows that the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, passed in 1925, is antiquated, meaningless, and totally ineffective.

Existing limitations on expenditures are absurd and disclosure provisions are ridiculous.

A new law is sorely needed to cope with methods and costs of present-day political campaigns.

Previous attempts to revise the law have been unsuccessful despite the fact that on at least three occasions the Senate has approved bills to improve election laws.

This year the President sent to the Congress another measure designed to close loopholes and require complete disclosure of all campaign finances. I had the privilege of introducing that bill, S. 1880, on May 25, 1967. Public hearings were held on June 28 and 29, 1967, and after deliberations, the Subcommittee on

Privileges and Elections reported the bill unanimously to the Committee on Rules and Administration, which, after further consideration, reported the bill with technical amendments to the Senate.

Costs of political campaigns have risen astronomically, making a shambles of ceilings or limitations on expenditures. Emphasis has shifted from limitations to disclosure on the principle that an informed citizenry will react at the polling places to evidence of excessive expenditures.

This bill, therefore, reaches into every niche of political activity to bring forth all possible information concerning contributions and expenditures for examination by the public.

Complete disclosure is accomplished by requiring all candidates for Federal elective office and political committees supporting them to file detailed financial statements with the Clerk of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of the Senate and with clerks of U.S. district courts in the district where the candidate resides or where the principal office of the political committee is located.

Additionally, statements are required to be filed concerning primary elections, caucuses, special and general elections, nominating conventions and presidential preference primaries.

Every political committee, whether National, State, or local, would be required to file financial statements if it received or spent in excess of \$1,000 during a calendar year.

It was recognized by the Senate Rules Committee that not every small political committee throughout the United States could be burdened by Federal reporting requirements—especially those which were primarily supporting local candidates or issues. The \$1,000 cutoff would eliminate most of those minor or ad hoc local committees.

While limitations on expenditures by candidates and political committees are removed by S. 1880, there still remains a limitation upon the amount which may be given to a candidate or a political committee.

Section 103 of the bill, beginning at the bottom of page 4, sets a limit of \$5,000 on the amount which a contributor could give to any candidate or committee. He may give any number of \$5,000 contributions to separate candidates and committees but he may not give more than \$5,000 in total to any particular candidate and one or more political committees supporting that candidate.

There is a proviso in that section which would eliminate from the limitation or contributions a political committee. Thus, political committees could still give to a candidate or another political committee amounts in excess of \$5,000.

However, the definition of "political committee" includes the term "individual." There is a possibility that any individual could claim that he was acting as a political committee and thus evade the \$5,000 limit on contributions.

To preclude that possibility, I shall propose an amendment which clarifies the intent of the limitation. By striking out

the proviso which states that "the term 'person' shall not include a political committee" and substituting a new proviso stating "that nothing contained in this subsection shall prohibit the transfer of contributions received by a political committee," the loophole is eliminated.

Political committees could still transfer to candidates and political committees more than \$5,000 of its receipts, but an individual or person claiming to be a political committee could not use his own personal wealth to evade the law but only those contributions received by him from others and those receipts would have to be reported publicly.

Disclosure is the cornerstone of this bill. Every candidate for President or Vice President and every candidate for the Senate and each political committee supporting such candidates shall file statements with the Secretary of the Senate.

Every candidate for the House of Representatives and each political committee supporting them shall file statements with the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Additionally, a copy of each statement filed by a candidate or a political committee shall be filed with the clerk of the U.S. district court for the district where the candidate resides or where the principal office of the political committee is located in that district.

Every statement will disclose all names and addresses of persons who have contributed \$100 or more or to whom expenditures have been made of \$100 or more. Further, every financial transaction, whether contribution, gift, loan, transfer, sale, expenditure, and so forth, shall be disclosed in detail.

Reports, in each instance, would be filed on the 10th day of March, June, and September of each year and also by the 31st day of January of each year. Before each primary, special or general election, reports would be filed on the 15th and again on the fifth days prior to the date of such election.

Persons who make contributions or expenditures of \$100 or more, other than to a political committee or a candidate, would also be required to file reports in the same manner as is required by candidates or committees. Committees or associations responsible for or assisting in the operation of political conventions to nominate national candidates would be required, for the first time, to file a report, not later than 20 days prior to the date of the presidential election, showing all receipts and expenditures.

Under existing law, the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House have no duties except to receive and preserve statements filed by candidates or political committees.

This bill, S. 1880, would impose a much greater range of duties.

Those officers would be required to develop forms for the filing of statements; to prepare and publish a manual for bookkeeping and reporting; to develop coding and cross indexing systems; to make all documents available for public inspection and copying; to preserve all documents for 10 years in the Senate and

5 years in the House; and to make audits, field investigations and report violations of law.

It has been said that statements of campaign contributions and expenditures should be filed with the office of the Comptroller General rather than with the officers of the Congress because the Comptroller General's office is set up to handle accounting matters and is set apart from the Congress.

Mr. President, I disagree with that position on several grounds:

First, The Constitution states, in article I, section 5, clause 1, that "each House shall be the judge of the elections, returns and qualifications of its Members" and in article I, section 5, clause 2, that "each House may determine the rules of its proceedings, punish its Members," et cetera.

The Congress, therefore, has the power and the duty to monitor the election of its Members, including campaign contributions and expenditures.

Second, The General Accounting Office is merely an arm of the Congress and has no extraordinary power to monitor Federal elections.

In fact, the Comptroller General has consistently expressed reluctance to receive responsibility for overseeing Federal election activities.

Third, Both the Secretary and the Clerk could supplement their offices with staff and equipment, just as the Comptroller General would, to process financial statements in accordance with this bill.

For those reasons, I would oppose any change in the places for filing campaign statements.

Clerks of the U.S. district courts would be given duties similar to those of the Secretary and Clerk pertaining to the receiving, filing, preserving, and making available for public inspection the campaign statements required to be filed with them.

Mr. President, this bill was submitted to the Congress by the President. I introduced it and held public hearings to receive all views on it. It was studied by the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections and the Committee on Rules and Administration. It was reported unanimously from both committees.

This bill is needed to restore public confidence in congressional political campaigns and the handling of campaign finances. It is my sincerest hope that it will be given early approval by the Senate.

Mr. President, during its consideration of the bill the committee adopted certain perfecting amendments to the bill. The amendments are for the purpose of achieving conformity and clarity in the several provisions and do not affect the bill substantively. I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be approved en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The amendments were agreed to en bloc.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] and myself, I call up amendment No. 284 and ask to have it read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the amendment, as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

"Sec. . (a) Section 602 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended—

"(1) by inserting '(a)' before 'Whoever', and

"(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) Whoever, acting on behalf of any political committee (including any State or local committee of a political party), directly or indirectly solicits, or is in any manner concerned in soliciting, any assessment, subscription, or contribution for the use of such political committee or for any political purpose whatever from any officer or employee of the United States (other than an elected officer) shall be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned not more than three years, or both."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, under the existing law, section 602 of title 18 of the United States Code prohibits anyone who is a Senator or a Representative or a delegate, or anyone who is a candidate for Congress or for any of these national offices, under penalty of a \$5,000 fine or imprisonment for not more than 3 years, from soliciting civil service employees for political contributions.

However, the loophole in the law is that there is nothing to prohibit us, as public officials, or anyone who is a candidate for national office from having the National or State committees or their representatives solicit these same employees on our behalf.

The result has been that under the past several administrations there have been solicitations, and in recent years it has developed almost into shakedowns of Government employees. They are asked to make contributions to the \$100 dinners, or \$500 dinners, with the threat hanging over their heads that their bosses are going to be there and that their promotion will be jeopardized if they are not seen at these dinners.

The President, in his message recommending these election reforms, took notice of the need for a reform in this area and said it was a problem which should be dealt with. Unfortunately, the President's recommendation did not contain a provision covering this loophole. Perhaps it was an oversight. In order to carry out his stated intentions, as well as my own intentions, and what I think would be the intention of all Members of the Senate, we offer this amendment to close the loophole by amending section 602 and stating not only that it would be unlawful for Members of Congress or candidates for Congress to solicit campaign funds from civil service employees but also that it would be unlawful to have anyone through a National, State, or special committee solicit employees on their behalf.

I am hopeful that the chairman of the committee will see fit to accept the amendment. I do not know what the objections could be, but I will want a record vote in order that the full position of the Senate may be shown.

Mr. President, I offer this amendment

on behalf of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] and myself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the name of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] is included as a sponsor of the amendment.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I wish to speak briefly concerning the bill. I feel that there should be some reform in our laws concerning the recording of election spending.

During the time this bill was under consideration by the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections, it was not possible for me to give the time and attention to it that I would have liked, as I had to be absent from Capitol Hill. The members of the committee were very gracious in delaying action on this measure until I could attend.

Realizing that whatever might be enacted in this Congress should be done in this calendar year, I did not offer any amendments in committee. I felt that the recommendations of the President were entitled to be considered by the Senate.

Further, I was of the opinion that any matter such as this, involving the campaign of every Senator and every candidate for the Senate was something that would not be ultimately decided by the committee, but would be decided by the Senate as a whole, because every Senator is interested in the law pertaining to the financing of his campaign and to reports which should be filed.

I make that statement for the reason that I do not want my vote cast in the committee to report the bill for consideration as being construed that I do not favor certain amendments or that I necessarily favor the bill. My vote in the committee was in favor of having the Senate consider the bill, nothing more. I may or may not vote for the bill. It depends on what it is like when we get through with it.

I believe that amendments offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] have great validity, and I expect to support them.

I do wish to call to the attention of the Senate another important matter, as I see it, upon which I expect to offer an amendment. I refer to section 608, on page 5 of the bill. This section says:

(a) It shall be unlawful for any person, directly or indirectly, to make a contribution or contributions in an aggregate amount in excess of \$5,000

(1) during any calendar year, or
(2) in connection with any campaign for nomination for election, or election,

to any political committee or candidate, to two or more political committees substantially supporting the same candidate, or to a candidate and one or more political committees substantially supporting the candidate:

Lines 7 to 12, which come under subhead (2), would indicate that a person could not contribute more than \$5,000 to a candidate, or to any committee set up by that candidate.

But line 6 would put an absolute ceiling upon what an individual person could contribute for all candidates, all committees, all purposes, to \$5,000.

Mr. President, I do not believe that is wise. I do not believe that it will pro-

mote disclosure. I do not believe it is just.

I view a political campaign as an honorable thing. I believe that it represents efforts of a group and individuals to advance the cause of good government as they see it. Therefore, I think the raising of funds for a campaign, in many respects, is like raising the funds for the community chest, for the Animal Rescue League, to build a library, or to do any other worthwhile thing. You need large contributors, you need small contributors; you need a lot of small contributors to spread the responsibility, and we should encourage that. That is why I favor a provision which would give a tax benefit up to a certain amount—say for a \$100 contribution.

However, there are people in this country, who are interested in good government, who give generously, and do so without any ulterior motive. They have no Government contracts; they expect no Government contracts. They ask no special favors of the people to whom they contribute but to carry out their idea of what is good government. They may contribute to a long list of candidates for the House of Representatives, or a long list of candidates for the Senate, as well as to their candidate for President.

As I read this section 603, on page 5, there would be an absolute limit of what a person could give to all candidates for all purposes, of \$5,000.

What that will do, if this is enacted into law, will be to shut off the honorable money, the untainted money. It will drive the tainted money under the table.

I realize a great speech can be made condemning contributors. But how are you going to explain how people can get elected without money? How are you going to explain how people who do not have great wealth can be elected to office, unless somebody else contributes to them?

Mr. President, it is time to cast aside any temptation to hypocrisy. I say to the Senate that a limit such as this will shut off honorable, untainted money, and it will not shut off tainted, dishonorable money, but will merely drive it under the table.

Therefore, I propose, at the proper time, to offer an amendment to strike out line 6 on page 5, and to renumber the succeeding sections.

Then we would have a limitation on the amount that a person could give to a candidate, or to the candidate's committee; but the limitation would not apply from the Atlantic to the Pacific. If someone has a great love for his country and believes a certain course is best for his country, and has the substance to support 20 candidates for Congress, is it not in the public interest that he do it? Or does the Senate favor a system that will either limit running for office to those people who come from families that can pay the entire bill, or a system that invites hypocrisy and drives the contributions beneath the table?

I think that this section, as written, defeats the very purpose of the bill. The purpose of the bill is disclosure. This section, if enacted, will add to the amount of contributions that are not disclosed.

In connection with this section, I call

attention to lines 20 to 23, on page 6, subsection (f):

(f) Nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to prohibit any contribution to a candidate by the spouse or a child, grandchild, parent, grandparent, brother, or sister of the candidate.

So in one part of this section, we put a ceiling on what a public spirited individual can do, across the entire land, but here we say that nothing shall prohibit any contribution from within the family. If that is not a contradiction, I do not know what you would call it.

That section might be improved by changing the word "committee" on line 21, to the words "a contribution," and adding, on line 23, "provided the contribution is not otherwise prohibited."

But as it stands, a member of the family can make any contribution. Mr. President, that can be pretty high. It can be a pretty good sized contribution.

I hope what I am about to say will not be regarded as a discouragement to those who are sponsoring the bill. I would like to see this bill enacted soon; but I think we should be realistic about it.

We are back in session on the first day after a 10-day recess. It is true that this bill has been made the pending business. But every Senator knows that on the day after a recess, a mountain of things pile up in all avenues of his work, whether it is returning telephone calls, his staff needing to see him about various things, a backlog of mail, or what not.

Since this is a piece of legislation which should have the attention of every Senator, and since it is a piece of legislation where a committee cannot make the decision for the entire Senate—because it deals with a matter of immediate concern to every Senator—I hope that we can have ample discussion of this measure today, and that the major votes upon it will be made later.

I do not mean to suggest that no amendment should be voted on today. However, certainly if an opportunity is afforded to all Senators to participate in this debate, it will result in a better vote. It will result in a bill that will have the backing of the Senate when we go to conference.

I hope that this can be done. For the time being, I yield the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I would like to have the yeas and nays on the pending amendment. I do not think there are enough Senators present on the floor to obtain the yeas and nays.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of 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. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the pending amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Delaware would prohibit po-

litical committees or persons acting in behalf of political committees from soliciting, directly or indirectly, contributions or assessments for the use of the committee or other political purpose from any officer or employee of the United States.

Section 602 of title 18 already prohibits Congressmen and officers and employees of the United States from soliciting or receiving, directly or indirectly, any contributions or assessments for such use from any other such officer or employee.

The purpose of this section was to prohibit a coercion or a coercive attempt by people such as the Senator from Delaware described a few moments ago.

Section 603 of title 18 prohibits the solicitation of contributions in Federal buildings.

There is, therefore, broad coverage pertaining to incumbent Congressmen, candidates, officers, and employees to prohibit them from soliciting or receiving contributions from other such persons. However, to apply the same prohibition to committees would be unfair, and I submit that it would be most difficult to enforce.

Committees, like other business enterprises, solicit contributions or other support from citizens on the basis of available public listings. A canvass of citizens in certain areas, like southern Maryland or northern Virginia, would be certain to reach large numbers of Federal employees and officers.

The committee would have no means of ascertaining in advance which of the citizens solicited were employed by the United States. To ban all committees from soliciting in this manner U.S. employees would be to prohibit such solicitations from anyone under pain of violating unintentionally the Federal law and thereby subjecting themselves to a fine of \$5,000.

I submit, Mr. President, that the amendment is quite unreasonable, and I hope it will be defeated.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I believe that the Senator from Nevada is doing a little shadow-boxing. I point out that section 602 has been a part of the Corrupt Practices Act for a number of years, and the proposed amendment would not change one iota the method by which contributions would or would not be solicited, except that the existing law says that whoever is a Senator, a Representative, a Delegate, a Resident Commissioner, or a candidate for Congress, or any of these national offices shall not solicit Federal civilian employees for political contributions.

Nothing in the existing law, however, prohibits the head of an agency from taking a list of his employees and turning it over to Joe Doakes or one of the national or State committees and having the committees solicit them on his behalf. The proposed amendment would merely add to the existing law to prevent solicitations on our behalf. It now says that a Member of Congress or a candidate for Congress cannot make these solicitations; under the amendment no one could solicit on behalf of the candidate or party.

This would not mean that he could not send out newsletters to his mailing list for fear one of the individuals receiving the letter happened to be working for the Government.

I point out that for years this law has been on the books. We, as Members of Congress or as candidates for public office, have been acting under this law. None of us has ever had any difficulty as far as that is concerned. I am speaking of normal letters, not solicitations. We cannot solicit campaign contributions from any civil service employee.

Let us face it: We all know what we are trying to correct and what this abuse has been.

I should like to read an editorial that appeared in the Washington Star of May 24, 1964, which outlined this matter very well. I read the editorial:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Sunday Star, May 24, 1964]

THE BIG BITE

Administrations may come and administrations may go, but the big bite goes on forever. The big bite, by polite definition, is an invitation to attend a dinner party in honor of a Washington dignitary, such as for the President of the United States. For the high privilege, the guest is expected to chip in at least \$100 for the good of the party—Democratic Party, that is.

Well, that's all right. Anyone who wishes to ante up that kind of money to break bread with President Johnson at the Armory next Tuesday is entitled to do so. It is those people who would just as soon not, but who are going to anyway, or at least are going to pay for it, whom we are concerned about.

These are the grade 11 and upward Federal career employees who receive invitations, plus subtle and not-so-subtle hints that it would be good personnel strategy to cough up the cash.

It is an evil practice which has been going on so long now it almost has won the badge of respectability through repetition and the broad wink. Administration after administration has shut its eyes to the implications of coercion, blackmail and veiled threats which are part of these "invitations" to Federal career employees. Each time it happens someone says: What about the Hatch Act and the Corrupt Practices Act?

The plain truth is that these laws, designed to protect the Federal worker against political flim-flam, are all but worthless in such cases. In the first place, they require a formal complaint by the offended employee, who is not about to risk his future so rashly. Second, they require prosecution by political appointees loath to bite the feeding hand.

Consequently, there is only one practical solution for muzzling the big bite. That is for the President of the United States and the national committees of the political parties to put a stop to the biting practice, once and for all.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. I should like to ask the Senator a few questions, to ascertain the intent of his amendment.

Is it the intent of the Senator to create a situation where a political committee, for instance, would be in violation of law if they sent out a general mailing asking for contributions or the sale of dinner tickets, and some of those letters were received by Government employees?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If that list of names is general—we might say the boxholder list or a general broad list, with no thought as to what the position of the person is—it would not be affected any more than the Senator's letters or my letters today are affected if we write to an individual. We do not have to search his pedigree or determine his financial status from Dun & Bradstreet. But we would not be able to solicit direct contributions, as it is being done now, where the boss of an agency may hold a cocktail party and put a notice on the bulletin board: "All who are going to this dinner stop by." They claim there is no coercion. But that is one way they can see whether the persons puts his \$100 on the line.

We all know the abuse. We are not that naive. And the employee knows the difference from a voluntary contribution and a shakedown.

A general boxholder letter may come from the two national committees and may come to a Republican or a Democrat. I received an invitation today to attend one of the Democratic fundraising dinners. I do not believe I shall be able to make it. I am sure I received the letter as a boxholder from a general list of names in my hometown.

But such a situation is not involved with respect to the proposed amendment. This refers to the solicitation from Joe Doakes as an employee of the Government. The law already states that a Member of Congress cannot solicit civil service employees or Government employees, for contributions. The proposed amendment would add the words that you could not have somebody do it on your behalf. In other words, I would not be permitted to turn the list of names over to Sam Jones and say, "You make the solicitation for me." Nor could the head of an agency mention the contributions to his employees and follow through with a check on who attends.

There is no question but that there is an abuse. Let us correct it.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the Senator. I should like to ask him one or two more questions, so that the legislative intent can be shown. Certainly, his objective is worthy, and I support it.

Suppose a county political committee mails a letter of solicitation to all those in that particular county who are registered or affiliated with that party, and some of them happen to be Government employees. If the letter goes to everybody, is it the Senator's intention to make the mailing of such a letter an offense?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I checked into that question with the legislative counsel, and I was advised that the existing law does not make that an offense and the proposed amendment will not change it. But if in the solicitation it can be established that someone gave that county chairman or the man making that solicitation a list of Government employees to be solicited, then they would be involved. It is an offense when it is the intent to solicit Joe Doakes because he is an employee of the Government with the inference—"You got your

job from the administration; therefore, there is a responsibility to contribute."

The proposed amendment is supposed to stop that practice. Other than that, the employee has the right of every American citizen to contribute to the party of his choice. He has a right to contribute to the candidate of his choice as long as it is done freely and he is not solicited or pressured on the basis of his official capacity.

Mr. CURTIS. To bring the matter rather close to Washington, because there are more Government employees here: In other words, the Senator is saying that either political party could solicit all people living in Montgomery County, Md., for political contributions, and that committee would not be in violation because a number of the people happened to be Government employees.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct. If they were solicited as part of a broad county or city solicitation, for example, if they solicited every boxholder in Washington in a general solicitation it would not be a violation under this amendment.

However, if it could be established that in that solicitation the head of the agency was later seeking to get the names of the man making the solicitation then they would be involved.

I shall read the present law again:

Whoever, being a Senator or Representative in, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, or a candidate for Congress, or individual elected as, Senator, Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner, or an officer or employee of the United States or any department or agency thereof, or a person receiving any salary or compensation for services from money, derived from the Treasury of the United States, directly or indirectly solicits, receives, or is in any manner concerned in soliciting or receiving, any assessment, subscription, or contribution for any political purpose whatever.

Mr. President, that is the law now as it relates to every candidate for national office.

All the amendment would do would be to say that we cannot turn this list over to some individual for solicitation on our behalf.

Mr. CURTIS. Or any general party.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Or to a general party.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one additional question to make the matter abundantly clear?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. If the amendment of the Senator is agreed to, is it the intention of the Senator to make it unlawful for one of the political parties in Montgomery County, Md., to solicit either orally, in writing, or in any other way campaign contributions from all those people who affiliate with that party?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Not as members of the party in general. But if the head of the agency passes the word down that there is going to be a solicitation and that they are to come by so that they can be checked on, that would be unlawful. They can contribute of their own accord on a purely voluntary basis as American citizens. They can support the candidate or the party of their

choice, but their jobs should not be involved.

I shall read some of the letters I have received.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. In other words, is it the intent of the Senator that the government employee shall not be subject to any solicitation to which his neighbors are not subject even though they are not government employees?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct; or in a manner in which someone is going to check up to see whether or not, he as an employee did or did not contribute.

Mr. CURTIS. But if he is approached in the same way as his neighbors who are not government employees, the people doing that solicitation would not be in violation?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Not if they were solicited as voting citizens of the country and not solicited as Government employees.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I shall read an excerpt from two letters I have received:

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
Senator from Delaware, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: On May 27 *The New York Times* reported your resolution calling on the Attorney General to investigate charges that federal employees were being solicited for political funds in violation of the Hatch Act. The article implied but did not state that the resolution was carried.

I am a federal employee, whose recent appointment to a non-supervisory Grade 11 was entirely non-political. Every employee (above clerical) of my office was solicited to contribute for the impending Johnson affairs in New York City. Amounts of the expected "gift" were recommended. When I declined to give, my pay and my advancement were, it was suggested, in danger.

I do not intend to make any charges under the Hatch Act, and am not seeking any relief for myself or punishment of others. However, I completely support your resolution, and urge you to do everything within your power to see that a meaningful inquiry is made. The kind of sophisticated extortion that can be involved in these violations is humiliating to those who yield and to those who don't, to say nothing of the officials who condone it.

Sincerely,

Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS:

I am a career employee with many years of service. I have never been high-pressured for the \$100 fund raising like I have been this year. This is the first time I know of that employees were solicited at work, right at their desks. A list was maintained of givers and nongivers in the Commerce Department. Lack of faith and integrity in the Civil Service System prohibits me from revealing my name. Fellow employees know that promotions are denied to the nongivers.

Yours truly,

Mr. President, these are but two of many letters which I have received.

In addition, the newspapers in Washington have had numerous Federal employees call to their attention the manner in which they are solicited.

I shall now read from an article

which appeared in the *Washington Star* of June 25, 1965:

WORKER PRODDED ON \$100 TICKET,
WIFE COMPLAINS

The wife of a top Civil Service grade employee at the Office of Emergency Planning called *The Star* this morning to complain that her husband had been asked by his boss to buy a \$100 ticket to tomorrow's Democratic dinner.

"He was told," the irate wife said, "that the White House is displeased with the number of tickets purchased so far" by OEP employes.

The wife said she would not give her name in order to protect her husband. "I know they wouldn't fire him," she stated, "but they could easily abolish his job."

Early this afternoon, Emet F. Riordan, OEP director of information, released a statement which said: "There is no solicitation of any kind within the agency for ticket buying."

This type of solicitation would surely be covered under the amendment.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. CANNON. Is it not a fact that solicitation is covered under section 602 at the present time and that it is specifically written out in clear and unambiguous language?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Perhaps the Senator should join me in getting a new Attorney General of the United States because he claims that under present law he can do nothing about it.

Mr. CANNON. The Senator did not answer my question. Is it covered or not?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If they would prosecute, but the Attorney General says that he cannot prosecute under the existing law. President Johnson, in his message to Congress, said there was a loophole in this law. He told the Senator's committee there was a loophole. I do not know why the committee did not act on the suggestion.

The loophole is that while the Senator and I cannot solicit any employee we can have somebody solicit on our behalf.

This lady's boss, about whom she complained, was not a candidate for public office and would not be covered under the present interpretation of the law, but it would be prohibited under this amendment.

Mr. CANNON. The statement concerning loopholes in no way related to section 602. It related to the fact that primaries and conventions were not covered under the law, nor were local political committees. The Senator knows that it had nothing to do with section 602.

The Senator has said that it would depend on intent. Is the Senator now saying if a committee unintentionally solicits a Federal employee there would be no violation of the law?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. For example, if a committee were to advertise for campaign funds and take a full-page ad in the *Washington Post* or the *Washington Star* it cannot be determined who is going to read the advertisement. However, if they are solicited directly as employees it would be in violation. I think the Senator knows what we are talking about.

If the Senator does not think that this proposal covers the matter, what lan-

guage does the Senator have to stop the practice? The Senator knows that the abuse goes on. How would he stop it?

Mr. CANNON. I was going to ask the Senator the following question: If the Senator is referring to intentional solicitation, why is he not willing to write that into law leaving it quite clear in the law that any type of solicitation would be a violation?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Does the Senator know of any instance where any Senator, Representative, or candidate for Congress ever had difficulty under the existing law as now written? Does the Senator know of one instance anywhere where any man in any party had difficulty under the law as it is now written? I am making no change in that part of the law. However, intention is a factor.

Mr. CANNON. If the Senator means violating the law, I have not been looking for instances where a man might violate the law. Perhaps the Senator has been working on it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Perhaps we both should work on it.

Mr. CANNON. Would the Senator have any objection to making intent a part of his amendment?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Is the Senator suggesting that as a part of the general law?

Mr. CANNON. I am suggesting in connection with the amendment here. Would the Senator have any objection to make it clear it is an intentional and willful violation?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I would have no objection if it were made applicable to intentional solicitation. That is what we are talking about: knowingly or intentional. I was told by those who assisted in drafting the proposal that this language would cover it, but I have no objection to making it clear.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the *RECORD* three articles from the *Washington Evening Star*.

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

[From the *Washington Evening Star*, May 26, 1964]

DEMOCRATS EXPECT TO GROSS OVER \$3 MILLION
THIS WEEK

(By Walter Pincus)

"It can be a real help to your company." That was the closing line of a sales pitch made last week by a solicitor for tonight's \$1,000 a-plate Democratic Party President's Club dinner to the Washington representative of a national corporation.

The dinner at the International Inn and the subsequent Salute-to-President Johnson Gala at D.C. Armory, combined with two dinners and another gala at New York City's Madison Square Garden Thursday night, should gross over \$3 million for party coffers.

Solicitors have been active in the past two months selling everything from \$1,000 memberships in the President's Club to the \$5 balcony New York gala tickets.

HOW TICKETS ARE SOLD

A party spokesman estimated that more than 500 tickets, at \$1,000 each, have already been sold for tonight's dinner, while a crowd of between 7,000 and 8,000 at \$100 a ticket is expected at the Armory.

The President's Club dinner in New York

Thursday is expected to draw 1,000 persons at \$1,000 each—making it the first publicly-reported \$1 million dinner in campaign fund-raising history.

How are the \$1,000 tickets sold in Washington? Many of them go to old party contributors whose names regularly grace such lists.

To get the hesitant new big money men, one sales pitch last week included:

Assurance that the \$1,000 membership in the President's Club would put the donor's name on a list of those to be considered for invitations to White House social functions.

An understanding that the donor's name would be on a list seen by the President.

A statement that a personal letter would be sent the donor from Democratic Party Finance Chairman Richard Maguire stating that the gift was appreciated and the Democratic National Committee was available for assistance if such help was needed.

CONTROVERSIAL SOLICITATION

And finally, that the funds can originate from any sources—so long as someone's name is attached to the \$1,000 when it arrives at the national committee.

The most controversial solicitation attached to tonight's gala—that of Government employees. Both parties, when in power have solicited top civil servants by mail. Democrats recall that at each Salute-to-Eisenhower dinner there was an announcement listing the number of tickets sold in each executive department.

Since 1962, the Democrats have made a strong effort to get those Federal employees who were appointed to their positions—so-called Schedule C jobs—to buy \$100 tickets each year to one major party function.

ABOUT 1,440 C POSITIONS

Currently, there are about 1,440 Schedule C positions of which, according to a Civil Service spokesman, about 80 per cent are filled. Some 400 of the persons holding down these jobs, however, are regular Civil Service and not political appointees.

However, the pressure on employees to buy the \$100 ducats is not limited to those under Schedule C. Regular civil service employees in grades 11 and above in many agencies have received mailed "invitations" and follow-up telephone calls and direct appeals from their bosses to attend the affair.

Winking at the Federal laws that prohibit solicitation of Federal employees in Federal buildings, the Democratic National Committee has designated sales co-ordinators in each executive agency. Quotas have been established normally based on the number of Schedule C positions in a given department combined with a 10 per cent increase over the past year's ticket purchases.

SOLICITATION EVIDENT

In 1962, the Democratic National Committee filed its report with the Clerk of the House listing contributions received chronologically. By cross-checking names it was possible to see blocks of ticket-purchases as they came in from various departments—a clear indication that solicitation was made and contributions received within the department.

For example, on January 18, 1962, seventeen \$100 contributions in a row were recorded for top officials of the Defense Department. On January 12, of that year, twenty-five \$100 contributions in a row were recorded for upper-level Agriculture Department officials.

One Agriculture Department employe who contributed said he was solicited by his division chief who indicated a 10-ticket quota had been given him.

Since 1962, the Democrats have shuffled their contributors in reporting to the House Clerk and it is no longer feasible to determine how contributions are received at the National Committee.

This year, the dinner promoters have taken to marking the solicitation cards distributed to the executive departments with a number so that when the contributions come in directly to the committee they can easily be traced to the department of origin and credited to that department's quota.

In justifying their approach to Schedule C employes, one Democratic contributor said, "They had no hesitancy in seeking political support when they went to their jobs; they shouldn't complain now when they have to pay for that support."

In New York City, three events Thursday night, all run by the city's President's Club are expected to raise almost \$2 million. Headed by United Artists President Arthur Krim, the New York fund-raising group has become highly active in national party affairs.

Complementing the \$1,000 President's Club dinner is a \$100-a-plate affair for a new group known as the senior club's Associates Division. Promoted among younger New York Democrats, this group has already held a pep rally with White House aid, Bill Moyers as speaker.

Solicitors have fanned out, making their appeal particularly among young lawyers who might some day want jobs in Washington. In more than one case, a ticket purchaser was told his name would go on a list that would be consulted when applicants were being cleared for political jobs next January.

Spiced with this type of sales appeal the Associates dinner has steadily grown to where some 1,300 are now expected to crowd the ballroom of the Americana Hotel.

The Madison Square Garden re-run of tonight's gala is expected to draw 17,500 with the bulk of the tickets purchased and distributed to regular party organization workers.

Not all the money raised in New York goes to the national campaign effort. The New York State Democratic organization is seeking some of the funds to help defray its coming State campaign expenses and to meet some of the debts that have been run up over the past years. Though the National Committee under President Kennedy reportedly demanded and received \$300,000 of the first \$400,000 cleared in 1962, plus half the remainder, no such agreement on fund division has yet been reached.

[From the Washington Evening Star,
June 25, 1965]

DEMOCRATIC DINNER APPEARS A SELLOUT (By Walter Pincus)

Tomorrow night's \$100-a-plate Democratic Congressional fund-raising dinner appears to be a solid success—the promoters have booked an overflow dinner crowd of 2,875 into the Washington Hilton Hotel on top of about 5,500 that are now expected at the D.C. Armory.

The apparent sale of 3,000 or more tickets came despite a reported falloff of purchases by federal workers. A survey of government workers indicates the sales effort toward them was less intense this year and was limited primarily to home mailings to lists of last year's donors.

"It was a light touch, nothing like last year," one aide to a Cabinet member said yesterday. Another added that plans for an in-house solicitation had been dropped three weeks ago.

Though both President Johnson and Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey are expected to appear at both affairs, the real money draw has been a nation-wide solicitation of small business, labor and corporate contributors both directly from Washington and indirectly through individual representatives and senators.

The fact that this is being billed as Washington's only Democratic party fund-raising

dinner this year has been impressed on the representatives of the various lobbying organizations and other interest groups in Washington.

The bulk of the money raised, after expenses, will go to support Democratic candidates in the 1966 House and Senate races.

Success of this year's ticket sales assured promoters of the dinner that net receipts will surpass last year's dinner which yielded \$400,000 to be divided by the Senate and House Democratic Campaign Committees.

It also guaranteed that the Democrats would be well on their way toward amassing a record campaign-fund kitty to be disbursed among House and Senate candidates next year.

Though the solicitation effort is being run from Democratic National Committee headquarters under the over-all direction guise, it's all being handled in the name of a specially formed group—the Democratic Congressional Dinner Committee.

Use of this organization will permit the Democrats to take advantage of a campaign fund law loophole and not report the names of those who actually paid \$100 or more for tickets—contributions that are normally required to be disclosed under federal law. Political committees, such as the dinner unit, that receive and spend their money within the District are exempt from reporting.

Chairman of the Congressional Dinner Committee is Nell Curry, California trucking executive and long-time party fund-raiser. Curry last year acted as treasurer of the \$1,000-a-Member President's Club. He also has played a key role in encouraging trucking firm owners and operators around the country to contribute to the party and its candidates.

The purchase of 16 full-page advertisements by truckers in last year's Democratic Convention program at \$15,000 a page was reportedly promoted primarily by Curry.

Despite the lack of hard-sell techniques on government employes, there will be a round of federal agency cocktail parties before the dinner. However, they apparently will be fewer in number and smaller in size than those which preceded last year's Democratic gala.

There also, reportedly, has been less in-house calling to ask if employes were planning to attend their bosses' parties.

Health, Education and Welfare employes will gather at the Skyline Inn tomorrow night. At the Presidential Arms, between 1,000 and 1,500 government workers from five agencies, including the Commerce Department, are expected.

Some Post Office Department employes and officials, along with a number of Congressmen, are to attend a pre-dinner gathering sponsored by the National Association of Postmasters of the U.S., a private organization that has purchased tickets and distributed some to its guests.

D.C. Transit buses will carry the government employes from their cocktail parties to the armory. Though, for the most part, top agency officials pay for pre-dinner parties out of their own pockets, the Democratic National Committee has arranged for the bus transportation. But party officials last night could not say who would pay for the buses.

The Democrats apparently have not spared expense to make the dinner a success. One estimate put the cost of each meal—including service—at from \$12 to \$15 a plate.

The Mayflower Hotel, which is catering the armory affair, refused yesterday to give any information on the dinner—from the number expected to be served to the name of the main course.

Decorations for the armory, which were described by someone involved in their preparation as "the biggest the Democrats ever had for a dinner," are expected to cost about \$20,000.

Democratic party finances are a closely

guarded operation. According to records filed with the Clerk of the House, some \$900,000 has been contributed to the party in the first five months of 1965. All but \$75,000 of that amount came from \$1,000-and-up contributors.

The Republican party, on the other hand, reported that during the same period it collected almost \$800,000 of which over 75 percent came from contributors of less than \$100.

To stimulate small contributors, the Democrats have begun a contest aimed at \$10 givers. Though it is not expected to draw much in the way of money, it will create the impression that the party is seeking to encourage the small donor.

[From the Washington Evening Star, June 18, 1964]

THE FEDERAL SPOTLIGHT: CIVIL SERVICE TO PROBE CHARGES ON \$100 TICKETS TO PARTY DINNER

(By Joseph Young)

The Civil Service Commission will investigate charges that Government career employees were pressured into buying \$100 tickets for the recent Democratic gala honoring President Johnson.

It will be the first CSC investigation in history involving charges of this sort.

Such charges have cropped up in previous administrations, although the intensity of the pressure on Federal employees has seldom if ever equaled that of the past few years.

The CSC previously has said it would investigate if it got any specific complaints, but none were forthcoming. Employees were too afraid of losing their jobs by making such formal charges.

Now, however, Representative Nelsen, Republican of Minnesota, is turning over to the CSC specific cases in which he charges that employees of the Rural Electrification Administration were asked to buy tickets to the democratic affair and that the sales were made on Government property, both violations of the law.

In reply, the CSC wrote Mr. Nelsen:

"Consonant with the commission's responsibilities under the Hatch Act, and within its jurisdiction over Federal employees in the competitive civil service, the commission welcomes your co-operation. If you will furnish the commission with the information in your possession with appropriate identification of the persons and employing agencies, a thorough investigation will be made and you will be informed of the results."

Mr. Nelsen subsequently turned the information over to the CSC and the investigation will get under way.

Mr. Nelsen hopes that this will encourage other Federal employees who feel they were pressured to contact the CSC's legal division and furnish the necessary information. The investigation could then broaden into a Government-wide inquiry of such practices.

Persons found guilty of coercion in connection with political fund-raising events could be ordered fired by the CSC, providing they are career employees. If the offending person is not under civil service, then the CSC would turn the case over to the agency with its recommendations for their dismissal.

Collecting funds on Government property for political events is a violation of the Corrupt Practices Act and subject to criminal penalties. Any information turned up in such cases would be turned over by the CSC to the Justice Department.

Recently, there was a report that President Johnson, after reading that General Services Administration employees complained of being pressured to buy tickets for his gala, wrote to GSA ordering that such tactics be stopped. GSA, however, denies that it ever received such a letter from Mr. Johnson.

CHILD'S CANDOR

One of the House members who last week voted against the Government pay raise bill,

which includes a \$7,500 congressional pay raise, had lunch the next day at the Capitol with his little boy.

Spotting one of his father's colleagues, the kid shouted out: "Daddy voted against the pay bill, but he's sure glad it passed."

HEAT DISMISSALS

Government employees who work in non-air-conditioned buildings really have to sweat before they can be released because of the heat.

Under the Government's hot weather dismissal regulations, the temperature and humidity have to hit the following combinations before employees can be released: 100 and 88, 99 and 42, 98 and 45, 97 and 49, 96 and 52 and 95 and 55.

USIA

Joseph C. Wheeler has been named Deputy Assistant Director for Administration for the United States Information Agency. Mr. Wheeler, a former finance and budget director for Agriculture Department, spent the past two years as Deputy Public Affairs Officer and Attache in Belgrade, Yugoslavia. Previously he served as executive officer for USIA in Rome.

RETIRED EMPLOYEES

Clarence Tarr of Springfield, Ill., is the new president of the National Association of Retired Civil Employees. Mr. Tarr will come here to assume his new duties. Two Washingtonians were elected among the officers—Martha Townsend, national secretary; and Harold Lingenfelter, treasurer.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I wish to read an excerpt from the article:

Since 1962, the Democrats have made a strong effort to get those Federal employees who were appointed to their positions—so-called Schedule C jobs—to buy \$100 tickets each year to one major party function.

Currently, there are about 1,440 Schedule C positions of which, according to a Civil Service spokesman, about 80 per cent are filled. Some 400 of the persons holding down these jobs, however, are regular Civil Service and not political appointees.

However, the pressure on employees to buy the \$100 ducats is not limited to those under Schedule C. Regular civil service employees in grade 11 and above in many agencies have received mailed "invitations" and follow-up telephone calls and direct appeals from their bosses to attend the affair.

Winking at the Federal laws that prohibit solicitation of Federal employees in Federal buildings, the Democratic National Committee has designated sales co-ordinators in each executive agency. Quotas have been established normally based on the number of Schedule C positions in a given department combined with a 10 per cent increase over the past year's ticket purchases.

Mr. President, these solicitations have gone on under preceding administrations as well as under the present administration, but that does not make it right. It is wrong.

This has been going on for years. The question is, do we want to stop it?

So far as I am concerned, I see no reason in the world why this should not be prohibited. Certainly if these same employees as private citizens, living in Washington, Maryland, Nevada, or elsewhere, who receive letters from a general mailing list, see fit to contribute to the party of their choice that is their privilege.

George Wallace or Martin Luther King who we are told are going to run for President, would not have access to the names of these employees, but if the name of a Government employee should

be included on their lists, certainly we could not make that a Federal crime; but solicitation with the intent to take advantage of or to use coercion on Government employees, in my book, must stop.

Perhaps the Senator thinks that the language could be changed and still achieve the same objective. I am not wedded to the language. I am wedded to the principle that we should make sure that we put a stop to the solicitation of these employees by either political party. We as officeholders or as candidates for public office, are prohibited from doing it ourselves, and we must make sure that no one can do it on our behalf.

That is the loophole in the law.

Mr. CANNON. From what the Senator says, I believe we are not far apart in our thinking. The Senator indicates that this should apply only to deliberate action, action where the list is made available and those people are circularized alone. Therefore, in view of the Senator's explanation as to what he would intend by this action, I should like to ask whether he would agree to inserting the words "intentionally and willfully," after the word "party" on line 8. If he would, I think I could accept the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That may not be the exact place I will suggest the absence of a quorum so that we can work this out. I understand that the Attorney General would have to prove that this was done with intent, as was done in the case I cited. That is what I am trying to correct. Mr. President, for that purpose, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. 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. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to modify my amendment on page 1, line 8, after the word "indirect," to insert the words "intentionally or willfully."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Delaware? The Chair hears none, and the amendment is modified accordingly.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, this carries out the intent of the amendment. It would achieve the objective I am seeking; namely, that these employees must not be solicited in any manner, either directly or indirectly, by a candidate for public office or by anyone doing so on his behalf. This amendment will give adequate protection. With that understanding, I am ready to vote on the amendment, as modified, but I would want the Senate to have a roll-call vote so that when it goes to the House they will know that we mean business and that we intend that the amendment be held.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

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 Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTROYA], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CORTON], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CORTON], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 62, nays 5, as follows:

[No. 242 Leg.]
YEAS—62

Alken	Burdick	Dirksen
Allott	Byrd, Va.	Ellender
Baker	Byrd, W. Va.	Ervin
Bartlett	Cannon	Fannin
Bayh	Carlson	Fong
Bennett	Case	Fulbright
Boggs	Cooper	Griffin

Brooke	Curtis	Gruening
Hansen	McClellan	Ribicoff
Harris	McGee	Scott
Hayden	McGovern	Smathers
Hickenlooper	McIntyre	Smith
Hill	Miller	Sparkman
Holland	Monroney	Spong
Hollings	Morse	Stennis
Hruska	Morton	Talmadge
Inouye	Mundt	Thurmond
Jordan, Idaho	Nelson	Tower
Kennedy, Mass.	Pearson	Williams, Del.
Kuchel	Prouty	Young, Ohio
Long, Mo.	Proxmire	

NAYS—5

Clark	Metcalf	Yarborough
McCarthy	Mondale	

NOT VOTING—33

Anderson	Hatfield	Murphy
Bible	Jackson	Muskie
Brewster	Javits	Pastore
Church	Jordan, N.C.	Pell
Cotton	Kennedy, N.Y.	Percy
Dodd	Lausche	Randolph
Dominick	Long, La.	Russell
Eastland	Magnuson	Symington
Gore	Mansfield	Tydings
Hart	Montoya	Williams, N.J.
Hartke	Moss	Young, N. Dak.

So the amendment of Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, as modified (No. 284), offered for himself and Mr. CARLSON, was agreed to.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I rise to speak in explanation of my negative vote on this amendment.

I have voted "no," not because of the principle involved in the amendment, but because of this absurd penalty.

Under this amendment—and I agree with the intent, to prohibit political solicitation of Federal employees—the penalty, next year, of a \$5,000 fine or imprisonment of not more than 3 years, or both, for soliciting some Federal employee to buy a ticket to a political event, is a stiffer penalty than that being imposed in America today for people burning down our cities.

I think for a great legislative body like this to invoke such a terrible penalty as going to the penitentiary for asking somebody to contribute to a campaign is utterly ridiculous, to the point of asininity. Though I want to see a provision in the law prohibiting the solicitation of money from Federal employees for Federal candidates, I will not vote for such a penalty.

I hope that sometime before the consideration of this bill is over, we can replace this penalty with some reasonable penalty and come down to some rule of reason. I think the majority of the Members of this body are lawyers. I say that we will never see anyone convicted with this kind of penalty until doomsday, even if he were indicted.

Whom they indict in Federal courts depends in large measure upon whom the Attorney General of the United States tells them to indict. It is not like a State court in my State, where the district attorneys are elected by the people, and the grand jury and the State district attorney of each county decide who will be indicted. But in the Federal Government, the district attorneys take orders from the Attorney General, and they seek to indict, generally, the people who are ordered to have indicted. I doubt whether the Attorney General would order anyone indicted under the extreme provisions of this section, with its excessively harsh penalties.

This penalty, makes Congress look

ridiculous, and would defeat any conviction, unless the offense were done with malice and on a vast scale.

I wish we could reconsider the matter now, and seek to provide a reasonable penalty.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PEARSON. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. CURTIS. 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 Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] proposes an amendment as follows:

On page 5, line 6, strike out "(1)", the comma, and the word "or"; and on line 7, strike out "(2)".

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will be in order.

The Senator from Nebraska is recognized on his amendment.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I can explain briefly what this amendment would do, and I strongly believe it will be accepted.

As this section is now written, it would limit a donor to an aggregate of \$5,000 for all candidates in the United States. That was not intended, I do not believe.

The amendment I have offered would limit a single donor—a person—to contributing not to exceed \$5,000 in any one year to any one candidate, or a committee for that candidate. That is, I think, as it should be.

Without my amendment, a donor could not contribute to a list of candidates in several States, if the aggregate amount is more than \$5,000.

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

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, personally I do not believe that a donor is limited by the present language to a total contribution of \$5,000 to several individual candidates. There is a difference in judgment between the distinguished Senator from Nebraska and myself on that point.

However, there is no such intent, and the language that the Senator has proposed makes that absolutely clear. Inasmuch as that was not the intent of the committee, and it is not the intent of the language that is in the bill at the present time, and since the Senator and I are completely in accord on our objectives, I am willing to accept his modified language.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the distinguished Senator, and I ask for a vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I now request the attention of the chairman of the committee concerning certain language in the bill. It may be that we can establish what it desired here by collo-

quy; it may be that someone will have some additional language to offer.

I refer to the definition of a candidate, found on page 2, lines 8 to 18. That language says:

(b) The term "candidate" means an individual who seeks nomination for election, or election, to Federal office, whether or not such individual is elected. For purposes of this paragraph, an individual shall be deemed to seek nomination for election, or election, if he (1) has taken the action necessary under the law of a State to qualify himself for nomination for election, or election, to Federal office—

That part is all right. As soon as he has taken action that has made him a candidate, he is a candidate. But it is the next language that I refer to—

or (2) has received contributions or made expenditures, or has given his consent for any other person to receive contributions or make expenditures, with a view to bringing about his nomination for election, or election, to such office—

Here is the problem. If an individual is a candidate, he is required to make certain periodic reports. If a Senator has two, three, four, five, or even five and one-half years of his term yet to run and that Senator makes expenditures to go home and—as it is commonly called—mend his fences or do the things that he must do in order to keep in touch with his people, the expenses that he has made will help him if he is a candidate two, three, four, or five years from now.

On the other hand, if the man does not know whether he will be a candidate, are we going to subject him to making reports as a candidate because he spends money to keep in touch with his people throughout his term?

Is it the intent of the language I have just read from page 2, lines 14 through 18, of the bill, to make any such requirement, or is it the intent to cover that reasonably short period before the filing, or whatever procedure must be followed in an individual State, when the individual actually begins to campaign?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, there certainly is no intent to cover the period of time when an officeholder is serving his constituents and making expenditures to mend fences and find out what they are thinking or just to visit with them. Certainly, that is not the intention. However, there is a period of time provided in most States to cover the period within which filings can be made.

The reason for referring to the necessary action in subparagraph (1) is because the necessary action is taken when a man files his nomination petition or follows whatever procedure is required in an individual State. That man has then taken the necessary action to become a candidate.

Subparagraph (2) relates to this same period of time substantially. However, a candidate may not have actually filed his nomination papers, but may have received contributions and made expenditures. There is certainly no intent here to cover a greater period of time in the case of a person who is already elected than the period of time required of a person seeking election.

Mr. CURTIS. I can understand why a certain period before filing might well

be covered. For instance, an individual might be a candidate in 1968, and if he has an August primary, he does not have to file until July.

I can well understand that we should include his expenditures in the months just prior to July, and that is the period of time the Senator intends to cover.

Mr. CANNON. That is the intention. As a matter of fact, the first filing period then would be, as I recall, March 10. The next period would be July 10, as I recall the provisions of the bill.

Mr. CURTIS. Is it the intention of the Senator definitely not to include the routine expenditures made while keeping in touch with one's constituents in the year prior to his effort to be renominated and reelected?

Mr. CANNON. The Senator is correct. It is not the intent that that type of expenditure or contribution, if one is involved, be included in the provisions of the bill.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. CANNON. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I realize that State laws are different on this matter and vary in many respects. In the State of Colorado it is not necessary to file at all.

Colorado has a combination convention-primary system, and any member of either party who receives 20 percent of the vote at the State Assembly, as it is called, then goes on the primary ticket.

As I understand the answer of the Senator with respect to subparagraph (b) (1), the action necessary under the State law would really not take place in Colorado until after the candidate had been nominated by the convention and filed his acceptance. Some people receive a little more than 20 percent. However, thinking that their chances are not too good, they do not file their acceptance.

In the State of Colorado—and there are other States in which similar situations exist—the action under the State law, I would presume, would not be had until the candidate has filed his acceptance, which he has to do, I believe, within 5 days after his nomination by the State assembly.

Mr. CANNON. I believe the Senator is correct. That would be the final action required by State law. However, let us assume that he had not filed, but had actually sought the nomination at the convention and been nominated. It would appear that if a candidate had received contributions and made expenditures at that time, he would then be required to make a report, subject to these reporting dates.

The reporting dates are contained on page 15 of the bill. That part of the bill reads:

Such reports shall be filed on the 10th day of March, June, and September, in each year, and on the fifteenth and fifth days next preceding the date on which an election is held, and also by the 31st day of January.

Consistent with those reporting dates, if a person has actually sought a nomination and received contributions and made expenditures in connection therewith, he would be required to report un-

der this provision of the bill even though he had not actually filed his acceptance of the nomination.

Mr. ALLOTT. The distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] raised a question. It is difficult for an incumbent to determine under this section when he would actually be considered a candidate.

For the information of the Senator, the assembly in Colorado meets in July. I do not know whether, section 204 of the pending bill would operate, unless a man said he is a candidate. Suppose a man is just stepping up the mending of his political fences during that year and does not say that he is a candidate until perhaps a week before the State assembly? When is he actually a candidate?

The reason I ask these questions is that I do not believe any Senators want to run afoul of this law later on. Yet, in one sense or another, whether a man has filed for election, or followed whatever other procedure is required, we must somewhere pin this down so that we can determine when he actually becomes liable for filing.

Mr. CANNON. Subsection (b) reads:

(b) The term "candidate" means an individual who seeks nomination for election, or election, to Federal office, whether or not such individual is elected. For purposes of this paragraph, an individual shall be deemed to seek nomination for election, or election, if he (1) has taken the action necessary under the law of a State to qualify himself for nomination for election, or election, to Federal office or (2) has received contributions or made expenditures, or has given his consent for any other person to receive contributions or make expenditures, with a view to bringing about his nomination for election, or election, to such office.

Mr. ALLOTT. If the Senator will bear with me, I should like to pin this matter down a little closer.

For example, in Colorado, the assembly is held in July, and I believe this can be applicable where a man has to file, also. If he did not actually make an announcement until—let us take the extreme case—the night before or a week before the assembly, the question then arises, for an incumbent, whether he was out taking care of his constituents and explaining political issues to them or whether he was a candidate running for office.

I believe we have something here that might cause us trouble. I assume, from what the Senator has said, that in the situation of Colorado, where the assembly is held ordinarily in July and the primary in September, having gone through the assembly and signed the acceptance, which he is required to file with the secretary of state, then certainly he would qualify under subparagraph 1.

Mr. CANNON. He certainly would.

Mr. ALLOTT. Considering what the Senator has said, I assume that unless the man had made a public pronouncement prior to that time, that he was a candidate, he would not be responsible under the reporting provisions of section 204 until he had made some such announcement or said in a specific way that

he was looking for votes or looking for support for his candidacy for the election.

Mr. CANNON. Or unless he had been out soliciting contributions for the purpose of getting elected.

Mr. ALLOTT. Suppose he had not solicited contributions, but contributions had been given?

Mr. CANNON. I would say it would be the same thing. If the candidate accepted contributions for that purpose, whether he solicited them or not would seem to me to be immaterial. If he accepted a contribution for the purpose of helping his reelection, certainly he would be covered. That situation would be covered under this provision of the law.

Mr. ALLOTT. Then, is the distinguished Senator reversing the situation that existed in his discussion with the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, as to whether or not the man is getting assistance?

For example, let us say that an incumbent goes to his own State and he speaks for an organization. It does not matter what the organization is—it might be the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers or the chamber of commerce or anything else—and is compensated for that trip; and while he is there, he also speaks at other places and talks with other people in a general vein, without any respect to announcing his candidacy. Would this constitute a contribution? I believe we are in a very sensitive area here which must be pinned down in some way.

Mr. CANNON. Certainly, in the situation just described, the officeholder is carrying out the duties of his office; and so long as his principal duty is exactly what he is doing, I would think that there would be no question about it.

I discussed with the distinguished Senator from Nebraska the situation of a man who might not have accepted his nomination, but that it would be at or about the same time. Certainly it is clear if he has accepted it, or if he makes a public announcement and says, "I am going to be a candidate," fine. In the situation I mentioned a moment ago, if he solicits funds for the purpose of his reelection, that would be a clear case. But I believe that short of that, where there has been no solicitation of funds or no expenditure of money, it is not involved, anyway, because that is all you must report.

Mr. CURTIS. If the Senator will yield, I believe that I was in error with respect to the page. The term "candidate" is defined in the same terms at the bottom of page 8 and the top of page 9 in direct reference to the disclosure of Federal campaign funds. So the colloquy we had is pertinent. It should also be called to attention that what was said should apply to the definition of "candidate" as found on pages 8 and 9 as well as earlier in the bill.

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. ALLOTT. Yes. That is under title 2, the disclosure of Federal campaign funds.

Mr. CANNON. The Senator made reference to receiving an honorarium. This is covered on page 3 of the bill.

Mr. ALLOTT. I did not ask about

honorariums, but I did mention specifically expenses of such.

Mr. CANNON. It reads:

The term "contribution" means a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money for anything of value, made for the purpose of influencing the nomination for election, or election, of any person to Federal office or as presidential and vice presidential electors, or for the purpose of influencing the result of a primary—

It continues:

and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make a contribution, and also includes a transfer of funds between political committees;

Then it goes on to describe the term "expenditure" in the same context.

Mr. ALLOTT. I still do not believe that we have really pinned this matter down, and perhaps I can talk with counsel and we can figure some way of pinning it down further.

In looking over the report and the information which the chairman of the committee has issued, I find that with respect to contributions, it says that it includes everything of value.

At the top of page 3:

The term "contribution" means a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money or anything of value, made for the purpose of influencing the nomination for election, or election, of any person to Federal office, or for the purpose of influencing the result—

And so forth. Then down to line 11:

and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, express or implied, whether or not legally enforceable, to make a contribution, and also includes a transfer of funds between political committees;

In subparagraph (f), it says:

The term "expenditure" includes a purchase, payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift of money or anything of value, made for the purpose of influencing the nomination for election, or election, of any person to Federal office—

Perhaps I am nit-picking, but I believe I am aiming at something which is very vital in this matter.

Suppose a Senator—it could be the Senator from Nevada, the Senator from Colorado, the Senator from Florida, or a Senator from any other State—goes to his own State, and in the period of a year, we will say, before his reelection or proposed reelection, one of his friends picks him up at the airport and drives him a hundred miles to a dinner; and at the dinner he is the guest speaker, and he does not pay for his dinner. At least, it is very rare that they do pay upon such occasions. Does the proposed legislation mean that every such service must be evaluated and reported?

Mr. CANNON. In the first place, the service such as that described would not come within the purview of the bill because of the amount involved.

Mr. ALLOTT. Because it is under \$100?

Mr. CANNON. The Senator is correct. Second, it would be a question as to whether it was for the purpose of influencing the nomination for election or the election. If it were over \$100 and for that purpose, the Senator would have to decide the reason for his particular trip since he is the man who will have

to report. He would have to decide under the circumstances whether the contribution was for the purpose of influencing the nomination for election or election to Federal office.

Mr. ALLOTT. I am sure the Senator understands what I am talking about. The matter really comes down to the intention and the purpose at the time. If the person says, "At this time I went down to talk about this reclamation project and I went up to talk about the mining in the northern part of my State, and that is all I was doing," the only thing one can look at is the intention of the person himself.

Mr. CANNON. I think the Senator is correct in stating that it depends on the intention of the person himself, plus the surrounding circumstances. Certainly, if the Senator says, "It was not my intention to be running for election at that time," and the opponent says that it was, it is going to be a campaign issue because he did not make a report; but that is one of the facts we have to live with.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator. I am going to determine whether we can pin this down and tighten it so we would not run into controversies and conflicts in a campaign where someone says that he was campaigning for office and the other party says that he was not.

Mr. CANNON. I am sure the Senator is familiar with the attempt to tie down loopholes in the Internal Revenue Code. They are not all tied down and I do not know if we will be able to in this bill at this time.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator.

(At this point, Mr. SPONG assumed the chair.)

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

Mr. CANNON. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I note on page 5 of the printed bill, in Section 608, "Limitations on Political Contributions and Purchases," these words, and I shall read only the words that apply to the question I am going to ask:

(a) It shall be unlawful for any person, directly or indirectly, to make a contribution or contributions in an aggregate amount in excess of \$5,000—

Then, skipping to line 11: "to a candidate."

Does that mean that the \$5,000, the amount stated there, is the maximum limitation on the contribution any person as defined in this bill can make to any candidate as defined in this bill either in a primary or general election?

Mr. CANNON. The Senator is correct. That is the limitation in the bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. I so understood it.

I now turn to page 24 of the bill under which we find in section 212 "State Laws Not Affected," these words:

(a) Nothing in this title shall be deemed to invalidate or make inapplicable any provision of any State law, except where compliance with such provision of law would result in a violation of a provision of this title.

I am disturbed a bit by this section. The State statute of the State of Florida, which I represent in part, in a similar provision, fixes a limit of \$1,000 for a contribution in either a primary or a gen-

eral election, whereas in this law it seems that the limit of \$5,000 is fixed as the limit of contribution in any primary or general election; that is, in a Federal election for the House of Representatives, the Senate, the Presidency, and Vice Presidency.

I am speaking now of contributions to persons. What, in the opinion of the Senator, is the situation where there is that difference between State law and Federal law? Does this section 212 mean that in Federal elections this provision would become the controlling provision, and the \$5,000 limitation would become the legal limitation rather than the lesser amount prescribed by State law?

Mr. CANNON. If the Senator will yield, I think this provision as written would permit the State to impose its own lesser limitation. It would be only in the event the State attempted to enlarge the limitation that this provision of the law would apply. So if the State of Florida has a limitation of \$1,000 for a contribution to a candidate for a primary election that would be the limit in the State, and the \$1,000 in the general election. Of course, that would be a total of \$2,000 vis-a-vis a \$5,000 total in the bill before us.

I think this would not change or attempt to change the State law where the State law has a more strict requirement.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator. I would like to ask one more question in order to point up the situation.

Do I understand the Senator by his ruling or interpretation to state he does not regard the \$5,000 provision in the bill as a provision that would be violated by the imposition of a smaller limitation by State law?

Mr. CANNON. That is my interpretation.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator. I think that makes the point very clear.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 283

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 283 and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 7, after line 5, insert the following:

"Sec. 105. Section 610 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"§ 610. Contributions or expenditures by national banks, corporations, or labor organizations

"(a) It is unlawful for any national bank, or any corporation organized by authority of any law of Congress, to make a contribution or expenditure in connection with any election to any political office, or in connection with any primary election or political

convention or caucus held to select candidates for any political office.

"(b) (1) It is unlawful—

"(A) for any corporation or any labor organization to make, directly or indirectly, any contribution or expenditure in connection with any election, or to make, directly or indirectly, any contribution to any committee, association, or organization (whether or not a political committee) which makes such contributions or expenditures; or

"(B) for any candidate, any political committee, any other committee, association, or organization, or any other person to accept or receive any contribution prohibited by this section.

"(2) For purposes of applying paragraph (1), the source of the funds from which a contribution or expenditure is made shall be immaterial, and such paragraph shall apply to a contribution or expenditure made from funds contributed for such purpose by the shareholders of a corporation or the members of a labor organization, as the case may be, as well as from any other funds of a corporation or labor organization, from whatever source derived, even though the shareholders of the corporation or the members of the labor organization, as the case may be, consent to such contribution or expenditure.

"(3) Paragraph (1) shall apply to a contribution or expenditure by a corporation or a labor organization without regard to the amount of such contribution or expenditure.

"(4) Paragraph (1) shall not apply to an expenditure made—

"(A) by a corporation in connection with a publication or other communication intended primarily for the stockholders of such corporation, or

"(B) by a labor organization in connection with a publication or other communication intended primarily for the members of such labor organization.

"(c) Every corporation or labor organization which makes any contribution or expenditure in violation of this section shall be fined not more than \$5,000; and every officer or director of any corporation, or officer of any labor organization, who consents to any contribution or expenditure by the corporation or labor organization, as the case may be, and any person who accepts or receives any contribution, in violation of this section, shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both; and if the violation was willful, shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned not more than two years, or both.

"(d) As used in this section, the term "labor organization" means—

"(1) any organization of any kind, or any agency or employee representation committee or plan, in which employees participate and which exists for the purpose, in whole or in part, of dealing with employers concerning grievances, labor disputes, wages, rates of pay, hours of employment, or conditions of work; and

"(2) any organization, association, or council of labor organizations, described in paragraph (1)."

On page 7, line 6, strike out "105" and insert "106".

On page 8, line 5, strike out "106" and insert "107".

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, under existing law, section 610, title 18, of the United States Code, was supposed to have prohibited political contributions or expenditures in connection with any general election, or any primary election or political convention, by national banks, corporations, or labor organizations. We are advised, however, that existing law is not being interpreted in the manner in which Congress intended.

I ask unanimous consent to have the entire section 610 of the existing law printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

SECTION 610. CONTRIBUTIONS OR EXPENDITURES BY NATIONAL BANKS, CORPORATIONS OR LABOR ORGANIZATIONS

It is unlawful for any national bank, or any corporation organized by authority of any law of Congress, to make a contribution or expenditure in connection with any election to any political office, or in connection with any primary election or political convention or caucus held to select candidates for any political office, or for any corporation whatever, or any labor organization to make a contribution or expenditure in connection with any election at which Presidential and Vice Presidential electors or a Senator or Representative in, or a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to Congress are to be voted for, or in connection with any primary election or political convention or caucus held to select candidates for any of the foregoing offices, or for any candidate, political committee, or other person to accept or receive any contribution prohibited by this section.

Every corporation or labor organization which makes any contribution or expenditure in violation of this section shall be fined not more than \$5,000; and every officer or director of any corporation, or officer of any labor organization, who consents to any contribution or expenditure by the corporation or labor organization, as the case may be, and any person who accepts or receives any contribution, in violation of this section, shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both; and if the violation was willful, shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned not more than two years or both.

For the purposes of this section "labor organization" means any organization of any kind, or any agency or employee representation committee or plan, in which employees participate and which exist for the purpose, in whole or in part, of dealing with employers concerning grievances, labor disputes, wages, rates of pay, hours of employment, or conditions of work. (June 25, 1948, ch. 645, 62 Stat. 723; May 24, 1949, ch. 138, § 10, 63 Stat. 90; Oct. 31, 1951, ch. 655, § 20 (c), 65 Stat. 718.)

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Reviser's Note.—Based on section 251 of title 2, U.S.C., 1940 ed., The Congress (Feb. 28, 1925, ch. 368, title III, § 313, 43 Stat. 1074).

The War Labor Disputes Act, June 25, 1943, ch. 144, § 9, 57 Stat. 167, amends this section by making it temporarily applicable to labor organizations; therefore the effective date of this section will be postponed by a special provision of the enacting bill until the expiration of the amendatory act. (See sections 1509 and 1510 of title 50, App. U.S.C., 1940 ed.)

Minor changes in phraseology were made.

SENATE REVISION AMENDMENT

The special effective date provision was eliminated by Senate amendment, inasmuch as the act of June 23, 1947, ch. 120, § 304, 61 Stat. 159, which became an additional source of this section, made the provisions of section 9 of the War Labor Disputes Act (50 U.S.C., App. § 1509), which had temporarily amended section 251 of Title 2 U.S.C., permanent legislation. This section was accordingly changed by Senate amendment so as to give effect to such act of June 23, 1947, ch. 120, § 304, 61 Stat. 159. See Senate Report No. 1620, amendments Nos. 4 and 5, 80th Cong.

AMENDMENTS

1951—Act Oct. 31, 1951, amended second paragraph by inserting "and any person who accepts or receives any contribution", and

by adding the additional punishment provisions after the semicolon.

1949—Act May 24, 1949, amended catchline by adding "or expenditures".

CROSS REFERENCES

Definitions of terms applicable to this section, see section 591 of this title.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the caption on this reads, "Contributions or Expenditures by National Banks, Corporations, or Labor Organizations."

It is clear that Congress intended to prohibit such contributions.

Section 610 reads in part as follows:

It is unlawful for any national bank, or any corporation organized by authority of any law of Congress, to make a contribution or expenditure in connection with any election to any political office, or in connection with any primary election or political convention or caucus held to select candidates for any political office, or for any corporation whatever, or any labor organization to make a contribution or expenditure in connection with any election at which Presidential and Vice Presidential electors or a Senator or Representative in, or a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to Congress are to be voted. . .

The rest of the section is in the RECORD, but the law is clear that for any corporation or any labor organization whatever to make a contribution or expenditure in connection with any election, whether presidential or congressional candidates be involved, is unlawful. I do not think we should need an amendment in this particular case; however, the law is not being enforced and is not being interpreted by the Attorney General as prohibiting cash contributions.

Nor does he interpret the law as prohibiting cash contributions that are being made out of union or corporate funds to political parties and to political candidates.

I had two cases called to my attention where such cash contributions have been made. One case involved a union which contributed \$25,000 in cash to a political party out of union funds. There were other contributions from union funds in varying amounts—\$10,000, three \$2,500 contributions, two \$2,000 contributions—to other candidates by this same union. This case was called to the attention of the Attorney General. I have a letter here which I will place in the RECORD from the Attorney General stating that under existing law there is no basis for prosecution.

I ask unanimous consent to have my speech of January 19, 1966, on this case, printed in the RECORD, followed by my correspondence with the Attorney General dated January 26, 1966, and his reply thereto of February 6, 1966.

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

STATEMENT OF SENATOR JOHN J. WILLIAMS, AS DELIVERED IN THE U.S. SENATE, JANUARY 19, 1966.

Mr. President, today I call attention to a strange series of events surrounding the case of Mr. Lawrence L. Callanan, a convicted official of the powerful St. Louis Steamfitters Local 562.

In 1954 Mr. Callanan as an official of this union was convicted of a \$28,000-shakedown of a Tulsa pipeline contractor.

Federal Judge Rubey Hulen in sentencing Mr. Callanan described the case as a "more grievous and aggravated violation of the law" than any other racketeering case tried before him.

Continuing Judge Hulen said, "The evidence of merciless use and betrayal of people who labor for their livelihood and were members of unions supposed to be represented by these defendants, is shocking. Unless I had heard the facts under oath I would not have believed them."

The Judge further remarked that Callanan "hasn't shown one bit of remorse. Indifference to the welfare of union workmen is glaring."

He stated further, "Callanan took from the funds of the union, of which he is an officer, funds to pay for his defense. . . . Callanan was the brains of the racketeering conspiracy."

In 1960 after serving about half of a 12-year sentence Callanan was paroled.

Treasury Department records show that during the years 1956, 1957, 1958, 1959 and 1962 Mr. Callanan did not file any Federal income tax returns.

For the years 1950, 1951, 1952, 1953 and 1954 Mr. Callanan created a delinquent tax liability, including penalty and interest, of \$40,219.84. The Treasury filed a deficiency tax assessment as follows:

Taxable year	Tax	Penalty	Assessed interest	Accrued interest	Total
1950	0	\$206.68	\$755.47	\$698.48	\$1,660.63
1951	\$1,222.00	1,048.54	604.97	898.36	3,773.87
1952	4,883.51	3,382.49	1,762.07	3,033.09	13,061.16
1953	4,861.95	3,414.20	1,462.57	2,945.57	12,684.29
1954	5,097.48	920.20	1,202.10	1,820.11	9,039.89
Total	16,064.94	8,972.11	5,787.18	9,395.61	40,219.84

On April 9, 1964, the Treasury Department accepted an offer in compromise whereby Mr. Callanan paid \$17,000 in settlement of his \$40,219.84 tax debt plus a graduated percentage of his income in excess of \$7500 for the years 1964 to 1974.

An Internal Revenue Service summary noted that he was then earning \$150 a week as a steamfitter and added a doleful note that there are "no prospects of any material increase" in his income.

In the same month, April 1964, President Johnson commuted the sentence of this labor racketeer and thereby removed the legal blocks which had restricted his union activities.

The St. Louis Globe Democrat in its October 2-3, 1965, issue carried this interesting comment:

"Before his commutation was granted . . . Callanan faced legal blocks to resuming union-related activity until July 1971.

"He recently surfaced on the political high seas as the director of the lush 'voluntary' political fund of Local 562, his salary reported in the \$15,000-\$20,000 range."

Reports of campaign donations filed with the Clerk of the House of Representatives January 12, 1965, show that on November 2, 1964, John A. Lawler, Business Manager of the Steamfitters Local 562, contributed \$25,000 to "Friends of L.B.J."

I quote Section 608 of Title 18 of the U.S. Code, entitled "Limitations on political contributions and purchases:

"(a) Whoever, directly or indirectly, makes contributions in an aggregate amount in excess of \$5,000 during any calendar year, or in connection with any campaign for nomination or election, to or on behalf of any candidate for an elective Federal office, including the offices of President of the United States and Presidential and Vice Presidential electors, or to or on behalf of any committee or other organization engaged in furthering, advancing, or advocating the nomination or election of any candidate for any such office or the success of any national political party, shall be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both."

On June 2, 1965, Mr. L. L. Callanan, 10517 Lookaway, St. Louis, Missouri (home address), made a \$1000 contribution to the Democratic National Committee.

On June 24, 1965, Mr. Lawrence Callanan, 1242 Pierce Avenue, St. Louis, Missouri (address of the union), made another \$1000 contribution to the Democratic National Committee.

These two \$1000 political contributions were made by the same man who just the

year before had compromised a \$40,000 tax obligation for \$17,000.

On June 2, 1965, a \$1000 contribution to the Democratic National Committee was made in the name of E. Beck, 4317 Haven Street, St. Louis, Missouri. Mr. Beck is listed as Mr. Callanan's son-in-law and according to press accounts, last year was made an assistant to Callanan in running the "voluntary" political fund of Local 562 members.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a list of these political contributions as appearing in the reports filed with the Clerk of the House of Representatives under dates of January 12, 1965, and September 10, 1965:

"REPORT FILED JANUARY 12, 1965, BY FRIENDS OF L. B. J.

"November 2, 1964: John L. Lawler, St. Louis, Mo., \$25,000."

"REPORT FILED SEPTEMBER 10, 1965, BY THE DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE

"June 2, 1965: L. L. Callanan, 10517 Lookaway, St. Louis, Mo., \$1,000.

"June 2, 1965: J. L. Lawler, 1242 Pierce Avenue, St. Louis, Missouri, \$1,000.

"June 2, 1965: E. Beck, 4317 Haven Street, St. Louis, Mo., \$1,000.

"June 24, 1965: Lawrence Callanan (sic), 1242 Pierce Avenue, St. Louis, Mo., \$1,000."

Next I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the letter signed by Mr. Sheldon S. Cohen, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, as addressed to me under date of January 6, 1966, confirming Mr. Callanan's tax delinquency:

U.S. TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., January 6, 1966.

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This is in further response to your letters of October 6 and 12, 1965, in which you requested certain information regarding the compromise settlement of tax assessments by the Treasury Department with Mr. Lawrence L. Callanan, St. Louis, Missouri.

Information furnished by the District Director in St. Louis, Missouri, discloses that an offer in compromise from Mr. Callanan was accepted on April 9, 1964. The amount of the offer was \$17,000, plus a future income collateral agreement providing for the payment of a graduated percentage of annual income in excess of \$7,500 for the years 1964 to 1974, inclusive. This is the only offer which has been accepted from Mr. Callanan over the past thirty years.

The following is a breakdown of the liability which was compromised:

Taxable year	Tax	Penalty	Assessed interest	Accrued interest	Total
1950.....	0	\$206.68	\$755.47	\$698.48	\$1,660.63
1951.....	\$1,222.00	1,048.54	604.97	898.36	3,773.87
1952.....	4,883.51	3,382.49	1,762.07	3,033.09	13,061.16
1953.....	4,861.95	3,414.20	1,462.57	2,945.57	12,684.29
1954.....	5,097.48	920.20	1,202.10	1,820.11	9,039.89
Total.....	16,064.94	8,972.11	5,787.18	9,395.61	40,219.84

You also requested to know whether Mr. Callanan has filed timely tax returns over the past ten years. The records of our District Director in St. Louis, Missouri, disclose the filing of income tax returns by Mr. Callanan for the years 1955, 1960, 1961, 1963, and 1964. Up to this point we have been unable to find any record in the St. Louis office of returns filed by Mr. Callanan for 1956, 1957, 1958, 1959, and 1962. However, we would not want to say with any degree of finality that Mr. Callanan did not file for these years, since he could have filed in other district offices.

Of the returns on record in the St. Louis District, all were timely filed except the 1955 return which was received after the due date.

With kind regards,

Sincerely,

SHELDON S. COHEN,
Commissioner.

Perhaps there is a plausible explanation for the strange circumstances surrounding this case, but I fail to see it.

JANUARY 26, 1966.

HON. NICHOLAS DEB. KATZENBACH,
U.S. Attorney General,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: On January 19, 1966, as appearing in the daily Congressional Record, pages 619 to 622, I outlined a \$25,000 campaign contribution that had been made to the "Friends of LBJ" by Mr. John L. Lawler, St. Louis, Missouri, and at the same time I quoted Section 608 of Title 18 of the United States Code, which prohibits contributions in excess of \$5,000 by any individual or contributor.

There appeared in the Washington Star of January 23 the following item:

"SENATOR WILLIAMS, THE ANSWER IS

"The Justice Department had already completed its investigation of the \$25,000 contribution by John L. Lawler, a St. Louis union official, to the 1964 Johnson presidential campaign, when Sen. John J. Williams, R-Del., mentioned it last week in a Senate speech.

"The department determined that a federal law barring individual contributions over \$5,000 had not been violated. The money allegedly was collected as individual donations in St. Louis and subsequently was brought to Washington by Lawler."

In this connection will you please furnish me the following information:

1. In the Department of Justice's investigation:

a. Was it found that the contribution represented a series of individual donations rather than a \$25,000 contribution by Mr. Lawler or that it was a contribution made from union funds?

b. If it represents contributions from individuals does not the law require that the names and addresses of the contributors be filed rather than all under the name of one individual?

(1) If so, please furnish the name and address of each donor who contributed toward the \$25,000 fund?

c. If these funds were taken from the political fund maintained by the union, does this not constitute a violation of the law which prohibits unions from contributing to political campaigns?

Yours sincerely,

JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

FEBRUARY 9, 1966.

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: The Attorney General has asked me to reply to your letter of January 26, 1966, discussing a statement made by you in the Senate on January 19 concerning one John L. Lawler of St. Louis, Missouri.

In October 1965 this Department began an investigation of an allegation that Mr. Lawler had contributed \$25,000 to a campaign committee supporting the candidacy of President Johnson. That investigation showed that the \$25,000 contribution represented the accumulation of many small contributions by individuals in the St. Louis area to the Voluntary Political, Education, Legislative, Charity and Defense Fund of Steam Fitters Local 562. It was not a personal contribution of Mr. Lawler and the Voluntary Fund is not a labor union.

Title 2, United States Code, Section 244 does not require a local committee to file anything with the Clerk of the House of Representatives. Section 244 does require national committees or multi-state committees to file with the Clerk of the House the names of each person who contributes \$100 or more and the total sum of all other contributions received within a calendar year.

On the basis of the information developed by the investigation, it was concluded that no violation of law appeared. However, if additional or contrary information of any substance were received in this matter, or in any matter within the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice, it would receive the fullest consideration.

Sincerely,

FRED M. VINSON, Jr.,
Assistant Attorney General.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I also have a case where a cash contribution was made by a corporation with the understanding that the contribution would then be included as an expense item of the corporation and thereby be charged off as a tax deduction for income tax purposes. These contributions were made by the corporation, and they were charged off. That is all admitted by officials of the company. This case was called to the attention of the Attorney General, who again said that under existing law they were unable to prosecute.

Thus, I say that if existing law is not adequate we should repeal it and let it be known that all corporations and all unions can make all the political contributions they wish. If Congress is not in favor of such cash contributions by unions and corporations—and I do not think that we are—then we should amend the law and stop it. Let us specifically state that these cash contributions are violations of the law, whether made directly or indirectly.

The amendment as it is written clearly spells out that this would in no way affect, nor is it intended in any way to affect, the rights of corporations through its memorandums or letters to advise its stockholders on what is good or not

good legislation, and so forth. They have a perfect right to conduct their business and advise their stockholders. This is not in any way a restriction on those rights.

By the same token, it is specifically spelled out that the union can send its correspondence and official publications to its union members and call their attention to various legislative proposals which are before Congress. They can, if they wish, call to their members' attention how I voted on an issue and how my opponents may be better able to help them with legislation. This does not interfere with their reporting to their union members, but it is clearly intended to stop them from making cash contributions to my political campaign or to my opponent's campaign, as is now being done under existing law by both unions and corporations.

I repeat, the amendment would not stop any union or corporation from performing its legitimate functions in connection with advising its membership.

For example, unions for years have protested the Taft-Hartley Act and have urged its repeal. I happen to be one who supports that act, and I think it should stay on the books; but there is nothing in my amendment that would stop a union in my State from calling the attention of its members to the fact that I supported this particular bill. They have a right to do that and to support my opponent. I am not quarreling with their right to inform their members on legislative proposals, but this amendment would stop cash contributions to political candidates or parties.

The existing law now states:

It is unlawful . . . for any corporation whatever, or any labor organization to make a contribution or expenditure in connection with any election at which Presidential and Vice Presidential electors or a Senator or Representative in, or a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to Congress are to be voted . . .

The intent of the law is clear, but it has not been enforced. They rely on the loophole that these are not direct contributions but siphoned through a committee or some individual.

Yes, the law now states it is unlawful, but enforcement is silent. As I stated earlier, I do not know how we could make it much clearer except to make the legislative record clear that cash contributions to the party or the candidate are prohibited, whether made direct from union funds or through a committee.

My amendment specifically spells out that it is unlawful to make these contributions either directly or indirectly.

Let me quote from section (a) on page 2:

(b) (1) It is unlawful—

(A) for any corporation or any labor organization to make, directly or indirectly, any contribution or expenditure in connection with any election, or to make, directly or indirectly, any contribution to any committee, association, or organization (whether or not a political committee) which makes such contributions or expenditures; or . . .

Mr. President, I think it is clear that this would not in any way restrict unions or corporations from doing that which Congress clearly intended; namely, informing their members.

When section 610 of the Corrupt Practices Act was first passed, it was the intent to prevent them from making cash contributions, as they are being permitted to do today by the Attorney General of the United States. It is now necessary to spell out specifically in no uncertain terms, clearly and emphatically, that such would be a violation of the law.

I hope this amendment can be adopted unanimously.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. I presume that the Senator is speaking of his amendment No. 283?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes.

Mr. ALLOTT. I should like to ask the Senator to refer to the language beginning on line 6 on the first page of his amendment which reads,

It is unlawful for any national bank, or any corporation organized by authority of any law of Congress . . .

There are relatively few corporations organized by authority of the law of Congress. I would like to ask the Senator why he has limited this language to corporations with a Federal charter. I believe in his own State, as well as mine, I can think of many large corporations which are not organized by the authority of the law of Congress, but which are organized by the authority of the law of the State in which they are incorporated.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct. Subsection (a), as appearing on page 1 of the amendment, lines 6 through 11, is lifted verbatim out of the existing law, and it refers to national banks or corporations that are nationally chartered, but on the next page section 1(b) it adds that it is unlawful for any corporation or labor organization.

In the second section, we refer to corporations incorporated, for example, in the State of Colorado, Delaware, or other States. That is the exact manner in which it is referred to in existing law.

If the Senator will turn to page 45 of the pamphlet on his desk, the Corrupt Practices Act, he will see this same language.

There are two types of corporations, one chartered by Congress and the other chartered by the States. In order to take them both in, separate sections were written.

Mr. ALLOTT. I think it is important to make this clear for the purpose of the history of this legislation, because someone might misconstrue the use of the word "corporation" on page 2 of the amendment, section (b) (1) (A), as a corporation in the same sense as defined on the first page.

I want to be sure that the sense of the amendment is that the word "corporation" as used in subparagraph (b) (1) (A) is actually any corporation, whether organized under the laws of Congress or whether organized under the laws of any State.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct. I am glad the Senator raised that question, because this discussion

should clarify it. That definitely should be clear.

In both instances, section 610, as it appears on page 1 of the amendment, is in accordance with existing law, and on page 2, subsection (b) (1) (A) is the same as existing law, except for the words "directly or indirectly" to make it broad enough so there will be no question that contributions made by unions and corporations are covered, whether the contribution is made directly or indirectly.

The existing law reads:

It is unlawful for any national bank, or any corporation organized by authority of any law of Congress, to make a contribution or expenditure in connection with any election to any political office, or in connection with any primary election or political convention or caucus held to select candidates for any political office—

That is the first section. Then it goes on—

or for any corporation whatever, or any labor organization to make a contribution or expenditure in connection with any election . . .

That is the existing law.

The change I am proposing in the existing law is that these contributions, if they are made directly or indirectly, either from out of corporation funds or out of union funds, are all a violation of the law. I think that was the intent of the law as originally written or as indicated by the legislative record, but it is now being interpreted differently by the Attorney General. I have had correspondence with him concerning contributions by a union or corporation, to the effect that since the contributions were made indirectly from union or corporation funds such use was not in violation of the law. That is the interpretation of the Department of Justice, and unless we amend the law and broaden it to make clear our intention that will continue to be the interpretation.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. BROOKE. Under the Senator's amendment, are labor unions prohibited from doing anything that they are not able to do under existing law?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. In my opinion, no, except that both labor unions and corporations under Department rulings are being permitted to do this. When I say "unions" and "corporations" I should not use the plural because I have but one example of each. Both of these made cash contributions, and nothing was done. In the case of the corporation the contribution was charged off indirectly as a business expense, which I do not think was intended under the law. A union made a cash contribution indirectly from the funds of the union. I do not think that was the intent of the law, because the law as it reads states that it is prohibited for any corporation whatever, or any labor organization, to make a contribution or expenditure in connection with any election at which presidential and vice-presidential electors or a Senator or Representative are involved.

This amendment makes it clear that

contributions made indirectly from funds through the name of a third party would be illegal. Under the present law they are being permitted to get away with it.

I am only a layman, but I think I can interpret the law better than that. There are laws now that can be enforced, but they are not being enforced. I have a letter from the Attorney General's office stating that there will be no prosecution on either of these cases under existing law. We need to amend the law.

Mr. BROOKE. Does the Senator from Delaware have an example of the loophole?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes.

Mr. BROOKE. What is the example?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Specifically, one example was a \$25,000 contribution made by a steamfitters' local in St. Louis. This was a cash contribution. I have a letter from the Department of Justice stating that there will be no prosecution under existing law. There were several lesser contributions of from \$2,000 to \$10,000 to congressional candidates by this same union.

The contribution by a corporation involves a case that was called to the attention of the Senate Rules Committee in 1964, when it was conducting the Baker investigation. This case was, in turn, referred to the Department of Justice. It involved a cash contribution made indirectly by the International Telephone Co. In both cases the Justice Department has ruled that there will be no prosecution.

Mr. BROOKE. In the first case the Senator cited, was it a direct or indirect contribution from the labor union?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Indirect. The contribution was made in the name of one of the union officials. A \$25,000 contribution was made in the name of the union official, but admittedly it was from union funds.

To go further, I asked the question how a \$25,000 contribution could be made by the union when the Corrupt Practices Act states that \$5,000 is the limitation from any one individual. It was ruled that this was not a violation of the Corrupt Practices Act because the funds came from several people involving contributions of less than \$5,000 each. The same excuse was given in the case—

Mr. BROOKE. But the contribution was not actually made by the labor union?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is right; neither was it made by the corporation, but it was from the union's or corporation's funds, made indirectly into the political campaign. That is the reason why I am proposing that such contributions cannot be made indirectly. The law states now that they cannot be made directly. I am proposing that they cannot be made indirectly. Let us face it; we may as well have no law at all if we accept the proposition that these contributions can be made through third parties.

Mr. BROOKE. If I understand the Senator correctly, the \$25,000 was a contribution given by a group in which say, five persons contributed \$5,000 each.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No; it

was not broken down at all as to amounts. It was union funds placed into a political committee and then distributed as cash contributions.

Mr. BROOKE. I see. But there were a number of persons?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The assumption was that maybe there were possibly 3,000 or 4,000 members.

It was taken out of funds that were assessed against the members, the various collections from the membership. Of course, the only source of funds they have is their membership.

Mr. BROOKE. Did the money come from the union treasury, or from the private funds of the individuals who made up this group?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The report was that it came from the union treasury, or from funds collected by the union from its members. Now, which fund or how they deposited it I do not know. But the point is that, just as in the case of the corporation, while it did not come directly out of the corporate funds, it came out of them indirectly. The Department of Justice had testimony and affidavits from the officials of the company that that was done, just as they had evidence that it was done in the case of the union.

The law was intended to provide that neither corporations nor unions could make political contributions or expenditures for political parties. The law now states that they cannot do it directly. Let us not open a Pandora's box.

I shall place in the RECORD correspondence wherein the Department of Justice has stated that in these two cases there was no violation of the law. So if these two can do it every other corporation and every other union in America can do likewise. Maybe that is the way some want it done, but I do not think so.

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. BROOKE. Is the Senator saying that there are affidavits of which the Department of Justice has knowledge, to the effect that union funds were given to individuals to make contributions for political campaigns, which was obviously an indirect contribution made by the union; and yet the Department of Justice found insufficient evidence to prosecute under the existing law?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I will read their letter. This is a letter dated February 9, 1966, addressed to me, signed by Mr. Fred M. Vinson, Jr., the Assistant Attorney General. My letter referring to this case had been addressed to the Attorney General, Mr. Katzenbach. I have placed both letters in the RECORD earlier today, but I shall read his reply again:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, February 9, 1966.

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: The Attorney General has asked me to reply to your letter of January 26, 1966, discussing a statement made by you in the Senate on January 19 concerning one John L. Lawler of St. Louis, Missouri.

In October 1965 this Department began an investigation of an allegation that Mr. Lawler had contributed \$25,000 to a campaign committee supporting the candidacy of

President Johnson. That investigation showed that the \$25,000 contribution represented the accumulation of many small contributions by individuals in the St. Louis area to the Voluntary Political, Education, Legislative, Charity and Defense Fund of Steam Fitters Local 562. It was not a personal contribution of Mr. Lawler and the Voluntary Fund is not a labor union.

Title 2, United States Code, Section 244 does not require a local committee to file anything with the Clerk of the House of Representatives. Section 244 does require national committees or multi-state committees to file with the Clerk of the House the names of each person who contributes \$100 or more and the total sum of all other contributions received within a calendar year.

On the basis of the information developed by the investigation, it was concluded that no violation of law appeared. However, if additional or contrary information of any substance were received in this matter, or in any matter within the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice, it would receive the fullest consideration.

Sincerely,

FRED M. VINSON, JR.,
Assistant Attorney General.

As the law is now interpreted these funds can be assigned to a political committee and be distributed as indirect contributions.

Just how they could rule that they would not have to report to the House of Representatives I am likewise at a loss to understand, because even the existing law, as weak as it may be, states that all committees which make contributions in two or more States must report their contributions to the Clerk of the House of Representatives. Based on his reply they apparently did not. It has been established that they made cash contributions in about eight States in addition to the \$25,000 contribution to the Johnson campaign.

The point is, Does Congress intend that the unions can take their funds, which are collected from their members, siphon them through another committee, and by this indirect method make a cash contribution to your campaign or my campaign, or to whatever candidates or political parties they wish?

Let us just face it, the law is worthless as it is now being interpreted.

Likewise, does Congress intend for corporations, in any manner whatsoever, to be able to make political contributions to the party or candidate of their choice, and those funds, in turn, be charged as an operating expense of the corporation?

I do not think the existing law ever contemplated that. I was surprised that the Department of Justice found that there was no basis for prosecution.

If Congress wants to reject this amendment and thereby state that these contributions made indirectly are valid, then let us face it, we have opened a Pandora's box as far as political contributions are concerned, not only by unions but by corporations as well.

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, it seems to me very clear that Congress never intended unions or corporations to be able to do indirectly what they could not do directly. But listening to the letter from Assistant Attorney General Vinson addressed to the Senator from Delaware, I failed to distinguish any statement in that letter which supported the Sena-

tor's assumption that the money was actually union money. That is a question I wish to have clarified. If the money belonged to individuals who voluntarily joined together in a group in making political contributions, even though they were union members, it seems to me there is no law prohibiting that, nor should there be. Union members as individuals or as voluntary groups should not be denied the right to make political contributions.

If there is evidence that money which belonged to the labor union was being indirectly given to a political candidate or a political committee, then that would be in violation of the existing law.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I might say to the Senator that there is nothing in this amendment—and I would oppose it if anybody proposed to put it in—that would prohibit any individual American citizen, I do not care whether he be a member of a labor organization, a stockholder of one of these companies, an official of a company, or an official of a union, from making contributions to his party or candidate. Certainly we are not going to deny that right. That is the American privilege, and I would defend it. If there were anything in this amendment which would stop it I would oppose such action.

But the point is that Congress did say that while it will preserve the right of the union members, preserve the right of the stockholders, preserve the right of the union officials, and preserve the right of the officials of corporations, as individuals, to support the party of their choice, in the existing law it also stated that contributions by a union or by a corporation would be prohibited.

I merely would add to the law "contributions that are made by the unions or by the corporations either directly or indirectly." That is the only change I am suggesting. I would close this loophole.

Mr. BROOKE. Then is it fair to say that the Senator's amendment is no more than a clarifying amendment to the existing law, and adds nothing to the existing law, nor detracts anything from it?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. My amendment clearly spells out that it would be the intent of Congress that cash contributions to political parties by corporations or unions are prohibited. It would apply to unions and to corporations, both alike.

This is not an amendment dealing with unions only; it is not an amendment dealing just with corporations. The existing law states "any corporation or any union." This amendment uses the same language. All I am suggesting is that we make it clear that they cannot make those contributions either directly or indirectly. It would stop the political cash contributions by both. Why should they not be stopped?

As I stated earlier, there is nothing in this amendment which is intended to abridge the right of that union or that corporation to write its members or stockholders, pointing out a certain law which it thinks is a good or a bad piece of legislation and that JOHN WILLIAMS voted for or against it. That is their busi-

ness, and I will defend their right to do it. But that is not what we are talking about here. It does not reflect on the right of a corporation to tell their stockholders that certain legislation would be good or bad for the corporation. They have a right and a duty to advise their members, both as corporations and as unions.

This is a question of whether they may make political cash contributions as unions or as corporations. The existing law spells out that they cannot make those cash contributions directly, but they get around this by siphoning their money through individuals or some committee.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, as I understand the amendment of the Senator, it is intended to prohibit direct or indirect contributions to political campaigns by either corporations or labor unions.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct. They could not be made either directly or indirectly.

Mr. AIKEN. That means that the campaign contributions would then come from individuals.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator does not believe that would play into the hands of very wealthy people?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It would not do so any more than does the existing law. Under the existing law Congress has already spelled out its intention. The existing law was intended to provide that no corporation or labor organization can contribute. This provision carries out that purpose.

There have been occasions on which contributions were being made indirectly. I have outlined two specific cases in which such contributions were made indirectly, and the Attorney General ruled in both cases that there was no basis for prosecution. These contributions were made indirectly. They were not made directly in either case.

Mr. AIKEN. However, 500 stockholders of a corporation or 500 members of a labor union could each contribute up to \$5,000 to a political campaign.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If they formed as a group they would come under the classification of a committee. That is covered in another part of the pending bill, and it would be applicable to that situation.

If there were 500 union members or 500 stockholders of a corporation, each of them as individuals could make the maximum contribution to the party of his choice. This provision would not affect at all their right as citizens to make contributions to the candidates or the party of their choice.

That refers only to contributions using corporate or union funds.

It would be physically impossible for every stockholder to know how the corporate money was being contributed or for every union member to know how the union money was being distributed. Members of unions may find that they are contributing to a different party than that which they are voting.

We know that is not a pro rata or voluntary contribution.

Mr. AIKEN. Is there anything in the Senator's amendment that would prevent a corporation from seeking advice from a lawyer and perhaps paying him \$6,000 for his advice, \$5,000 of which fee the lawyer could, as an individual, contribute to a candidate's campaign?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. This would not prohibit that lawyer from making a contribution. Nor would the existing law prohibit that practice. However, both the existing law and the pending amendment would cover that situation if it were part of a conspiracy.

Under the existing law, without the addition of the pending amendment, if a corporation were to conspire with attorney "X" to pay him \$6,000 with the understanding that \$3,000 of that amount would go to the campaign of Joe Doakes, that would be a violation of the law. It would be conspiracy to violate the Corrupt Practices Act.

Mr. AIKEN. If there were no understanding to that effect, is there any provision in the bill that would prohibit a corporation from seeking advice from 10 lawyers and paying each of them \$6,000, so that each of the 10 lawyers could then legally contribute \$5,000 personally to a political campaign?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The pending amendment would not affect that situation at all. Neither would it affect the ability of a union's lawyers to do so.

Mr. Hoffa had a series of lawyers. I suppose he paid them sizable fees. However, if the lawyers on their own initiative decided to make contributions as American citizens they have a right to do so. Nothing in the pending amendment, the existing law, or the pending bill would prohibit that practice. However, if this were done as part of a conspiracy it would be prohibited.

Mr. AIKEN. It would be very difficult to prove a conspiracy, because if a corporation were to consult 10 different lawyers, it would undoubtedly get six different answers.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The corporation might get 10 different answers.

Mr. AIKEN. It would be very difficult to prove a conspiracy unless the 10 lawyers were to all give the same answer.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. We could not stop them from making contributions as individual citizens any more than we could stop the stockholders of a corporation or members of a union from doing so. If as American citizens they want to make contributions they may do so. The law provides that every American citizen can contribute up to x dollars under certain rules to a candidate of the party of his choice.

This provision would not affect that in any way, whether that man be a corporation lawyer, a stockholder, an officer, or a member of a union. This is not intended to affect the right of any individual citizen, no matter what his capacity is, from using his personal funds to make contributions.

It would merely amend section 610 by providing that neither a union nor a corporation can indirectly do what Con-

gress has specifically spelled out that they cannot do directly.

Mr. AIKEN. It would be a real constructive amendment if it would work. However, I doubt if it will work.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It will work. And if not we will get somebody in the Attorney General's office that will enforce the law.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] have spelled out certain situations in which the pending amendment might apply.

I would like to speak of a situation that I believe has been questioned more often than any other since the adoption of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Would the Senator's amendment apply to those committees which were established by labor unions usually in the name of political education committees? The employees contribute funds to such committees or, usually, the funds are checked off. The political education committee then makes contributions to candidates.

I believe that is the situation in which the funds of employees, not labor unions, are more frequently used for campaign contributions.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The pending amendment would apply to these cases. It is intended to apply. That is what I pointed out—the method of doing something indirectly that they could not do directly. A corporation should not be able to make contributions in the name of some committee or individual and then charge off those contributions as an expense item. Neither should union leaders be allowed to distribute their members' money.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator's amendment then would not apply to a committee into whose treasury employees voluntarily contribute money and designate a candidate to whom they want the contributions made.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If the amendment is agreed to I assume that the employees would make the contributions direct to the party of their choice. Why should the money be put through the hands of some union leader? The same thing would be true in the case of stockholders and corporations. They would make contributions direct.

Let us face it. If we permit a corporation by indirection to make these contributions from corporate funds by siphoning them into committees or individuals there is no possible way in which that procedure could be cleared with all of the stockholders.

By the same token, there should be no possible way that a union can take \$50,000 or \$100,000 out of the union treasury, put it in the XYZ committee, and make contributions from that committee when it could not do so from its own funds.

This measure is supposed to stop them from doing indirectly what the law says they cannot do directly.

If the Senate rejects this amendment

we might as well repeal the law and say the Pandora's box is open. If we reject this we would proceed on the premise that we believe it is all right, and if this corporation and this union can make cash contributions then all other corporations and all other unions can do likewise.

Surely the fact that in both instances these cash contributions were made to the Johnson campaign does not give them any special privilege.

Mr. COOPER. I understand the purpose of the Senator's amendment, but I recall that the question of the use of union funds contributed by employees through the checkoff system or otherwise has been questioned in the past, and there have been several cases in the courts. As I recall, the courts have held, with respect to such committees, that the use of these funds is legal. I assume that the Senator has studied the matter and has determined that the adoption of the amendment—if it should be adopted—would override the court decisions.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is the intent. The Attorney General's office has interpreted the law that the corporation and the union can make these contributions.

Mr. COOPER. As I understand the procedure, an employee's dues are checked off into the union treasury, the union contributes to committees, often called the Committee for Political Education. Then the committee, in addition to educational operations, makes contributions to candidates either directly or by advertising, campaign work, and so forth. Is my understanding correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator's understanding is correct.

Mr. COOPER. And the courts so far have upheld the procedure as perfectly proper.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The courts may have upheld the position that these are not direct contributions and that the law only relates to direct contributions. Since these contributions are made through a separate committee they would not be affected.

The purpose of the proposed amendment is to stop such a practice. Direct contributions are prohibited now, both as they relate to unions and as they relate to corporations. It would not in any instance stop either of them from their so-called educational operations, even if they want to send out a letter or other material every day. We are dealing with contributions to or expenditures on behalf of a political party or a candidate.

Mr. COOPER. Is it not correct that the chief objection that has been made to this procedure has been that made by individual union members that the funds they contribute to the treasury of the union are used for candidates they do not wish to support?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct. That is the problem. Their money could be supporting a candidate to whom they were violently opposed.

As I have said, nothing in the proposed amendment would stop any stockholder, official of a union, or member of a union from making the full maximum

contribution to the party or candidate of his choice, a direct contribution with him, himself, deciding that he wants to support JOHN COOPER in Kentucky. As a union member he would have a right to do that.

Mr. COOPER. I was once a union member years ago while in school.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I have brothers who were union members.

The point is that the law now states that neither the unions nor the corporations are allowed to do it, but they have found a loophole in this law.

Mr. COOPER. The aspect of the amendment that troubles me is this: I agree that it is not proper for an employee to pay into a fund and that his money then be used for contributions to a candidate he does not support. I wish I had available the cases that have been used in connection with this subject. I recall that the court decided the cases upon a constitutional ground, that the Congress could not restrain a union from this practice; that it was an expression of free speech under the first amendment. I am sorry that I do not have the cases before me.

Several years ago I introduced an amendment to the Federal Corrupt Practices Act which while similar to the pending amendment, was more limited so as not to offend the first amendment and it was rejected.

I wonder whether the Senator has available one of the cases.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No, I do not. I do not have any answer as to whether the court based its decision on the Constitution. I have checked with the legislative counsel, and I have been told that this is the way to correct it.

Mr. COOPER. The Attorney General said this amendment would correct it?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No, I checked this matter with the legislative counsel. The Attorney General just says that under existing law there is no way he can handle these cases. He seems to be well satisfied. He did not ask for a change in the law. It seems to me that Congress should not allow corporations or unions to do by indirection what it cannot do by a direct method.

Perhaps as a layman I am a little bold in moving into this field, but approximately 68 lawyers are in the Senate, and I venture to say we would get 68 opinions if we were to ask them.

Mr. COOPER. I agree wholeheartedly that for a corporation or a labor union to seek to evade, by conspiracy or otherwise, the plain intent of the law is bad and wrong and should be corrected. I am concerned, however, that the lower Federal courts—I cannot find the Supreme Court case ruling directly on this question—have held that it is not unlawful or illegal for labor unions to make contributions in this manner. Of course, that holding could be overturned by a statute, unless the decision of the court were based on a constitutional ground. I recall that it was based upon constitutional grounds—the abridgment of the first amendment. I do not believe the Senator's amendment would stand up in the courts.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I do not

see why it would be a constitutional question, limiting the law. But I am just an ordinary layman. On the other hand, it has been my experience that laymen do sometimes get the answer while the lawyers are still debating. I have always been impressed by the fact that when a case goes to court, the judge, under the law, has to be a lawyer, the prosecuting attorney has to be a lawyer, the counsel for the defense has to be a lawyer; and then they usually get the case so mixed up that it takes 12 laymen to get it straightened out. As a layman I am trying to get it straightened out.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. From a hurried examination of the bill, it would appear to me that without the Senator's amendment, there would be no prohibition in existing law or remaining law against a corporation contributing directly or a labor union contributing directly, because I call attention to page 25, the first four lines:

The Federal Corrupt Practices Act and all other acts or parts of acts inconsistent herewith are repealed.

In other words, S. 1880 is a rewriting of the entire Corrupt Practices Act. I fail to find anything in it that prohibits a contribution by either a bank or a corporation or a labor union. So the Senator's amendment is necessary, unless the Senate wishes to go on record as endorsing political contributions by banks, corporations, and labor unions—unless the corporation is engaged in Government contracts. That aspect is dealt with on page 7.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I believe the Senator has made a valid point. Furthermore, even if they kept the Corrupt Practices Act as it is written in section 610, the rejection of this amendment would in effect be repealing it, because Congress would be going on record as saying that, so far as the Senate is concerned, corporations and labor unions can make these contributions by siphoning their cash through a committee.

I believe this amendment should be adopted. I do not think it should even be controversial.

Mr. CURTIS. I agree with the Senator, and I would point out that the amendment of the Senator places no prohibition on any individual.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. None whatsoever.

Mr. CURTIS. But it does prohibit even the corporations or labor unions from being the vehicle, as well as from making the direct political contribution.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct. It would stop the corporations or labor unions from using their funds in a manner in which the law did not originally intend.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, before I make my statement in opposition to the amendment I would like to answer the Senator from Nebraska who raised the

question a moment ago that there would be no Corrupt Practices Act. The Senator is mistaken. The Corrupt Practices Act does not refer to section 610. That imposes restrictions on contributions of corporations, national banks, and labor organizations. That is under section 610 and not under the Corrupt Practices Act, which is a different title. Section 610 is under title 18, United States Code.

This amendment seeks to close possible gaps in section 610 of title 18 pertaining to campaign contributions and expenditures by national banks, corporations organized by any law of Congress, and labor organizations.

The amendment would prohibit a corporation or labor organization itself, as a legal entity, from making, directly or indirectly, contributions or expenditures to any committee, association, or organization.

Section 610, as it now stands, does prohibit contributions and expenditures by national banks, corporations, and labor organizations. Voluntary contributions by individual executives or employees of a corporation or by members of a labor organization are not prohibited nor should they be prohibited. Every citizen should be permitted to make a voluntary contribution to the candidate or party of his choice. If this amendment is passed, that would be prohibited.

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

Mr. CANNON. I shall not yield until I have finished my statement.

Section 610 properly enforced, needs no amendment and without enforcement the amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from Delaware would accomplish nothing.

In other words, the intent and provisions of section 610 already offer the same overall prohibitions as are offered in different language, by this amendment.

National banks, corporations, and labor organizations are now prohibited from making any contribution or expenditure to any party, committee, or candidate.

With respect to the example cited by the Senator, the letter of the Attorney General did not state what it had been represented it stated. The Attorney General, in effect, said, and I am oversimplifying this: These contributions were voluntary contributions on the part of members and, therefore, contributed for a political campaign and, therefore, we cannot prosecute. That is the law and that is what the law should be.

If the amendment of the Senator were adopted it would prohibit corporations from contributing to persons of their choice, or organizations sponsored by them; it would prohibit members of the labor union from making voluntary contributions. Perhaps that is an oversimplification.

If Senators wish to stop that sort of thing, they should vote for the amendment of the Senator. If not, if Senators think that members of a labor organization or corporation should be able to work with their organization to try to make political contributions to political candidates and organizations to partici-

pate in this great political organization we have in this country today, Senators should vote against the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator puts great emphasis upon the right of union members to make contributions. The Senator tries to give the impression that the adoption of this amendment would restrict this right. He is wrong. There is nothing in the amendment to prohibit any member of the union from making a contribution to the party of his choice in the maximum amount just as every other citizen can make. The amendment does provide, that they cannot use union dues and funds to make these contributions.

Let us face it, corporations and unions are both involved. The law covers both in the same sentence. The cases I pointed out are pertinent. If we reject the amendment we are saying, in effect, that unions and corporations can use corporation and union funds by contributing to the XYZ committee, and that committee, in turn, can make political contributions. I do not agree with that premise. We should not allow them to do by indirection what the law prohibits by direction.

The argument of the Senator about the individual right of these union members to contribute to the party of their choice is valid. That right is protected better under the amendment than under existing law. What we would prohibit is the right of some union official or corporate president to take union funds, which contain the contribution of that union member, or corporation funds, which is the money of that stockholder, and then make a contribution to the party of his choice and not the choice of the union member or the stockholder.

The argument of the Senator might very well be said to be one of the best arguments as to why the amendment should be adopted.

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

Mr. CANNON. I shall yield in a moment but first I wish to answer the Senator from Delaware. I had yielded to the Senator from Delaware for a question but he did not answer my question so I wish to answer his statement with a part of his amendment.

At the top of page 2 with respect to what is unlawful the following language appears on line 13:

(2) For purposes of applying paragraph (1), the source of the funds from which a contribution or expenditure is made shall be immaterial, and such paragraph shall apply to a contribution or expenditure made from funds contributed for such purpose by the shareholders of a corporation or the members of a labor organization.

That very clearly and specifically deprives the shareholders of a corporation or the members of a labor organization to say, "I voluntarily want to contribute funds to that union for the union to do such and such with those funds." It is as clear as it can be. If that does not deprive a union member or a corporation stockholder of a constitutional right that they have under our Constitution, I miss my guess.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Sen-

ator misses his guess. The law states that any corporation or any labor organization is already prohibited from making contributions. That is the existing law.

Mr. CANNON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. And it is still in effect. The difference is that they can get around the existing law by forming a committee, transferring the funds to this committee, and then letting that committee make the contribution.

This amendment would stop that evasive practice completely. It would apply to both corporations and unions.

If the Senate feels that such was intended and that they should have a right to make the contributions by this indirect method, then defeat the amendment and let it be well known that any corporation in America or any union in America can use corporate funds and union funds for political contributions, and we shall have completely nullified section 610. I am trying to put some teeth into the present law, but if Congress does not want any teeth in it then defeat the amendment. Personally, I cannot conceive of Congress going on record that any union or corporation can now make political contributions. Let us face it—we are not dealing with just unions or just corporations, we are dealing with both of them together.

The rejection of this amendment confirms a glaring loophole in the law and Congress will have given it a stamp of approval.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator stated earlier that he was not a lawyer. I think that his statement now fails to distinguish the legal points, the difference between the expenditure of the corporation's funds and the difference between the permissibility or availability to make voluntary contributions on the part of stockholders of corporations, or on the part of members of labor organizations. This is the whole distinction and it is a valid one. It is written right in the letter from the Attorney General to the distinguished Senator from Delaware, in which he tried to use it as an example here because the Attorney General would not prosecute.

Why would he not prosecute? He would not prosecute because these are voluntary contributions which are permitted under the law.

If we adopt the amendment of the Senator from Delaware, we would take it out.

Let me read it:

... the source of the funds from which a contribution or expenditure is made shall be immaterial, and such paragraph shall apply to a contribution or expenditure made from funds contributed for such purposes by shareholders of a corporation or the members of a labor organization, as the case may be, as well as from any other funds of a corporation or labor organization from whatever source derived, . . .

Mr. President, if the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] now wishes me to yield to him—as I promised to do earlier—I shall be happy to do so.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the distinguished Senator.

Mr. President, I invite the attention of all Senators to what I believe is a serious question.

Section 610 of existing law prohibits contributions by banks, insurance companies, and labor organizations.

Under the heading "Limitations on Political Contributions and Purchases" on page 5 of the bill, and over on page 7 under the heading "Contributions by Government Contractors," covering the prohibition against contributions made by someone contracting with the Government, and then over on the last page, 25, it states:

The Federal Corrupt Practices Act and all other Acts or parts of Acts inconsistent herewith are repealed.

In other words, we would repeal "all other acts," and if we do not reenact the Williams amendment or some other amendment, we would also repeal the prohibition against corporations and labor organizations making contributions.

I do not think that was intended, but I think that is what the language states.

I believe this matter should be given further consideration and study because we are dealing with the regulation of contributions, to prohibit contributions of Government contractors. Thus, we enter the field, and then we repeal the clause which says:

The Federal Corrupt Practices Act and all other Acts or parts of Acts inconsistent herewith are repealed.

I think there would be a serious question as to the existence of a prohibition against banks, corporations, or labor organizations from contributing to a campaign being in effect, if the pending bill is passed with that language appearing on page 25 still in it.

Mr. CANNON. I am very happy to answer the distinguished Senator from Nebraska on that point.

The provision relating to Government contractors is in section 611 of title 18.

The section the Senator from Delaware is talking about is section 610, title 18. Neither one of them is part of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act.

Now the repealer clause is very clear at the end. It states:

The Federal Corrupt Practices Act and all other acts—

And I am omitting now—
... is hereby repealed.

Now, the Federal Corrupt Practices Act does not contain either section 611 or section 610.

Now, as to "and all other acts or parts of acts inconsistent herewith are repealed," what are we repealing? We have changed section 611. It certainly is not inconsistent with the earlier section 611. We simply added "corporations" to it.

Section 610 is not inconsistent with any part of the act. Section 610 was put in concurrently with section 611 in the law as it now stands. Thus, any reported repealer of any act inconsistent, would have no effect on section 610 of title 18. I submit, therefore, to my colleagues, that this is just a red herring thrown across the trail here to suggest that we are repealing section 610 or any other part of the law except the Federal Corrupt Practices Act. That is not incon-

sistent with the part of the bill, in and of itself.

Mr. CURTIS. I invite attention to the fact that it says, "and all other acts or parts of acts"—

Mr. CANNON. Inconsistent herewith.
Mr. CURTIS. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. If the Senator will show me any inconsistency, I will be glad to talk about it.

Mr. CURTIS. I will show it to the Senator. We prohibit Government contractors from making contributions and we stop there. Then we repeal "and all other acts" or prohibitions of corporate entities, or labor unions.

Mr. CANNON. If the Senator will check title 18 as it now stands, he will find that Federal contractors were prohibited also under section 611 of title 18. Section 610 of title 18, existed right along, concurrently, with section 611 of title 18.

Mr. CURTIS. It is my contention that we have limited the rules as to who can contribute. The pending bill leaves out banks and corporations and labor organizations. The repealing clause very likely will repeal existing law. I think that, at least, should have some further study.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I was wondering in the course of debate whether the Senator from Nevada sees a distinction between, on the one hand, union members who choose to join in the form of a union and make a contribution to a political candidate or to an organization supporting a political candidate, and on the other hand, shareholders in a corporation who would be giving through corporate entities.

As I see the distinction, union members are bound together in a struggle for their own economic existence or their own economic survival, while stockholders, who may hold stock in a variety of different corporations, really have a rather different set of interests. I am wondering whether the Senator from Nevada finds that same distinction, and what he concludes about the way in which it should be considered in relation to this proposed amendment.

Mr. CANNON. Certainly there is a distinction in their interests, but I think that on the bill here their interest would have an applicability substantially the same, because if the Senator from Delaware's amendment were to be adopted, then it would not matter whether there were union members who wanted voluntarily to contribute through a parent organization or whether there were stockholders who wanted voluntarily to contribute through their corporation; or, a step further, whether they were simply employees of corporations which have many contributory plans which they encourage, and assign an officer of the corporation in charge of that program to stimulate interest in political campaigns, to get them to contribute voluntarily through the body that they set up within the corporate structure, so that those funds can be parceled out where there is a political candidate or a political party of their choice.

This is one of the great things about our system of government, that we have corporations encouraging this kind of participation, and that we also have unions who encourage participation in "buying a share" in their Government.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I was interested in, and I am wondering whether the Senator himself has made a study of, the legislative history and development of this legislation. Going back into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 93, at pages 6439 and 6440, there is a variety of quotations from the then Senator Taft. I should like to read briefly some of the comments he made during this period of time and ask whether the Senator from Nevada would comment on them. I read from what Senator Taft said at that time:

* * * the CIO-PAC can properly operate as a political organization, raising its funds from individual members.

If the labor people should desire to set up a political organization and obtain direct contributions for it, there would be nothing unlawful in that.

* * * unions can do as was done last year, organize something like the PAC, a political organization, and receive direct contributions, just so long as members of the union know what they are contributing to, and the dues which they pay into the union treasury are not used for such purpose.

This seems to be one of the indicators of intent from one of the architects of that legislation. This statement was in the Taft-Hartley law debate; it indicated Senator Taft's own feeling about the importance of union contributions and the significance of them.

Mr. CANNON. The Senator is absolutely correct. He has raised the point of the very thing the Senator from Delaware would take away with his amendment. He says he wants to amend the law so they cannot do that; so it would be against the law. The Senator from Kentucky pointed out that there are laws on the books stating that this is a lawful procedure. So it is permissible under the present law. The Senator from Delaware wants to change it. I do not think it should be.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Does the Senator agree that not only are there court decisions on this matter, but that there are constitutional safeguards, as well, under the first amendment?

Mr. CANNON. The Secretary is absolutely correct. I tried to make that point earlier. By this proposal, we would try to deprive these people of a constitutional right to participate in their government.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I thank the Senator for yielding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW AND AUTHORIZATION FOR ALL COMMITTEES TO MEET DURING SESSION OF THE SENATE TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business tonight, it stand in recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I have no objection to the Senate's meeting at 10 o'clock tomorrow, but the Committee on Finance has had hearings scheduled, and we cannot be in both places at the same time.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the previous request that the Senate recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning, with the proviso that all committees be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate tomorrow.

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

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am quite willing to have the Senate convene at 10 o'clock, of course; I do not wish to impede the business of the Senate. But a group of Senators, including myself, does have an obligation in the morning to attend an important meeting. I wonder if it could also be agreed that there would be no yeand-nay votes until 12 o'clock or later tomorrow.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The leadership is attempting to arrange the work for tomorrow so as to accommodate the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], who will experience an important event in his life tomorrow. It would be the intention of the leadership to do everything possible, if it can be so worked out with the Senator from Pennsylvania and with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], who is managing the bill, to avoid any rollcall votes before noon or 12:30 p.m. tomorrow.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator from West Virginia. I

have explained the nature of the conference to the Senator. It is to be held before one of the important agencies and has been long arranged. A large number of persons are in Washington to attend it. Several Senators have to be present, particularly the two Senators from Florida. If it can be arranged that there will be no rollcall votes before 12 o'clock or 12:30, I shall interpose no objection to the Senator's request.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] plans to offer two amendments. It is my understanding, after a discussion with him, that he will require about an hour on each amendment. So it will be the intention of the leadership tomorrow to attempt to delay any votes until noon, if possible. The Senate can discuss the amendments and attempt to delay votes on them until noon, in order to accommodate the Senator from Florida and his associates.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

ELECTION REFORM ACT OF 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1880) to revise the Federal election laws, and for other purposes.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware.

No one denies that dissenting members of associations—whether corporations or labor unions—must be protected from misuse of their funds. No one questions the need to prevent units of economic power from using that power, and distorting political campaigns with large infusions of funds.

But this bill does not meet such a need—it is a dangerous cure for a dubious disease. It is neither fair, nor balanced—and it may well be unconstitutional. When the late Senator Taft sought to limit union political influence in the Taft-Hartley law, he specifically recognized the right of groups—including unions—to play a part in the political process. His bill thus refused to place the disastrous restraints on union activity which this bill would do—because Senator Taft recognized that the abuse lay in coercing members of unions; not in channeling funds willingly contributed for political purposes.

Yet this amendment ignores the vital distinction between coercion and voluntariness. Under this amendment—page 2, line 14—

The source of the funds . . . shall be immaterial . . . even though the shareholders of a corporation or labor organization, as the case may be, consent to such contribution or expenditure.

Thus, any union organization which collects funds from union members—no matter how eager the members are to contribute—would be committing a crime.

Surely the constitutional rights of association—which have been so zealously guarded in recent years by the Supreme Court—are seriously impaired if an association of members with a common economic interest cannot channel this interest into the field of politics with

funds willingly and voluntarily given by individual members.

Indeed, the Supreme Court seriously questioned the whole legislative structure restricting associational involvement in politics. In International Association of Machinists against Street, the Supreme Court noted the grave constitutional questions such limitation raised. In view of the drastic extension now proposed on political participation by members of a common association, the validity of this amendment is highly dubious.

Second, the apparent impartiality between unions and corporations is false. Shareholders do not stand to the corporation as union members do to the union. The commonness of interest, the vital role played by the union in the economic life of the member, is far greater than that of a corporation to shareholder. Indeed, this is what propelled the passage of the labor bill of rights 8 years ago. This distinction does not permit us to set up mechanistic equations, which is just what this bill does.

But more important, the bill does not reach the very real methods of corporate campaign contributions. As an article in Fortune magazine, in May 1956 detailed, the varieties of contributions are infinite. Executives can, as individuals, give large amounts to campaigns, knowing they will regain the funds in the form of bonuses. Secretaries can be loaned out to offices; executives can take leaves of absence to work in campaigns. Yet none of these methods of contribution are reached in this amendment.

Moreover, the alleged union abuse has already been reached not only by legislation, but by the courts. In Brotherhood of Railway Clerks against Allen, the Supreme Court specifically barred unions from using any dues of dissenting members for political purposes.

In view of the severe constitutional problems, in view of the imbalance, and in view of already existing law correcting union abuses, this bill's need is far from clear. Yet this bill is now being considered—and no hearings have been held, no witnesses called, no evidence advanced to show the need for this radical restraint on traditional political rights of labor organizations.

I urge the defeat of the amendment.

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

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. MONDALE. I commend the Senator from Massachusetts for his very fine statement in opposition to the pending amendment.

As I understand the amendment, it seeks to draw a parallel between what is seen as an effort by individual stockholders to give to a campaign via the corporation with an effort by an individual union member to contribute voluntarily to COPE or some other similar organization.

Does the Senator from Massachusetts regard this as a fair parallel, or does he know of any instances in which individual stockholders have attempted to contribute to campaigns in this way?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I

think that the parallel breaks down very quickly. As I mentioned, the union members are binding themselves together to work out arrangements with respect to wages and living conditions and general conditions of employment.

The stockholders have an entirely different interest. In many instances the stockholders themselves are stockholders or officers of other corporations, and their interests are different.

I think, therefore, that trying to draw a parallel is really quite unreasonable. However, let me say, beyond merely responding to your question, that the Senate concerned itself for a considerable period of time some month ago with problems of campaign financing and funding.

During that debate the difficulties which those of limited wealth have in raising sufficient funds to be able to participate in the election procedures were discussed. The pending amendment would, once again, dramatically hinder the ability of those of more limited wealth to run for office. It would cut off one of the groups that would be able to supply some limited funding. There is that additional consideration.

We should realize that the unions themselves are really entitled to have the right to support actively, by contributions, those that are seeking public office whose views are similar to those which have been assumed by the unions. I do not think there is anything inherently wrong with that as long as union members know this and make voluntary contributions. In many instances this is carrying through the democratic process. This is important and it is helpful.

One vital point which concerns me about the pending legislation is, as I understand the pending amendment, that it prohibits all kinds of contributions to all candidates. This therefore directly infringes on the ability of States to make determinations as to whether they want their own laws. If they want to see the continuation of this kind of activity, they can now make that determination.

What we are doing is really making a complete and blanket prohibition of such activity.

Mr. MONDALE. Does the Senator believe that this purported effort to restrict or limit contributions by corporations would be any more effective than the numerous provisions now found in State and Federal law to prohibit corporations from so doing, concerning which scholar after scholar has pointed out that they have been a virtual nullity because of the many ways in which corporations can avoid these provisions and effectively support through corporate assets the campaign of the candidate of their choice? Or are we really in effect claiming that we are choking off corporate interests, but in fact adopting a nullity, as has been the case with so many State statutes, including the State of Minnesota, which purport to prohibit corporate contributions, but which in fact through skillful corporate maneuvering permits the corporations to continue to contribute?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I certainly identify myself

with the comments made by the Senator from Minnesota. I indicated what I at least thought were some of the methods being used today by many corporations to provide either services or manpower or the funding of political campaigns. These methods would not be terminated even by the pending amendment. What would be terminated would be certainly the ability of the unions themselves to participate through voluntary contributions.

I am concerned about this matter. If this would accomplish everything that those who have offered the amendment claim—that it would end all kinds of corporate contributions and union contributions—I think we should evaluate it on that basis. However, that is not so.

As the Senator has pointed out, both from the experience of his own State and of other States, there are numerous examples in which there are ways to avoid even the kind of language suggested by the pending bill.

Mr. MONDALE. As I recall, in 1956 there was a Senate study or a committee study of campaign contribution practices in this country.

That study pointed out that five wealthy families gave more to one party than did the 16 million members of organized labor. Thus, from a practical standpoint these modest contributions, given voluntarily—and they are modest and they are given voluntarily—in many cases represent the very minimum amounts necessary for these individuals, alone and collectively, to help the candidates of their choice. If these individuals were to be denied this modest effort to contribute to the candidate reflecting their philosophy, then regardless of the alleged parity of the pending amendment, the practical effect would be virtually to silence many who represent the point of view of thousands of union members who are now permitted to contribute to the candidate of their choice.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I agree. It has been suggested that we ought to eliminate any organization such as COPE or any of the other political action groups and leave it completely up to the union or the union members.

Would the Senator not agree with me that in many instances it is difficult for a union member in Springfield, Mass., to know whether it is important in the achievement of certain legislation that the money be used in the State of Oregon or in another part of the country?

Because that man is working every day, he has no way of knowing these things unless there is some kind of educational group to provide this kind of service.

He wants to see the programs which his union has supported achieved. However, he has no way of really knowing how his interest will be most vitally affected.

Mr. MONDALE. Are these suggestions that such organizations as the Committee on Public Action be dismantled coming from the ranks of organized labor or individual union members, or are they coming from others that are really not so motivated by the rights of individual members as they are by an attempt to

destroy the political effectiveness of a voluntary organization which works with the voluntary support of individual union members?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I must say, as the Senator has suggested by his question, that it is not coming from those that believe in and have indicated strong support for unionism and the welfare of the union activists. This is troublesome.

I suggested earlier in my brief remarks that the Supreme Court has ruled on this question and has recognized the closeness and the parallel to the right of free speech by being able to speak effectively and has also suggested a number of other activities, among which is that of being able to participate in campaigns by making contributions so that those who are candidates will be able to speak effectively on radio and television. We recognize that these activities cost money. There are some rather fundamental constitutional questions involved. That concerns me as much as do the other factors.

I am concerned because there have been no hearings on the pending amendment. Even though there are constitutional questions involved, this matter has not been referred to the Judiciary Committee for its study and deliberation. And even though it affects the unions of this country, there has been no referral of the proposal to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the members of which have made considerable study of the subject.

It has not been referred to the Finance Committee, which has been considering the panoramic problems of campaign expenditures.

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

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. MONDALE. Some years ago, when I was writing a law review note on this issue for the Minnesota Law Review, I recall studying every authority I could find on this issue. My recollection is that they are virtually unanimous in their viewpoint that, No. 1, existing laws which prohibit corporate contribution are ineffective; No. 2, that if you took away the right of voluntary contributions to COPE and the rest of the kind presently permitted in Federal law, you would substantially diminish the opportunity of the person of modest income to reflect his point of view in this fashion, and that it would be a very unfair blow to the fairness of American campaigns.

Perhaps if we were to have hearings on this proposal, we could bring the many top experts from the fine schools around the country and others to testify to what they think of the present campaign contribution practices, disclosure practices, and the rest. Among them I would recommend Mrs. Louise Overacker, who is regarded as one of the great experts on this question, who has proposed that the ceilings on corporate contributions be removed because they are of no effect, anyway—the prohibitions and the ceilings—and that the same be done with respect to union contributions, so that there will be complete fairness; but then insist upon full disclosure, so that the candidate

who is the selected candidate of corporation A would be known as such, and the amount that he received would be known. Then we would have it out in the open, where everybody would know, instead of the under-the-rug contributing that is going on. The same would apply with respect to unions. People could then run under their true colors.

I believe that in many cases the sources from which a candidate receives money may tell more about his views than what he says on the political platform. This is the real way to get at the issue—meaningful public disclosure, which permits the public to deal wisely, on the basis of what the candidate says and the sources and amounts of the campaign contributions.

This is my understanding of the vice which the top experts in this field are pointing out today, and the pending proposal would be antithetical to the advice that I believe the Senate committee would hear if it were to hold the hearings that the Senator from Massachusetts suggests.

Therefore, I believe that is an additional reason to reject the amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I believe the Senator has made a number of very worthy points with respect to procedures which have been followed which really, in this set of circumstances, have not brought to the Members of this body the kind of balanced judgment and reasoned presentation which this body should expect on a matter as complex and as controversial as this. In fact, the many implications and ramifications that have been suggested by the proposed amendment, and the means of meeting some of the problems that are suggested, all are very useful and helpful and point up the state of confusion about the problem.

I appreciate the comments of the Senator from Minnesota.

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

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, so far as the Senator from Florida is concerned, he was attracted by this amendment originally; and if it applied only to the bona fide funds of a corporation or a labor union, he would be willing to support it; because he thinks that the bona fide funds of either of these two classes of organizations should not be contributed for political purposes.

However, the vice in the proposed amendment, the Senator from Florida believes, is in lines 13 to 18 on page 2 of the printed amendment, which read as follows:

For purposes of applying paragraph (1), the source of the funds from which a contribution or expenditure is made shall be immaterial, and such paragraph shall apply to a contribution or expenditure made from funds contributed for such purpose by the shareholders of a corporation or the members of a labor organization, as the case may be.

The Senator from Florida sees no propriety at all in that part of the provision which, in effect, would prevent contributions by individuals, and which simply would use the corporation or the

labor organization, as the case might be, as a conduit; and for that reason he is strongly opposed to the amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I believe the comments of the Senator from Florida are extremely pertinent and very helpful. Those provisions of the amendment are distressing and when they say "the source of the funds from which a contribution or expenditure is made shall be immaterial," this excludes, as the Senator from Florida has pointed out, whether they are voluntary or compulsory. I believe that language is extremely unfortunate.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I commend the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts for his leadership in this field and for the thought he has given to the proposed amendment. I do not believe it is strange that the Senator has devoted such consideration to the bill because, although it comes from the Committee on Rules and Administration, the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts is a member of the Committee on the Judiciary. The main genesis of the proposed amendment is criminal penalties. When you are dealing with criminal penalties to be inflicted through the Federal courts, it is a matter, as has been pointed out, in which the Committee on the Judiciary has a great interest and should take interest. If the proposed amendment is to be attached to the bill, I believe the bill should go to the Committee on the Judiciary for its opinion and for hearings.

The question I address to the distinguished Senator relates to the language on page 3 of the bill, beginning with line 11:

And every officer or director of any corporation, or officer of any labor organization, who consents to any contribution or expenditure by the corporation or labor organization, as the case may be—

I interpolate that the distinguished Senator from Florida has just pointed out that on the other page this would apply to funds contributed by individual shareholders in a corporation or individual members of a union, not out of union funds or out of corporate funds.

I continue reading:

And any person who accepts or receives any contribution, in violation of this section, shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both; and if the violation was willful, shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned not more than two years, or both.

My question to the distinguished Senator is this: In view of the fact that the two penalties are provided, one for willful violation, in lines 14 through 15, the penalty of a \$1,000 fine or a year's imprisonment would apply to someone who unwittingly and unknowingly accepted the contribution, would it not?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. It would appear to me that that would be a correct interpretation.

As the Senator from Texas has suggested by his question, the effect of the amendment would be to completely

proscribe the opportunity for any union member or any shareholder in a corporation to ever participate in any State, local, or Federal election by means of making some contribution.

It would appear that if he did it completely without full understanding or knowledge, he would be subjected to the initial penalty which the Senator from Texas has pointed out—\$1,000 and not more than 1 year. If they were able to show that he willingly contributed, he would be subject to the \$10,000 fine and not more than 2 years in prison.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. It seems to me that this would be a very exaggerated penalty, insofar as it provides for imprisonment, and I wish to ask the Senator this question: Suppose someone pleaded guilty or was found guilty and was fined a thousand dollars and he paid it, and because of the proviso that he could have been imprisoned a year, he would be guilty of a felony. He would then lose his citizenship and his right to vote, would he not?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. That would certainly appear to be correct.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. And he could only be restored by a pardon from the President.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. That would be my interpretation.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I have run into this matter since becoming a Member of the Senate. A prominent businessman in my State was in the construction business and he built homes. In that connection there were requirements for Federal loans and certain affidavits had to be filed. Through carelessness he permitted the filing of those affidavits in his name. He was hailed up and he was told that they had decided to make an example of him. He was indicted and the matter went to the Federal court. As I have said he was an honorable businessman. He was told that if he would pay a \$250 fine on one case the matter would be all over and the other cases would be dismissed. He did pay the fine of \$250 and the other cases were dismissed. He thought that ended the matter. However, several years later someone became jealous because of a civic enterprise in which he was engaged and they said that this businessman was not a citizen and could not vote.

If he were found guilty and paid a fine of \$250, under Federal law he has been found guilty of a felony and he loses his citizenship, which can only be restored by a pardon from the President. It is a slow process to get the President to sign a pardon.

I recommend to the Senator, as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, that the entire Federal criminal penalty system should be overhauled. We have many laws covering minimal offenses where people pay a little fine, and they are guilty of a felony. Under most State laws there is no felony unless the person is sent to the penitentiary. However under Federal laws a person pays a fine, is guilty of a felony, and he loses his citizenship.

There is one penalty in this provision in an instance where a campaign man-

ager or a candidate could unknowingly solicit or accept the fund, pay a fine of \$100, and be guilty of a felony. He might pay a fine of \$10 if he pleads guilty and be guilty of a felony. I think that is a great injustice in our Federal criminal system and this situation points up that matter.

I am glad that the Senator from Massachusetts, as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, where fines and penalties are dealt with, has taken the lead in connection with this amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I oppose this amendment. It would disrupt the operation of the only effective political voice possessed by millions of working men all over our Nation. It would interfere with principles of freedom of political expression, probably to the extent of violating the first amendment. And it would have far-reaching effects, perhaps unintended, in State and local elections.

Its premise—to prevent union misuse of members' funds—is invalid. For the funds it would cut off are funds voluntarily contributed, as Senator Taft made clear in the original Taft-Hartley debate 20 years ago. Its effect—to prevent individuals from choosing the way in which they will express themselves politically—is invalid, too, and this invalidity is probably of constitutional dimension. A long line of Supreme Court decisions makes clear the demarcation between instituted coercion and individual freedom in political giving, and this amendment clearly invades individual freedom.

The practice which this amendment would disrupt permits workers to support candidates all over the country who are sympathetic to their cause—in the measure in which particular candidates need support. Giant corporations do not require this kind of cooperative effort. They are national—or almost so—in their economic power and scope. But the individual union member deserves the protection of being able to contribute to a group which will spend his contribution where it will be most effective.

Political contributors by unions and their members are now legal in State and local elections, unless State or local otherwise provides. This amendment would—in one sweeping action—change State and local practice all over the Nation overnight. I do not think we should take such action without a little more thought and deliberation, without more understanding of the implications of our actions.

But most fundamentally, the amendment is wrong because it will impair individual rights, and on that ground alone, even if there were no other, it should be objected.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all time on this amendment and the amendments thereto be limited to 20 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I do not think we need a consent request now. I shall not take more than 5 minutes, but I do not think we need a unanimous-consent order.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Would the Senator from Delaware agree to a unanimous-consent request for 20 min-

utes on the amendment and all amendments thereto, to be equally divided?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No. I am ready to vote now, and I was ready to vote before.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I withdraw my request.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, earlier in the debate, I raised the question as to whether or not the courts had passed on this section of the bill. I said I thought I remembered that the courts had passed on this particular section, and that they had termed it a constitutional question.

I find that the district court has passed on it, and ruled, as I remembered, on that section of the act, which prohibited a union from making contributions. The question arose with respect to committees and political contributions in those situations where the contribution might be termed involuntary. Nevertheless, the court has held that that section of the act was unconstitutional under the first amendment.

Mr. President, I think it might be possible to draft a bill which would, for example, prohibit a contribution to a candidate or prohibit the use of these funds for the operations of a political campaign, such as the cost of driving voters to the polls or matters of that sort.

However, I must say, after reading the pending amendment and studying the cases that have passed upon this question and which hold that it would be an invasion of the first amendment, I shall vote against the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I shall be brief. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] made much of the fact that hearings have not been held on the bill. Hearings were held on this bill and on all phases of the Corrupt Practices Act.

Then the Senator from Texas spent considerable time expressing great concern over the very harsh penalties in the amendment which he referred to as found on page 3, beginning on line 16 through line 19. The Senator from Massachusetts concurred that these were extremely harsh penalties and said that was one of the reasons the amendment should not be agreed to.

I point out that these are the same penalties provided for in the existing law.

I wish to ask both of them, as members of the Committee on the Judiciary and as lawyers, to follow the language of the amendment and the penalties while I read from the present act itself, because it is verbatim. I quote from section 610 of the Corrupt Practices Act.

(They) shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both; and if the violation was willful, shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both.

Mr. President, that penalty provision was lifted verbatim from the existing law and put into this amendment. The Senators are debating against the present act, not my amendment. I am sure that as lawyers they will agree on this point.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I do

not understand how the argument that the Senator is trying to make rebuts my statement. Even though the Senator is taking boilerplate language from the act the extent goes far beyond other sections of the act. It reaches fundamental questions of free speech and other fundamental questions in which the Supreme Court has ruled. Taking boilerplate language does not satisfy me that it makes it acceptable. I stand by the earlier interpretations. I think the points made by the Senator from Texas are just as valid now as they were then.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator from Massachusetts has referred to this penalty as coming from another section of the act. I most respectfully call his attention to the fact that I am not referring to another section of the act. I am referring to section 610, the Corrupt Practices Act, title 18, and I am referring to the penalty provision under the section we are here amending. They are identical; so what is the argument?

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that section 610 of the existing law, containing that language, be printed in the RECORD.

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

*** shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both; and if the violation was willful, shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned not more than two years, or both.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the penalty provisions of the pending amendment beginning on page 3, lines 16 through 19, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

*** shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both; and if the violation was willful, shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned not more than two years, or both.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Anyone reading the language will find that they are identical. The Senators are doing a lot of shadow boxing.

I have read the existing law as it now prohibits corporations and unions from making any contribution or expenditure in connection with any election in which the President or Members of Congress are involved. Then it lists the penalties to which I have referred. All I am doing is stating that same prohibition will apply to contributions made by corporations or unions when such contributions are siphoned through a second or third party.

I have placed in the RECORD the letters from the Department where they said in effect that when these contributions are made indirectly by corporations and union, no laws are violated. The pending amendment would correct this situation regardless of whether these contributions are made directly or indirectly.

As to the need for the union member to have a right to contribute to the party of his choice, compared with the need of the stockholder of the company having the right to contribute, I point out that

there is nothing under the existing law and there is nothing under this amendment which would restrict a union member, a corporation member, a corporate official, a stockholder, or whatever he may be, from contributing as an individual. That is a fallacious argument.

I would not support any proposal which tended to restrict the right of the individual citizen in any way. What this does do would be to stop the union as a union, or the corporation as a corporation, from taking money that was contributed either by the corporate stockholders or by the union members, with or without their consent, and making a cash contribution or an expenditure to the party that was the favorite choice of the union official or the corporate president and not necessarily the choice of the individuals involved in each case.

Certainly any individual, as an American citizen, whether he be a union member, a stockholder, or an official in any capacity in either organization, has a right to contribute to the party of his choice. But, I say further that no official of any union or corporation has the right to take the money contributed by members or stockholders and then make a cash contribution to the party of his own choice, which may or may not be the party which that particular member supports.

The issue is clear. So far as I am concerned, I am ready to vote. I think it boils down to: Do we want to stop the unions and corporations from making political contributions from union or corporate treasuries?

This amendment carries the same penalties for both.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I shall reluctantly vote against the amendment because I believe it reaches too far. I think it is unfortunate that we do not have a carefully worded amendment which would prohibit and stop the use of union funds for political purposes as well as corporate funds for political purposes.

There are too many instances today where corporate funds and union funds are actually being used, directly or indirectly, for political purposes.

However, as the Senator from Florida has already pointed out, that language reaches too far. The amendment would also prohibit voluntary contributions to such committees as the Committee for Political Education and others.

I have said on many occasions I felt that voluntary contribution for political purposes, even though they be collected by a union, should be all right. I shall, consistent with that position, stated often times in the past, vote against the amendment.

I do hope that other amendments might be offered which would appropriately tighten the Corrupt Practices Act and make it effective, as it was originally intended, particularly when Senator Taft and others amended the Taft-Hartley Law.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD certain editorials and comments on this subject.

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

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, Oct. 2-3, 1965]

DONATION OF \$25,000 BY LAWLER FOR JOHNSON CAMPAIGN—STEAMFITTER AGENT'S ACTION APPEARS TO HAVE VIOLATED FEDERAL LAW
(By Al Delugach and Denny Walsh)

By far the handsomest gift to "Friends of LBJ" in the 1964 presidential campaign was the \$25,000 it reported as a contribution from John L. Lawler. He is business manager of the powerful St. Louis Steamfitters Local 562, which pays him about that much annually.

On its face, the donation appears in violation of federal law forbidding a contributor from giving over \$5,000 to a single committee in a federal election.

"Friends of LBJ" was a gilt-edge group of political "insiders" that raised campaign funds for President Lyndon B. Johnson.

The President, in April, 1964, commuted the labor racketeering sentence of the Local 562 strongman, Lawrence L. Callanan.

Other 1964 contributions listed as made by Lawler include \$2000 to the "President's Club for Johnson Committee" and \$3000 to the Democratic National Committee.

Callanan himself, as well as Lawler and other key Local 562 figures, are also reported as having plunked out a total of \$6000 in contributions to the Democratic National Committee just last June.

LARGE DEBTS

The committee, which reported raising \$1,330,640 between June 1 and Aug. 31 this year, still has large debts from the 1964 campaign.

Callanan was convicted under a Republican administration in 1954 of the \$28,000 shake-down of a Tulsa pipeline contractor. He was paroled in 1960 after serving nearly half of a 12-year sentence in Leavenworth.

A few days earlier, the Internal Revenue Service granted him a favorable settlement of his \$40,000 tax debt from the kickback period.

Because of his allegedly modest finances, he was permitted to pay \$17,000 cash and a percentage of anything he earned above \$7500 a year for ten years. The IRS summary of the case noted he was then earning \$150 a week as a steamfitter and added a doleful note:

There are "no prospects of any material increase" in his income.

Before his commutation was granted eight days later, Callanan faced legal blocks to resuming union-related activity until July, 1971.

SALARY HIKE

He recently surfaced on the political high seas as the director of the lush "voluntary" political fund of Local 562, his salary reported in the \$15,000-\$20,000 range.

The financial report of "Friends of LBJ" was filed with the clerk of the United States House of Representatives in Washington Jan. 12, 1965.

It was sworn to by its treasurer, Paul A. Porter, and submitted on the letterhead of the high-powered Washington law firm of Arnold, Fortas and Porter.

One partner, Abe Fortas, has recently been named to the Supreme Court bench. Another, Thurman Arnold, is former head of the Justice Department's antitrust division. Mr. Arnold was a defense attorney for Callanan in appeals of his conviction to the Supreme Court in the 1950s.

The name of the chairman of "Friends of LBJ" was not in its report. A spokesman for the Democratic National Committee said he did not know. Several attempts to contact Mr. Porter Friday about the report were unsuccessful, although he was in his office.

Among the \$121,950 in contributions reported for 1964 was \$25,000 on Nov. 2 by Lawler, who was listed as a "contributor." Although the law requires the name and address of contributors, the report gave only the name and city of each.

The Hatch Act states that "whoever"

makes contributions of more than \$5,000 to a political committee in a federal election shall be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both. Committees as contributors are excepted.

U.S. LABOR LAW

Under federal labor law, unions and corporations are not permitted to make political contributions on their own.

Lawler was said to be out of the city Friday and not available for comment about his reported contribution.

By comparison to the \$25,000 gift, Henry Ford II of Detroit was down on the report for \$3,000 and Hollywood star Gene Autry for \$5000.

According to the 1964 financial report of Steamfitter Local 562 to the Labor Department, Lawler, was paid \$19,960 salary, plus \$1500 allowances and \$4136 expenses between Oct. 1, 1963, and Sept. 1, 1964.

The salary was \$5260 above Lawler's salary figure in the 1963 report filed.

The Democratic National Committee's report filed with the House clerk showed a \$1000 contribution June 2, 1965, by "L. L. Callanan," 10517 Lookaway dr. (his home address), and another \$1000 by "Lawrence Callanan," 1242 Pierce ave. (address of the union).

OTHER DONATIONS

Other \$1000 donations last June 2 were listed for "J. L. Lawler," "G. Seaton" and "E. Steska," all of the union address, and "E. Beck," 4317 Haven St.

Steska is Local 562 president and Seaton the vice-president and business agent.

Beck, a steamfitter, is Callanan's son-in-law. He reportedly has been recently made assistant to Callanan in running the "voluntary" political fund, which is reputed to take in as much as \$390,000 a year from Local 562 members. The fund is quartered in the union hall.

As revealed Tuesday by The Globe-Democrat, Beck showed up in state records as one of the licensed agents of an insurance firm about the time it began doing business with Local 562's pension fund.

The fund's reports to the Labor Department do not list Beck as among those who were paid thousands of dollars in commissions on the deal.

Contributions to the Democratic committee from the Steamfitter elite appear munificent by comparison with many in the \$200-to-\$400 range from members of President Johnson's Cabinet and other government officials.

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, Oct. 2-3, 1965]

QUESTIONS TO BE ANSWERED

It is revealed elsewhere in today's Globe-Democrat that John Lawler, business manager of Steamfitters Local 562, made a \$25,000 campaign gift to "Friends of LBJ," \$2000 to the President's Club for Johnson Committee, and \$3000 to the Democratic National Committee, all in 1964.

Considering that Lawler's salary for 1964 was reported as \$19,960, this is extremely generous giving, indeed.

The Globe-Democrat believes the Internal Revenue Service should make an investigation of Lawler's finances to determine whether he paid taxes on what must be a vast income above his stated salary to enable him to give so generously to President Johnson and the Democratic National Committee.

We think, too, that United States Attorney Richard D. FitzGibbon should investigate whether any Federal law has been violated by these gifts. Federal law forbids a contributor from giving over \$5000 to one committee in a Federal election.

This may be difficult for Mr. FitzGibbon since he was the Callanan-Lawler candidate for Mayor until the steamfitter gang found

that Alfonso J. Cervantes had too great a lead and switched their endorsement from FitzGibbon to Cervantes. Nevertheless it is his duty and we expect Mr. FitzGibbon to do it.

We think that the Internal Revenue Service should also investigate the gift of Lawrence Callanan of \$2000 to the Democratic National Committee this year.

Callanan, convicted labor racketeer, was permitted to pay \$17,000 cash in settlement of a bill of \$40,219 for taxes, fraud and other penalties and interest.

He is required, under terms of the settlement, to pay a percentage of future earnings in excess of \$7500 a year on the \$23,219 balance of his tax liabilities.

If Callanan were so poor that the Internal Revenue Service had to compromise his debt to the government, how could he contribute \$2000 to the Democratic party?

Certainly the Internal Revenue Service, in view of Callanan's obvious affluence, should find adequate grounds for reopening its tax settlement.

Surely there can be no connection between the enormously generous gifts of Callanan and Lawler and President Johnson's commutation of Callanan's sentence, which enables him to go back into union activities.

Nevertheless, perhaps former Attorney General Robert Kennedy—now Senator from New York—would care to comment on his recommending Callanan for a return to grace in view of the smelly record of the steamfitters as blocks to progress in St. Louis, Callanan's continuing to run the union from his jail cell and, most importantly, the remarks of the late Federal Judge Ruby Hulien who, in sentencing Callanan, described the case as a "more grievous and aggravated violation of the law," than other racketeering cases tried before him.

"The evidence of merciless use and betrayal of people who labor for their livelihood, and were members of unions supposed to be represented by these defendants, is shocking," Judge Hulien stated at the time. "Unless I had heard the facts under oath I would not have believed them."

The judge remarked that Callanan "hasn't shown one bit of remorse. Indifference to the welfare of union workmen is glaring." Judge Hulien stated further: "Callanan took from the funds of the union, of which he is an officer, funds to pay for his defense . . . Callanan was the brains of the racketeering conspiracy."

Perhaps the White House itself would care to elaborate on the clean bill of health given Callanan last year.

It would be interesting to know, also, who urged Attorney General Kennedy and President Johnson to pardon this notorious extortionist.

The evidence of law violation and the possibility, at least, of the illegal use of union funds cries aloud for investigation.

Everyone who believes in good government will not be content until strong affirmative action is taken in the cases of Lawler and Callanan and, if there are abuses of law and trust, as we strongly suspect, they are thoroughly aired and punished.

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat,
Nov. 16, 1965]

THE CASE AGAINST THE STEAMFITTERS

The individual steamfitter in this area is probably just as good an American as any other citizen, but his union—Local 562—has kept more business out of St. Louis than anyone else can bring in. It is a corrupting influence in the life of this city.

Businesses not already in St. Louis steer clear of us because they simply will not submit to the steamfitters gang which has the highest wage scale in the nation, but whose featherbedding and other practices exorbitantly hike the cost of doing business.

Contractors using steamfitters cannot even appoint their own union foremen. They have

no voice in hiring their own union employees. They must take whomever the union gives them and have no control whatsoever over the job.

This is contrary to the universal practice of other unions. As a result, the steamfitters are regarded as the worst union in the area and, probably, in the country in terms of productivity and reasonable co-operative effort.

Some people may say, "Why worry about a small union of 1,200 members? A group that small, no matter how bad, cannot possibly do any harm." They could not be more wrong.

The power of the steamfitters is sheer money. Each union member is forced to contribute \$1 a day, \$2 for permit holders, to a "voluntary" fund for political education. It is "voluntary" only in the sense that he gives it or he doesn't work.

The \$250 annually which a resident steamfitter must "give" is more than the average person in those circumstances contributes to his church, the United Fund, the Boy Scouts and all good causes combined; yet he has no choice.

The total in this one fund amounts to approximately \$600,000 a year, which goes to political contributions known to be well up in six figures to at least one candidate and very well up in five figures to others.

In addition, this one small union takes in approximately \$2,500,000 annually, paid solely by the employers at the rate of \$10 per man-day worked. Benefits seeping down to the individual members from this fund seems curiously limited and accountability does not exist.

For example, several years ago the steamfitters canceled the group policy bought for their members with one of the best and most reputable insurance companies in America and took out policies with a small and little known company in Gary, Ind.

Curiously, this is the same company which sold 116,250 shares of stock with a market value of about \$5 per share to interested St. Louisans with good union contracts at \$1 per share. If this deal doesn't stink to high heaven, none ever did. It is currently being investigated by Federal authorities.

There is no applicable law governing the disbursement either of the \$600,000 political slush fund or the \$2,500,000 health and welfare plans. This is a shocking loophole and should be corrected at the Federal level.

Meanwhile, the union is controlled by Lawrence Callanan, who was convicted of extortion and served six years in a Federal prison, by his standby and lackey, John Lawler, who was indicted for extortion, but strangely never came to trial, and by Lawrence Thompson, a former Teamster convicted of extortion who makes sure the boys "give" their \$1 a day political contribution.

Some questionable practices maybe have their root in the fact that Callanan, Lawler and the like are able to make massive political contributions. Lawler recently contributed \$31,000 in the Friends of LBJ and other Democratic committees. Callanan was able to compromise \$40,219 in back taxes for \$17,000 but still was able to give \$2,000 to the Democratic National Committee. It probably was a coincidence, but not too long before that a presidential commutation was issued for Callanan who promptly resumed his role in union affairs.

With the power afforded them by the members' "voluntary gifts," the steamfitters can make quite some political hay. One of their members sits in the Missouri Senate and two are in the Missouri House of Representatives. There is talk that Lawler himself may, indeed, have the effrontery to run for a vacancy in the State Senate for which he was beaten three years ago.

Attorneys or proteges have been appointed as chairman of the St. Louis Board of Election Commissioners and as a judge of the Circuit Court.

The steamfitters are reaching for some of the highest offices in Missouri government and their influence for evil will expand unless checked in the public interest.

The entire matter cries aloud for ventilation and correction.

Specifically, the District Director of Internal Revenue should reopen the tax compromise of Callanan and investigate the amount paid on income taxes by Callanan, Lawler and associates.

The International Steamfitters Union should investigate the abuses which have brought—and are bringing—the entire steamfitter trade, an honorable one outside this area, into disrepute. The International Meatcutters Union straightened out a far less dangerous situation with their local, and the steamfitters can do no less.

We hope that Senator Williams of Delaware and Senator McClellan of Arkansas will investigate the entire mess in St. Louis and propose corrective Federal legislation.

The United States Attorney, Richard D. FitzGibbon, has announced that he will investigate the steamfitters before a Federal grand jury in Judge Roy Harper's court. We can think of no one less promising to conduct such an investigation.

FitzGibbon was a former law associate of Morris Shenker, who is in the steamfitter business up to his eyebrows. FitzGibbon was the steamfitters' choice as a candidate for Mayor until they found they could not beat Al Cervantes in the primary. FitzGibbon himself represents a nice balance between ineptitude and laziness, a combination hard to beat.

We urge the Justice Department, considering the many ramifications of the insurance deal, to send in a highly qualified special prosecutor to replace FitzGibbon and run the investigation.

The steamfitters' union is of personal concern to every businessman and every citizen in this area. It can only be reformed by the good offices of the Justice Department, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Internal Revenue Service, courageous Senators, and a courageous grand jury in Judge Harper's court, and by an aroused public opinion.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in reply to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN], I want to point out that this amendment would stop the abuse which is now going on and, at the same time, would not jeopardize the rights of any union member or stockholder to make a contribution to the party of his choice.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, as I stated earlier, this is simply a case of deciding whether we want to permit union members or stockholders of corporations to participate voluntarily in the process of their Government by being able to make voluntary contributions.

If we want to deprive them of the right which the courts have said is unconstitutional to attempt, as the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] has pointed out, then we should vote with the Senator from Delaware. If we want to preserve that right for them and give them the right to participate in the conduct of this great Government, then we should vote against the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I do not want to delay the Senate, but I cannot let go unchallenged the inference by the Senator from Nevada that the adoption of my amendment would in any way restrict the right of any American citizen, whether he be a

member of a union, a corporate stockholder, or an official of a union or a corporation, from making a contribution to the party of his choice. There is absolutely nothing in the amendment which would prevent such free action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment (No. 283) of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

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. BIBLE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER] would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea" and the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is paired with the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY]. If present and voting, the Senator from New York would vote "nay" and the Senator from California would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 19, nays 46, as follows:

[No. 243 Leg.]

YEAS—19

Bennett	Fong	Mundt
Boggs	Hansen	Smith
Carlson	Hickenlooper	Thurmond
Case	Hollings	Tower
Cotton	Hruska	Williams, Del.
Dirksen	Jordan, Idaho	
Fannin	Miller	

NAYS—46

Alken	Griffin	Mondale
Allott	Gruening	Monroney
Bartlett	Hayden	Nelson
Bayh	Hill	Pearson
Brewster	Holland	Prouty
Brooke	Kennedy, Mass.	Proxmire
Burdick	Kennedy, N.Y.	Ribicoff
Byrd, Va.	Kuchel	Scott
Byrd, W. Va.	Long, Mo.	Sparkman
Cannon	Long, La.	Spong
Clark	McCarthy	Stennis
Cooper	McClellan	Talmadge
Ellender	McGee	Yarborough
Ervin	McGovern	Young, Ohio
Fulbright	McIntyre	
Gore	Metcalf	

NOT VOTING—35

Anderson	Inouye	Muskie
Baker	Jackson	Pastore
Bible	Javits	Pell
Church	Jordan, N.C.	Percy
Curtis	Lausche	Randolph
Dodd	Magnuson	Russell
Dominick	Mansfield	Smathers
Eastland	Montoya	Symington
Harris	Morse	Tydings
Hart	Morton	Williams, N.J.
Hartke	Moss	Young, N. Dak.
Hatfield	Murphy	

So the amendment (No. 283) of Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware was rejected.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

PROGRAM—UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, there will be no more votes tonight. The Senate will continue its consideration of the pending business tomorrow when it meets at 10 o'clock.

I am informed by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] that he has an amendment which he will offer in the morning, and that he is joining with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] in the offering of a second amendment. I am also informed by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania that he would like to have not to exceed 1 hour on each of the two amendments.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, half an hour to a side.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Yes; half an hour to a side.

So, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, in connection with the amendment which is to be offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and with the amendment which is to be offered by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], there be a time limitation on each amendment of not to exceed 1 hour, the time to be equally divided between the mover of the amendment and the manager of the bill.

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. My understanding is that, in deference to the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], we would have no actual vote before 12 o'clock noon.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Yes. It is the intention of the leadership to delay any vote until 12 o'clock, but it is the thought of the leadership that we might proceed with a discussion of the amendments and possibly have the votes come at 12 o'clock or shortly thereafter.

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Suppose there are amendments to the amendment.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thought my request included amendments to the amendment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all time on each of the amendments to which I have just referred and the amendments thereto be limited to 1 hour, the time to be equally divided between the mover of the amendment and the chairman of the committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, is that 1 hour on the Clark amendment, or 1 hour on that amendment and 1 hour on amendments thereto?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time on the Clark amendments and all amendments thereto be limited to 1 hour on each, the time to be equally divided between the mover of the amendment and the chairman of the committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I object. I do not know that there will be any amendments to the amendments, but I would not want to be in the position, while committees are meeting, when there may be three or four amendments to the Clark amendment, of having no time to discuss those amendments. If the Senator wants to ask unanimous consent to have a limitation of 1 hour on the Clark amendments, to be equally divided, and 1 hour on any amendment thereto, to be equally divided, I would have no objection.

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I think it is so highly unlikely that there will be amendments to either amendment that I would be perfectly content to go along with the suggestion of the Senator from Delaware. As a matter of fact, I would have to, anyway. May I say that my situation is such

that my time is somewhat limited. I feel we will "get under the wire" with the suggestion of the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I withdraw my request.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, may I make a request?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, on the two amendments by me, one of which is co-sponsored by Senator SCOTT, the time be limited to 1 hour on each amendment, to be equally divided between the proponent of the amendment and the manager of the bill, with the understanding that on any amendments to either amendment a similar amount of time will be permitted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none—

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, would the Senator from Delaware have any objection to limiting the time on amendments to amendments to 30 minutes, the time to be equally divided?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I think the amount of time should be the same. I do not know that any amendments would be offered, but I think in the interest of good legislation, we ought to have the same amount of time. We do not know what the other side will be offering.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I do not object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement was subsequently reduced to writing, as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That during the further consideration of the bill (S. 1880) to revise the Federal election laws, and for other purposes, debate on amendments numbered 291 and 292 and any amendments thereto, be limited to 1 hour each, to be equally divided and controlled respectively by the movers of the amendments and the Senator from Nevada, Mr. Cannon.

RECESS UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, September 12, 1967, at 10 a'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate September 11, 1967:

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

Paul Rand Dixon, of Tennessee, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner for the term of 7 years from September 26, 1967—reappointment.

The following-named persons for appointment to the positions indicated:

COMMISSIONER, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Walter E. Washington, of the District of Columbia, to be Commissioner of the District of Columbia for a term expiring February 1, 1969—new position.

ASSISTANT TO THE COMMISSIONER, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Thomas W. Fletcher, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant to the Commissioner of the District of Columbia—new position.

IN THE AIR FORCE

Thomas H. Nielsen, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, vice Leonard Marks, Jr.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3299:

To be lieutenant colonel

Gulang, Marcelino C., XXXXXX.

To be majors

Beebe, John M., XXXXXX.
Donnelly, Eugene M., XXXXXX.
Horne, Jasper C., Jr., XXXXXX.
Joyce, Thomas F., XXXXXX.
Pelham, Wendall L., XXXXXX.
Wallace, Robert G., XXXXXX.

To be captains

Abernethy, Robert J., XXXXXXXX.
Abraham, Bruce R., XXXXXX.
Absher, Donald E., XXXXXX.
Acinapura, Joseph N., XXXXXXXX.
Adams, Elcie, XXXXXX.
Adams, Glen T., XXXXXX.
Adams, John R., III, XXXXXX.
Adcock, Jerry W., XXXXXX.
Albertson, Tom L., XXXXXX.
Aldinger, Robert R., XXXXXXXX.
Alexander, Junius R., XXXXXXXX.
Alexander, Terry L., XXXXXX.
Alfaro, Daniel V., XXXXXX.
Allen, Alex L., XXXXXX.
Allen, Kenneth D., XXXXXXXX.
Alley, James H., XXXXXXXX.
Allgood, Ray L., Jr., XXXXXX.
Allison, William T., XXXXXX.
Almquist, Tod F., XXXXXXXX.
Alpern, Stephen I., XXXXXX.
Altmeyer, James E., XXXXXX.
Altorfer, William G., XXXXXX.
Alvarez-Garcia, Luiz, XXXXXX.
Alvis, John M., XXXXXX.
Anchor, Leonard J., XXXXXX.
Anckaltis, William, XXXXXX.
Anderson, Charles, XXXXXX.
Anderson, David W., XXXXXX.
Anderson, James Y., XXXXXX.
Andrew, Edward L., XXXXXX.
Anjler, Louis J., Jr., XXXXXX.
Anselm, Donald C., XXXXXX.
Apfel, Paul W., XXXXXX.
Arata, Thomas C., XXXXXXXX.
Archambeau, Jason E., XXXXXX.
Armstrong, Alan P., XXXXXX.
Armstrong, Charles, XXXXXX.
Arnold, Billy R., XXXXXX.
Arnold, Wallace C., XXXXXXXX.
Arthur, James F., Jr., XXXXXX.
Arthur, Warren A., XXXXXX.
Atkins, George C., XXXXXX.
Atkins, Thomas H., XXXXXXXX.
Atkinson, John H., XXXXXX.
Authier, Edward E., XXXXXX.
Avery, John, Jr., XXXXXX.
Babbitt, Leroy A., Jr., XXXXXX.
Bacon, Carlton E., XXXXXX.
Baena, George, XXXXXX.
Bains, William J., XXXXXX.
Baird, Thomas H., XXXXXX.
Baker, Donald D., XXXXXXXX.
Baker, James D., XXXXXX.
Baker, James E., XXXXXXXX.
Bakkeby, William M., XXXXXXXX.
Balda, Jerome F., XXXXXX.
Baldwin, Byron S., XXXXXX.
Baldwin, Joseph A., XXXXXX.

Bangasser, Fredric D. H., XXXXXX.
Bankson, Peter R., XXXXXX.
Barber, John T., XXXXXXXX.
Barbour, Donald A., XXXXXXXX.
Barnes, Bruce A., XXXXXX.
Barney, Daniel G., XXXXXX.
Barringer, Ronald W., XXXXXXXX.
Bartay, Tandy E., XXXXXX.
Bartels, Steven E., XXXXXX.
Bartlett, Charles M., XXXXXX.
Battle, Brendan J., XXXXXX.
Bavis, Robert J., III, XXXXXX.
Beal, Patrick G., XXXXXX.
Becker, Harvey A., XXXXXX.
Beckett, Ronald L., XXXXXX.
Becking, Ernest A., XXXXXX.
Bee, Arlen E., XXXXXXXX.
Beebe, Merrell S., XXXXXXXX.
Behrenhausen, Richard A., Jr., XXXXXX.
Beinhacker, Neal D., XXXXXX.
Bellamy, Anthony R., XXXXXX.
Bender, Joseph F., XXXXXX.
Bender, Lynn A., XXXXXX.
Bennett, Andrew F., XXXXXX.
Bennett, Clyde R., Jr., XXXXXXXX.
Benson, Roger R., XXXXXX.
Bent, Robert E., XXXXXXXX.
Benton, Hubert F., XXXXXX.
Bentz, William A., XXXXXX.
Benvenuto, James V., XXXXXXXX.
Bergeron, Andrew L., XXXXXXXX.
Bergman, John F., Jr., XXXXXXXX.
Berinato, John J., XXXXXX.
Berkley, Clyde J., XXXXXX.
Berman, Jay M., XXXXXX.
Bernard, Robert K., XXXXXX.
Bernardi, Roger R., XXXXXX.
Berra, Louis C., Jr., XXXXXX.
Bertocci, David I., XXXXXXXX.
Besemer, Ellsworth, XXXXXX.
Bevans, Nathan E., XXXXXX.
Beyer, Lawrence M., XXXXXX.
Bliemeck, John F., IV, XXXXXX.
Biese, John J., Jr., XXXXXXXX.
Binkewicz, Joseph B., XXXXXXXX.
Binzer, Solomon V., XXXXXX.
Biondi, Richard M., XXXXXX.
Bird, Samuel R., XXXXXX.
Bird, William W., XXXXXX.
Bisantz, Anthony E., XXXXXXXX.
Bitgood, John J., XXXXXX.
Blackburn, John T., XXXXXX.
Blackwell, Joseph W., XXXXXX.
Blair, John D., IV, XXXXXX.
Blair, Robert H., XXXXXX.
Blake, William B., XXXXXX.
Blanda, Frank T., XXXXXXXX.
Blesse, James S., XXXXXX.
Blount, Howard P., Jr., XXXXXX.
Boomer, George M., XXXXXXXX.
Boehman, Richard J., XXXXXX.
Boeve, Lucas, III, XXXXXX.
Boland, Jimmie D., XXXXXXXX.
Bolton, Peter A., XXXXXX.
Bon, Virgil D., XXXXXX.
Bonville, George P., XXXXXX.
Boone, George F., XXXXXXXX.
Borg, Charles T., XXXXXX.
Born, William J. T. M., XXXXXX.
Bortel, James L., Jr., XXXXXXXX.
Bosarge, Frederick C., XXXXXX.
Bostdorf, John M., XXXXXX.
Bourland, James T., XXXXXXXX.
Bowe, Matthew A., Jr., XXXXXX.
Bowe, Robert M., XXXXXXXX.
Bowers, Billy J., XXXXXXXX.
Bowles, Norborn S., XXXXXX.
Bowman, Forest J., XXXXXX.
Box, Joe M., XXXXXXXX.
Boyce, Donald A., XXXXXX.
Boyce, John P., XXXXXX.
Boyd, Quinton P., XXXXXX.
Boyd, William L., XXXXXX.
Boyer, Albert J., XXXXXXXX.
Boylan, Peter J., Jr., XXXXXX.
Bradford, William B., XXXXXX.
Bragg, Stacy C., XXXXXX.
Brandon, Eddie L., XXXXXXXX.
Brannon, John D., XXXXXX.
Breen, John F., XXXXXX.
Brennan, Lawrence, XXXXXX.

Brennan, Richard P., XXXXXX.
 Breslin, Michael G., XXXXXX.
 Bridgman, Cain A., XXXXXX.
 Briggs, Duncan D., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Brinkley, Ulyus O., XXXXXX.
 Britton, Johnnie W., XXXXXXXX.
 Britz, Ronald J., XXXXXX.
 Brock, Willi E., XXXXXX.
 Brooks, Delbert R., XXXXXX.
 Brooks, Ronald E., XXXXXX.
 Brost, Daryl F., XXXXXX.
 Brown, Edward A. III, XXXXXX.
 Brown, James P., XXXXXX.
 Brown, Jerry L., XXXXXXXX.
 Brown, John L., XXXXXX.
 Brown, Joseph, Jr., XXXXXXXX.
 Brown, Raymond A., XXXXXXXX.
 Brown, Reginald J., XXXXXX.
 Brown, Robert A., XXXXXXXX.
 Brown, Roland P., XXXXXX.
 Brown, Willard G., XXXXXX.
 Browning, Robert W., XXXXXX.
 Broyles, Robert F., XXXXXX.
 Brummett, Henry U. B., XXXXXX.
 Bruner, Edward F., XXXXXX.
 Bryan, Joe S., XXXXXX.
 Bryan, Wallace A., XXXXXX.
 Buckles, Harvey I., XXXXXX.
 Buckner, Richard A., XXXXXX.
 Budge, Larry D., XXXXXX.
 Buntyn, William A., XXXXXXXX.
 Burch, Charles G., XXXXXXXX.
 Burch, Edgar F., III, XXXXXX.
 Burchell, Gail P., XXXXXX.
 Burdick, Raymond C., XXXXXX.
 Burgess, Douglas E., XXXXXX.
 Burgess, Peter D., XXXXXX.
 Burlas, Joseph E., Jr., XXXXXXXX.
 Burns, Charles P., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Burns, Clifford H., XXXXXXXX.
 Burns, Robert A., XXXXXX.
 Burton, Lance J., XXXXXX.
 Burwell, Rodney P., XXXXXX.
 Bury, Robert H., XXXXXX.
 Busdiecker, Roy F., XXXXXX.
 Bushdiecker, William A., XXXXXXXX.
 Butler, David H., XXXXXX.
 Butler, Irvin S., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Butterworth, Larry, XXXXXX.
 Butts, Don E., XXXX.
 Byrd, Johnnie P., XXXXXX.
 Byrne, Alan H., XXXXXXXX.
 Byrnes, James P., XXXXXX.
 Cain, Robert S., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Cairns, Robert B., XXXXXX.
 Caldwell, Robert C., XXXXXX.
 Caldwell, Robert W., XXXXXXXX.
 Calhoun, Richard W., XXXXXX.
 Callahan, Joseph C., XXXXXX.
 Callender, Robert D., XXXXXXXX.
 Callender, William E., XXXXXX.
 Campbell, Dale G., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Campbell, Jerry P., XXXXXX.
 Campbell, John G., XXXXXX.
 Campbell, John L., XXXXXX.
 Campbell, Larry D., XXXXXX.
 Campbell, Verne D., XXXXXX.
 Canady, Robert G., XXXXXXXX.
 Canarina, Arnold R., XXXXXX.
 Candler, Harry W., Jr., XXXXXXXX.
 Cansler, Joe C., XXXXXXXX.
 Carabin, Dan L., XXXXXXXX.
 Carboni, John N., XXXXXX.
 Cargile, James P., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Carlos, Thomas P., XXXXXXXX.
 Carlson, Gunnar C., XXXXXX.
 Carlton, Terry M., XXXXXX.
 Carney, Roger F. X., XXXXXX.
 Carollo, Samuel A., XXXXXXXX.
 Carr, John M., XXXXXX.
 Carson, Robert A., XXXXXX.
 Carter, George W., XXXXXXXX.
 Carter, Lewis L., XXXXXXXX.
 Carter, Norman D., XXXXXXXX.
 Carter, Randall O., XXXXXX.
 Carter, Robert A., XXXXXXXX.
 Carver, William G., XXXXXX.
 Casani, Andrew B., XXXXXX.
 Cash, Justin C., Jr., XXXXXXXX.
 Casto, James G., XXXXXX.
 Cavender, Jerry W., XXXXXX.
 Cavezza, Carmen J., XXXXXX.
 Ceccon, Claude R., XXXX.
 Cephas, Leonard M., XXXXXX.
 Chaffin, Harry J., XXXXXX.
 Chamberlin, Charles, Jr., XXXXXX.
 Champagne, Shelton J., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Chandler, Charles E., XXXXXX.
 Chandler, William S., XXXXXX.
 Chapman, Jimmy R., XXXXXXXX.
 Chauvin, Charles E., XXXXXX.
 Chelberg, Robert D., XXXXXX.
 Chen, William S., XXXXXX.
 Chester, Michael Q., XXXXXX.
 Child, John, XXXXXX.
 Chin, James R., XXXXXX.
 Chisholm, Leonard H., XXXXXX.
 Chism, J. W., XXXXXX.
 Christensen, Don T., XXXX.
 Christophersen, Frederick N., XXXXXX.
 Cisneros, Marc A., XXXXXX.
 Claassen, Walter E., XXXXXX.
 Clark, Daniel R., XXXXXX.
 Clark, Herman J., XXXXXX.
 Clark, Thomas S., XXXXXX.
 Clarke, Gordon M., XXXXXX.
 Clarke, Richard D., XXXXXX.
 Clawson, Lucien E., XXXXXX.
 Clemons, Damon L., XXXXXX.
 Clifton, Fred R., XXXXXXXX.
 Clough, Stanley M., XXXXXX.
 Coates, Thomas E., XXXXXXXX.
 Cochran, Alexander S., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Cody, Michael A., XXXXXX.
 Cohen, Robert E., XXXXXXXX.
 Cole, Warner B., XXXXXX.
 Coleman, Gerald C., XXXXXXXX.
 Collier, William P., XXXXXXXX.
 Collins, Francis C., XXXXXX.
 Colwell, Edison T., XXXXXX.
 Colwell, Richard J., XXXXXXXX.
 Compton, Martin A., XXXXXX.
 Conley, Willard C., XXXXXX.
 Conlin, Thomas J., XXXXXXXX.
 Conner, Dan A., XXXXXX.
 Connolly, James C., XXXXXX.
 Conway, Peter, XXXXXX.
 Cook, Garry M., XXXXXX.
 Cook, Jay C., XXXXXX.
 Cooke, Joseph D., Jr., XXXXXXXX.
 Cooksey, James K., XXXXXX.
 Cooley, Robert H., XXXXXXXX.
 Cooper, Gary R., XXXXXX.
 Cooper, Nelson J., XXXXXX.
 Copeland, Richard L., XXXXXX.
 Copeland, William C., XXXXXX.
 Corcoran, James R., XXXXXX.
 Cornelson, John C., XXXXXX.
 Coseo, David P., XXXXXX.
 Coston, James G., XXXXXX.
 Coston, Morris L., XXXXXX.
 Cote, Donald L., XXXXXX.
 Coulter, Holland B., XXXXXX.
 Couvillion, Donald A., XXXXXX.
 Covington, Benjamin W., III, XXXXXX.
 Covington, Everett, XXXXXXXX.
 Cowan, Bruce M., XXXXXX.
 Cowling, Bobby W., XXXXXX.
 Cox, William W., XXXX.
 Coyle, Fred W., XXXXXX.
 Coyne, Michael, XXXXXXXX.
 Craft, Morris H., XXXXXXXX.
 Craig, Norton W., II, XXXXXX.
 Crawley, Joe B., XXXXXX.
 Creighton, William S., Jr., XXXX.
 Cressler, Walter L., XXXXXX.
 Crews, Ephraim W., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Crisler, Herbert T., XXXXXXXX.
 Crittenden, John H., XXXXXX.
 Cronin, Daniel P., XXXXXXXX.
 Crowder, George L., XXXXXX.
 Crowell, Norman T., XXXXXX.
 Crowson, William L., XXXXXXXX.
 Crowther, James I., XXXXXX.
 Crumley, Dennis V., XXXXXX.
 Crumley, Michael H., XXXXXX.
 Crump, Harry F., XXXXXX.
 Cuccaro, Joseph, XXXXXX.
 Cuccaro, Joseph T., XXXXXXXX.
 Cullum, Richard O., XXXXXX.
 Culp, Clovis R., XXXXXX.
 Cumings, Thayer, XXXXXXXX.
 Cummings, Patrick W., XXXXXX.
 Cunningham, Norman N., XXXXXX.
 Curcio, Anthony J., XXXXXX.
 Cushman, James M., XXXXXX.
 Custer, Bert H., XXXXXX.
 Cuthbert, Thomas R., XXXXXX.
 Cuttell, Dee E., XXXXXX.
 Czuberki, Joseph A., XXXXXX.
 Daignault, David W., XXXXXX.
 Daily, Jerry R., XXXXXX.
 Dale, Harold L., Jr., XXXXXXXX.
 Dalgleish, Grant B., XXXXXX.
 Daniel, James P., XXXXXX.
 Danielson, Jeris A., XXXXXX.
 Daniloff, Frederick D., XXXXXX.
 Danner, Malcolm A., XXXXXX.
 Danner, Robert F., XXXXXX.
 Dascanio, John L., XXXXXX.
 Dauber, Peter F., XXXXXX.
 Davidson, Paul R., XXXXXX.
 Davis, Charles L., Jr., XXXXXXXX.
 Davis, David W., XXXXXX.
 Davis, James R., XXXXXX.
 Davis, Norman J., XXXXXX.
 Davis, Thomas J., XXXXXX.
 De Blasio, Robert L., XXXXXX.
 De Prie, Michael C., XXXXXX.
 De Vries, Paul T., XXXXXX.
 De Witt, Howard S., XXXXXX.
 De Young, Clarence, XXXXXXXX.
 Dearlove, James W., XXXXXXXX.
 Degener, Wellington P., XXXXXX.
 Del Favero, Robert V., XXXXXX.
 Denney, Steve H., XXXXXX.
 Desantis, Edward, XXXXXX.
 Dewar, John D., XXXXXX.
 Dicaprio, Anthony, XXXXXXXX.
 Dickinson, Curtis L., XXXXXX.
 Dickson, Robert C., XXXXXX.
 Dierking, Irwin S., XXXXXX.
 Dilkes, Fred A., XXXXXX.
 Dill, Paul H., XXXXXX.
 Dillard, Walter S., XXXXXX.
 Dluzyn, David A., XXXXXX.
 Doak, Peter, XXXXXX.
 Dobrzelecki, Eugene, XXXXXXXX.
 Dobyns, James W., XXXXXXXX.
 Doff, Lawrence D., XXXX.
 Doherty, Alfred C., XXXXXX.
 Doherty, James W., XXXXXXXX.
 Dolan, Edward, XXXXXX.
 Doleman, Edgar C., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Dombrowski, Phillip G., XXXXXX.
 Domingo, Anselmo R., XXXXXX.
 Dooley, John P., XXXXXXXX.
 Dorr, John M., XXXXXX.
 Dorrance, James M., XXXXXXXX.
 Dow, Richard H., XXXXXX.
 Dow, William A., XXXXXX.
 Dowdle, Marion W., XXXXXXXX.
 Downer, George R., XXXXXXXX.
 Downey, Arthur J., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Downing, Harry E., XXXXXX.
 Doyle, William J., XXXXXX.
 Dreska, John P., XXXXXX.
 Driscoll, William J., XXXXXX.
 Drum, Ted E., XXXX.
 Dubov, Bruce J., XXXXXX.
 Duff, John A., XXXXXX.
 Dunaway, Fred C., XXXXXXXX.
 Duncan, Garrett E., XXXXXX.
 Duncan, Jerry G., XXXXXX.
 Duncan, Wallace H., XXXXXXXX.
 Dunham, John M., XXXXXX.
 Dunn, Carle E., XXXXXX.
 Dunning, David G., XXXXXXXX.
 Dunning, Robert M., XXXXXX.
 Durel, Francis M., XXXXXX.
 Durham, Robert S., XXXXXX.
 Durlan, Ronald S., XXXXXX.
 Dwinell, Richard E., XXXXXX.
 Dye, Joseph D., XXXXXXXX.
 Dyer, Robert E., XXXXXX.
 Dyer, Travis N., XXXXXX.
 Dzinich, Kurt S., XXXXXX.
 Dzwonkiewicz, Richard J., XXXXXX.
 Earle, Richard H., XXXXXX.
 Eaton, David G., XXXXXX.
 Eaton, Hal S., XXXXXX.
 Ebaugh, Christian M., XXXXXX.
 Eby, Clifford J., XXXXXX.
 Edgar, William F., XXXXXXXX.
 Edge, James G., XXXXXXXX.
 Edwards, Richard C., XXXXXXXX.

Edward Robert T., XXXXXX
 Egan, Francis C., XXXXXX
 Eggleston, Michael A., XXXXXX
 Eielson, John A., XXXXXX
 Elland, Michael D., XXXXXX
 Elsele, Frederick W., XXXXXXXX
 Ekman, Michael E., XXXXXX
 Elder, Raymond K., XXXXXX
 Elfman, Charles B., XXXXXX
 Ellegood, Michael S., XXXXXX
 Elliott, John D., XXXXXXXX
 Elliott, Thomas H., XXXXXX
 Enfield, Samuel W., XXXXXX
 Erbacher, Richard P., XXXXXXXX
 Erhardt, Franklyn A., XXXXXX
 Estep, Bobby G., XXXXXX
 Evans, Alexander R., XXXXXX
 Evans, Donald L., XXXXXX
 Evans, Floyd L., XXXXXX
 Eveland, Edward L., XXXXXX
 Eveleth, Robert G., XXXXXX
 Evetts, James K., Jr., XXXXXX
 Faison, James C., XXXXXX
 Faist, David O., XXXXXX
 Fanning, Richard H., XXXXXX
 Farmer, Robert E., XXXXXXXX
 Fasching, George H., XXXXXX
 Faubel, Gordon J., XXXXXX
 Featherston, Jimmy J., XXXXXX
 Fenlon, James A., XXXXXX
 Fenn, Harlan L., Jr., XXXXXX
 Ferguson, Jack W., XXXXXX
 Ferguson, Paul S., XXXXXX
 Fernandez, Robert V., XXXXXX
 Ferring, Theodore J., XXXXXX
 Fetterolf, Robert J., XXXXXXXX
 Feuerbacher, Charles, XXXXXXXX
 Fincher, Jerry W., XXXXXXXX
 Fishburne, Francis J., Jr., XXXXXX
 Fisher, John W., XXXXXX
 Fitch, Kenneth L., XXXXXX
 Flack, Gary L., XXXXXX
 Flanagan, Joseph J., XXXXXX
 Flanagan, Desmond W., XXXXXX
 Flatley, Thomas M., XXXXXX
 Fletcher, Tyrone P., XXXXXX
 Foley, La Velle, M., XXXXXX
 Fonken, Stanley L., XXXXXX
 Ford, James L., XXXXXXXX
 Ford, William R., XXXXXX
 Fordham, James E., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Foreman, Le Roy F., XXXXXX
 Forrest, George G., XXXXXX
 Forster, Paul A., XXXXXXXX
 Fossum, Raymond O., XXXXXXXX
 Foster, Edward S., Jr., XXXXXX
 Foster, Harry G., III, XXXXXX
 Fox, James H., XXXXXX
 Fox, Louis W., XXXXXX
 Frank, John J., XXXXXX
 Frankenberger, Charles E., Jr., XXXXXX
 Frazier, Dean S., XXXXXX
 Freese, Jon A., XXXXXXXX
 Freitag, William W., XXXXXX
 French, Larry T., XXXXXX
 Friant, Fritz, XXXXXX
 Fringer, John W., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Fritz, Martell D., XXXXXX
 Frix, Robert S., XXXXXX
 Frost, Dean R., XXXXXX
 Frusciante, William J., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Funderburk, Ronald N., XXXXXX
 Gabriel, Henmar R., XXXXXX
 Gaddy, William D., XXXXXXXX
 Gallagher, Donald M., XXXXXX
 Gallegos, Luis E., XXXXXXXX
 Gallo, Anthony J., Jr., XXXXXX
 Gallucci, John V., XXXXXX
 Gamble, William R., XXXXXXXX
 Ganderson, Martin L., XXXXXX
 Gannett, Robert W., XXXXXX
 Gantt, John R., XXXXXXXX
 Garcia, Manuel, XXXXXX
 Garcia, Miguel A., XXXXXX
 Garcia-Correa, Jose, XXXXXX
 Gardner, Charles E., XXX
 Gardner, William C., XXXXXX
 Garens, Ralph W., Jr., XXXXXX
 Garretson, Ralph B., XXXXXX
 Garrett, Billy R., XXXXXXXX
 Gatlin, Jerry D., XXXXXX
 Geiger, Kenneth H., XXXXXX
 Geoffrion, David L., XXXXXXXX
 Gervasini, Richard, XXXXXXXX
 Gibbs, Homer J., XXXXXX
 Gibson, Francis L., XXXXXX
 Giddens, James L., XXXXXXXX
 Gilbert, Nicholas C., XXXXXX
 Gillespie, Frank W., XXXXXX
 Gilmour, Adam S., XXXXXXXX
 Giorgianni, Barbaro F., XXXXXX
 Girard, Ronald E., XXXXXXXX
 Girouard, Richard J., XXXXXX
 Glabus, Edmund J., XXXXXX
 Glass, Robert R., II, XXXXXX
 Gleichenhaus, David P., XXXXXX
 Godin, Roger A., XXXXXX
 Goff, Gordon D., XXXXXX
 Goldberg, Edward B., XXXXXXXX
 Goldstine, James A., XXXXXX
 Goldtrap, John W., XXXXXX
 Gole, Henry G., XXXXXXXX
 Golvach, Duane J., XXXXXX
 Gomez, Augustine, XXXXXXXX
 Gonzalez, Carlos M., XXXXXX
 Goodell, Eugene K., XXXXXX
 Goodin, Marion J., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Gooding, Warren M., XXXXXX
 Goodloe, Gall E., Jr., XXXXXX
 Goodman, Michael L., XXXXXX
 Goodwin, Lake G., XXXXXX
 Gordon, Thomas R., XXXXXX
 Gorrell, Stanley L., XXXXXXXX
 Gors, Kenwood J., XXXXXX
 Goss, Joseph B., Jr., XXXXXX
 Graham, Barry F., XXXXXX
 Graham, Leonard T., XXXXXX
 Graham, Robert G., XXXXXXXX
 Grannemann, Rodney F., XXXXXXXX
 Granrud, Jerome H., XXXXXX
 Grant, Lawrence M., XXXXXX
 Graves, Howard D., XXXXXX
 Gray, Peter A., XXXXXX
 Grazulis, Louis A., XXXXXX
 Green, Charles S., Jr., XXXXXX
 Green, Grant S., Jr., XXXXXX
 Green, Larry K., XXXXXX
 Green, Thomas G., XXXXXX
 Green, William V., XXXXXXXX
 Greenberg, Harold, XXXXXX
 Greene, Channing M., XXXXXX
 Greene, William E., XXXXXXXX
 Greenwood, Ronald L., XXXXXX
 Greer, Donald R., XXXXXX
 Gregory, Joel E., XXXXXX
 Greif, William J., XXXXXX
 Grenier, Paul W., XXXXXXXX
 Grier, Edward G., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Griffin, Eldred E., XXXXXXXX
 Griffith, Ronald H., XXXXXX
 Griffiths, William R., XXXXXX
 Grindell, Chelsey V., XXXXXX
 Gripkey, Edward M., XXXXXX
 Groesbeck, Wesley A., XXXXXX
 Gronich, Bruce J., XXXXXX
 Gross, Joseph C., III, XXXXXXXX
 Guffey, William R., XXXXXX
 Guiler, Douglas C., XXXXXX
 Guindon, Richard G., XXXXXX
 Guthrie, John D., XXXXXX
 Haas, Charles N., XXXXXX
 Haddock, Argie E., XXXXXXXX
 Haise, James R., XXXXXX
 Halbleib, Duane W., XXXXXX
 Halbman, Robert A., XXXXXXXX
 Hale, Donald E., XXXXXXXX
 Hale, William M., XXXXXX
 Hall, Bruce W., XXXXXX
 Hall, Edward Y., XXXXXX
 Hall, Henry W., XXXXXXXX
 Hallum, Joe K., XXXXXXXX
 Halpin, Daniel W., XXXXXX
 Halstead, Bruce B., XXXXXX
 Hamby, Larry B., XXXXXX
 Hamilton, Robert B., XXXXXX
 Hannon, Harold M., XXXXXX
 Hansell, Charles R., XXXXXX
 Hansen, Carl T., XXXXXX
 Hansen, David G., XXXXXX
 Hanson, Morris F., Jr., XXXXXX
 Harden, Monroe B., XXXXXX
 Hardman, Robert R., XXXXXX
 Harman, Richard A., XXXXXX
 Harmon, Charles E., XXXXXX
 Harmon, James J., XXXXXX
 Harmon, William E., XXXXXX
 Harper, Donald W., XXXXXX
 Harrell, Charles J., XXXXXX
 Harrell, Ernest J., XXXXXXXX
 Harrington, Marshall E., XXXXXX
 Harrington, Peter F., XXXXXXXX
 Harris, Benjamin T., XXXXXX
 Harris, Benny R. S., XXXXXX
 Harris, David J., XXXXXX
 Harris, Jack L., XXXXXXXX
 Harris, Robert N., XXXXXX
 Harris, Robert F., XXXXXX
 Harrison, Joseph J., XXXXXX
 Hartley, Benjamin W., XXXXXX
 Harvey, Jan V., XXXXXX
 Harvey, William R., XXXXXXXX
 Hastings, David A., XXXXXX
 Hatch, Robert W., XXXXXX
 Hathaway, Frank A., XXXXXXXX
 Hathaway, William E., XXXXXX
 Haupt, Jerome L., XXXXXXXX
 Hayes, James S., XXXXXX
 Hayes, John H., XXXXXX
 Haygood, James L., XXXXXX
 Hazelwood, Robert R., XXXXXXXX
 Head, William J., XXXXXXXX
 Heard, Wayne L., XXXXXX
 Heath, Roderick C., XXXXXXXX
 Heathman, Jimmie J., XXXXXX
 Hebert, John M., XXXXXX
 Hedges, John W., XXXXXXXX
 Heffner, Albert R., XXXXXXXX
 Helberg, William L., XXXXXX
 Helden, Elden W., XXXXXXXX
 Helman, Charles N., XXXXXX
 Heimdahl, Peter D., XXXXXX
 Henderson, Paul R., XXXXXX
 Henderson Thyron L., XXXXXX
 Hendrick, Thomas G., XXXXXX
 Henk, Harold A., XXXXXX
 Henry, George E. Jr., XXXXXX
 Henry, Larry F., XXXXXX
 Herndon, Doyle L., XXXXXX
 Heron, Bruce G., XXXXXX
 Herrick, Robert M., XXXXXX
 Herzog, Joseph E., XXXXXX
 Herzog, Lawrence A., XXXXXX
 Hesford, John P., XXXXXX
 Hester, David P., XXXXXX
 Hewett, James D., XXX
 Hibbs, William N., XXXXXX
 Hickey, John F., XXXXXX
 Hickey, William J., XXXXXX
 Higginbotham, Heston W., III, XXXXXX
 Higginbotham, Jerry, XXXXXX
 Higginbotham, Reginald P., XXXXXX
 Higgins, John M., XXXXXXXX
 Hightower, Thomas K., XXXXXX
 Hilby, Leslie E., XXXXXXXX
 Hill, George R., XXXXXX
 Hill, Wilmer D., XXXXXX
 Hiller, Herbert L., XXXXXX
 Hillier, Pringle P., XXXXXX
 Himmelsbach, Robert B., XXXXXX
 Hinton, Richard J., XXXXXX
 Hitti, John L., XXXXXX
 Hittner, Anthony L., XXXXXX
 Hodell, Charles B., XXXXXX
 Hodge, James D., XXXXXX
 Hodges, Harold H., XXXXXX
 Hodgson, George G., XXXXXX
 Hofmann, Ronald A., XXXXXXXX
 Holder, Alex M., Jr., XXXXXX
 Holley, John C., XXXXXX
 Hollingsworth, Malcolm L., XXXXXXXX
 Hollis, Neil B., XXXXXXXX
 Holloway, Rex L., XXXXXXXX
 Holly, Frank D., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Holmberg, Bruce P., XXXXXX
 Holter, John H., XXXXXX
 Holton, Quinton, II, XXXXXX
 Hone, Gerald J., XXXXXX
 Hooks, Harold V., XXXXXX
 Hooper, Donald M., XXXXXX
 Hope, Terrill C., XXXXXX
 Hopkins, Norman P., XXXXXXXX
 Horan, Earl C., Jr., XXXXXX
 Horsman, George L., XXXXXXXX
 Horton, John B., XXXXXXXX
 Horvath, John M., XXXXXX
 Horvath, Richard L., XXXXXXXX

Hougen, William E., XXXXXXXX
 Howard, Ronald G., XXXXXX
 Hoy, Pat C., II, XXXXXX
 Hruby, Kenneth L., XXXXXX
 Hudson, Donald L., XXXXXXXX
 Hudson, Richard L., XXXXXX
 Huff, Harold L., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Hughes, Billy M., XXXXXX
 Hughes, Patrick R., XXXXXX
 Hughes, Talbert W., XXXXXX
 Humphrey, David B., XXXXXX
 Hunt, John W., XXXXXX
 Hunt, Richard, XXXXXX
 Hunter, Starling D., XXXXXX
 Hutcheson, John D., XXXXXX
 Hutsell, Howard H., XXXXXX
 Hyde, Gary R., XXXXXX
 Hyde, Thomas A., III, XXXXXX
 Ingram, Donald C., XXXXXXXX
 Ingram, Kenneth A., XXXXXX
 Innis, Joseph F., XXXXXXXX
 Isom, William G., XXXXXXXX
 Jacko, Victor W., XXXXXX
 Jackson, Michael G., XXXXXX
 Jackson, Richard K., XXXXXX
 Jackson, Robert R., XXXXXX
 Jacobson, Joseph D., XXXXXX
 James, Henry L., XXXXXX
 James, Kenneth G., XXXXXXXX
 Janoska, Robert L., XXXXXX
 Jansen, Edward M., XXXXXX
 Janusz, Edward R., XXXXXXXX
 Jarman, Edward E., XXXXXXXX
 Jarock, Norman E., XXXXXX
 Jarrett, Bryon S., XXXXXXXX
 Java, John J., Jr., XXXXXX
 Jeffers, Walter, XXXXXX
 Jenrette, Albert W., XXXXXXXX
 Jess, Larry L., XXXXXXXX
 Jezszenszky, John F., XXXXXX
 Jeter, James W., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Jewell, James O., XXXXXXXX
 Jinks, James H., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Jobe, Kenneth D., XXXXXXXX
 Johansson, Stephen E., XXXXXX
 Johnson, Ben A., XXXXXX
 Johnson, Bruce G., XXXXXXXX
 Johnson, Carl H., Jr., XXXXXX
 Johnson, Douglas W., XXXXXX
 Johnson, Emmett F., XXXXXX
 Johnson, James G., XXXXXX
 Johnson, John O., XXXXXXXX
 Johnson, Lidge O. J., XXXXXX
 Johnson, Milo P., XXXXXX
 Johnson, Preston, XXXXXXXX
 Johnson, Ronald A., XXXXXX
 Johnson, Thomas M., XXXXXX
 Johnson, Thomas W., XXXXXX
 Johnston Frederick E., III, XXXXXX
 Johnston, Joseph W., XXXXXX
 Johnston, William D., XXXXXX
 Jolley, John R., XXXXXX
 Jones, Albert F., Jr., XXXXXX
 Jones, Charles F., XXXXXX
 Jones, Colonel B., XXXXXXXX
 Jones, Otis D., XXXXXX
 Jones, Robert E., XXXXXX
 Jones, Robert S., Jr., XXXXXX
 Jones, Royal L., XXXXXXXX
 Jones, Theodore S., XXXXXX
 Jones, Thomas A., XXXXXX
 Jones, Thomas C., XXXXXX
 Jones, Thomas H., XXXXXX
 Joosse, Stanley B., XXXXXX
 Jordan, James G., XXXXXXXX
 Joulwan, George A., XXXXXX
 Junio, Francis M., XXXXXX
 Kaiser, Robert A., XXXXXX
 Kammerdiener, John L., XXXXXX
 Kampher, John B., XXXXXX
 Karjala, Lawrence, XXXXXXXX
 Karsteter, Robert B., XXXXXX
 Kasa, Stephen J., XXXXXX
 Katholi, William D., XXXXXXXX
 Kauffman, Robert R., XXXXXXXX
 Kee, Robert J., XXXXXX
 Keech, William H., XXXXXX
 Keene, Jack R., XXXXXX
 Keene, Kurt L., XXXXXX
 Kelleher, Edward P., XXXXXXXX
 Kellim, Ronald R., XXXXXX
 Kelly, Benjamin E., XXXXXX
 Kelly, Patrick J., XXXXXXXX
 Kelly, William F., XXXXXX
 Kelly, William P., XXXXXXXX
 Kemp, Robert F., XXXXXX
 Kemper, Clarence B., XXXXXXXX
 Kennedy, Robert P., XXXXXXXX
 Kenny, Henry J., XXXXXX
 Kerscher, Thomas E., XXXXXX
 Kershaw, Theodore G., XXXXXX
 Kesler, Lawrence W., XXXXXXXX
 Kewley, Robert H., XXXXXX
 Kleffer, Pierre V., XXXXXX
 Kilburn, Darrell D., XXXXXX
 Kilfoil, John J., XXXXXX
 Killebrew, Ben E., XXXXXX
 Kincaid, Richard D., XXXXXXXX
 King, Samuel D., XXXXXX
 King, Thomas R., XXXXXX
 Kinkade, David R., XXXXXX
 Kintigh, Jerry I., XXXXXXXX
 Kirkpatrick, William T., XXXXXX
 Kirwin, Patrick J., XXXXXX
 Kleese, Lee F., XXXXXX
 Kleinstiver, Lloyd W., XXXXXX
 Knight, Kenneth E., XXXXXXXX
 Kniskern, Bruce E., XXXXXX
 Knox, Dean W., XXXXXX
 Koehler, Leo, Jr., XXXXXX
 Kopsak, George C., XXXXXX
 Koppels, Carl J., XXXXXXXX
 Korhonen, John E., XXXXXX
 Kostoff, John T., XXXXXXXX
 Kot, Mitchell R., XXXXXX
 Koury, Edward N., XXXXXX
 Kozlowski, Edward P., XXXXXXXX
 Kravitz, Lawrence R., XXXXXX
 Kremer, Alvin W., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Krol, Stanley, Jr., XXXXXX
 Kroll, Gerald, XXXXXX
 Kuntz, Edgar L., XXXXXX
 Kunz, Farrell J., XXXXXXXX
 LaBorne, Eugene F., XXXXXX
 LaRosa, Peter, XXXXXX
 Lacey, William G., XXXXXX
 Lacy, William A., XXXXXXXX
 Lagasse, Peter F., XXXXXXXX
 Laidlaw, Stephen R., XXXXXX
 Laing, Wesley N., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Laird, Kenneth W., XXXXXX
 Lally, Patrick G., XXXXXXXX
 Lambert, Jerry V., XXXXXX
 Lammers, Bruce T., XXXXXX
 Lampshire, Bradford G., XXXXXX
 Lancaster, Dudley C., XXXXXX
 Landry, Donald E., XXXXXX
 Landry, Lester J., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Lane, John J., XXXXXX
 Lang, William A., XXXXXXXX
 Langston, Edward H., XXXXXX
 Large, George R., XXXXXXXX
 Larkins, Aaron J., XXXXXX
 Larson, Ian W., XXXXXX
 Labater, Gerald D., XXXXXX
 Lasch, John A., III, XXXXXXXX
 Laske, Lawrence J., XXXXXX
 Laursen, Otto D., XXXXXX
 Lavigne, Norman A., XXXXXX
 Lawrence, John W., Jr., XXXXXX
 Lawson, Charles E., XXXXXXXX
 Leatherwood, Thomas, XXXXXX
 Lecklitner, Alan D., XXXXXXXX
 Ledbetter, William, XXXXXX
 Lee, Philip L., XXXXXXXX
 Lee, Robert C., XXXXXXXX
 Leedy, Eugene B., XXXXXX
 Legge, Barnwell I., XXXXXX
 Lehman, Bob E., XXXXXXXX
 Leidenheimer, John, XXXXXX
 Leinbach, Conwell B., XXXXXX
 Leland, Edwin S., Jr., XXXXXX
 Lenfest, William F., XXXXXX
 Lenhart, George D., XXXXXX
 Leonard, James E., XXXXXX
 Leonard, James H., XXXXXX
 Letendre, Robert W., XXXXXXXX
 Leverette, Thomas E., XXXXXX
 Lewis, Charles L., XXXXXX
 Lewis, Donald H., XXXXXX
 Liewert, Karl H., XXXXXX
 Ligon, Walter B., Jr., XXXXXX
 Lillenthal, Henry E., XXXXXX
 Lim, George K., XXXXXXXX
 Lind, Alan D., XXXXXX
 Linden, Laurence E., XXXXXX
 Lindroth, George A., XXXXXX
 Lingo, Johnny P., XXXXXX
 Lionetti, Donald M., XXXXXX
 Lipson, Elliot S., XXXXXX
 Littlefield, William, XXXXXXXX
 Livingston, James L., XXXXXX
 Lockey, Donald V., XXXXXX
 Lohr, Richard A., XXXXXX
 Lombardo, Michael J., XXXXXX
 Longhofer, James E., XXXXXXXX
 Loom, James F. X., XXXXXX
 Lopez-Sanchez, Andres, XXXX
 Lord, Gary R., XXXXXX
 Lord, Gerald, XXXXXX
 Lovelace, Guy M., XXXXXX
 Lubke, Alan H., XXXXXX
 Luff, Gary M., XXXXXX
 Lunday, Donald E., XXXXXXXX
 Lundberg, William F., XXXXXXXX
 Lynch, James F., XXXXXX
 Lynch, Michael J., XXXXXX
 Lynn, Clyde D., XXXXXX
 MacArthur, Graham, XXXXXX
 MacCracken, James C., III, XXXXXXXX
 MacKinnon, William N., XXXXXX
 Mace, David H., XXXXXX
 Mack, John H., XXXXXX
 Mackin, John P., Jr., XXXXXX
 Madden, Jim L., XXXXXX
 Maddox, David M., XXXXXX
 Maertens, Darrell B., XXXXXX
 Magee, David W., XXXXXXXX
 Magglo, Stephen, XXXXXX
 Magnus, Charles F., XXXXXX
 Magnus, Thomas H., XXXXXX
 Magnus, William L., XXXXXX
 Mahr, Bruce C., XXXXXX
 Mahr, Walter C., XXXXXX
 Maio, Joseph R., XXXXXX
 Mallette, Alfred J., XXXXXX
 Mallory, Glynn C., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Mallory, Philip H., XXXXXX
 Malone, William K., XXXXXX
 Maloney, Michael J., XXXXXX
 Maloy, Francis B., Jr., XXXXXX
 Mann, Marion E., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Manners, William E., XXXXXX
 Manning, James R., XXXXXXXX
 Mannion, Donald H., XXXXXX
 Manolakis, John J., XXXXXX
 Marcinkowski, Franc, XXXXXXXX
 Martin, Jack M., XXXXXX
 Martin, Larry J., XXXXXX
 Martin, Lowell L., XXXXXX
 Martin, Robert F., XXXXXX
 Martins, Joaquim D., XXXXXXXX
 Mathison, James S., XXXXXX
 Matthews, John H., XXXXXX
 Mavroudis, Antonio M., XXXXXX
 Mayhue, Don W., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Mayle, John C., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 McBee, Donald L., XXXXXX
 McCamley, Michael E., XXXXXX
 McCamy, John R., XXXXXXXX
 McCann, Richard W., XXXXXX
 McCarthy, William J., XXXXXX
 McCartin, John M., Jr., XXXXXX
 McCarty, Wendell E., XXXXXXXX
 McClendon, Miles R., XXXXXX
 McCollister, Kenneth W., XXXXXXXX
 McCord, Chancey K., XXXXXX
 McCormick, John E., XXXXXX
 McCreary, Howard E., XXXXXX
 McCullough, Sharpe, XXXXXXXX
 McDaniel, Edward H., XXXXXXXX
 McDaniel, Joseph H., XXXXXXXX
 McDaris, Lawrence F., Jr., XXXXXX
 McDevitt, James J., XXXXXX
 McDuffy, Clifford, XXXXXX
 McFarland, John A., XXXX
 McGee, William J., XXXXXX
 McGinnis, James P., XXXXXX
 McGraw, Jimmy J., XXXXXXXX
 McInnis, Irby N., Jr., XXXXXX
 McKee, Anthony J., XXXXXX
 McKinney, Paul D., XXXXXXXX
 McLaughlin, Charles, III, XXXXXX
 McLaughlin, John F., XXXXXX
 McLeod, James M., Jr., XXXXXX

McMath, Laney M., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 McMurray, Donald B., XXXXXX
 McNear, Richard E., XXXXXX
 McNeil, William D., XXXXXX
 McNulty, Stewart J., XXXXXX
 Meador, Jay B., XXXXXX
 Meany, George E., XXXXXX
 Meehan, William J., XXXXXXXX
 Meek, John E., XXXXXX
 Meissner, Kenith E., XXXXXX
 Melton, Otis H., Jr., XXXXXX
 Mercer, Thomas K., XXXXXX
 Meredith, Bruce A., XXXXXX
 Metz, Leon B., Jr., XXXXXX
 Metzger, Warren L., XXXXXX
 Meyer, Edward C., XXXXXX
 Meyer, Robert C., XXXXXX
 Meyer, William T., XXXXXXXX
 Michie, Richard L., XXXXXX
 Micol, Victor E., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Middlebrook, Paul R., XXXXXX
 Middlesteadt, Roger W., XXXXXX
 Miks, Richard, XXXXXX
 Milford, Thomas L., XXXXXX
 Milhorn, Charles L., XXXXXX
 Miller, Arlen C. T., XXXXXX
 Miller, Charles A., XXXXXX
 Miller, David L., Jr., XXXXXX
 Miller, Donn G., XXXXXX
 Miller, Drattie A., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Miller, Garrett S., XXXXXX
 Miller, Hugh H., XXXXXX
 Miller, John D., XXXXXX
 Miller, Kent F., XXXXXX
 Miller, Lewis J., XXXXXX
 Miller, Richard S., XXXXXXXX
 Miller, Richard W., XXXXXX
 Miller, Robin K., XXXXXX
 Millett, James S., XXXXXX
 Millett, Warren G., XXXXXX
 Minick, John M., XXXXXX
 Minnehan, Thomas J., XXXXXX
 Minor, Richard E., XXXXXXXX
 Mitchell, Donald G., XXXXXX
 Mitchell, Edwin A., XXXXXX
 Mitchell, James R., XXXXXX
 Mitchell, William R., XXXXXX
 Moffett, Joseph U., XXXXXX
 Mohr, Donnell S., XXXXXXXX
 Moltz, John M., Jr., XXXXXX
 Momorella, Joseph J., XXXXXX
 Montefusco, John A., XXXXXX
 Montgomery, John J., XXXXXX
 Moody, Robert D., XXXXXX
 Moore, Billy F., XXXXXX
 Moore, David G., XXXXXX
 Moore, Donald E., XXXXXXXX
 Moore, Donald M., XXXXXXXX
 Moore, Edward M., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Moore, Jack D., XXXXXX
 Moore, Michael E., XXXXXX
 Moore, Virgil C., XXXXXX
 Moose, Robert G., XXXXXX
 Morano, Michael, XXXXXXXX
 Morgan, Jon R., XXXXXX
 Morin, Michael J., XXXXXX
 Morrison, Robert C., XXXXXXXX
 Moss, Donald W., XXXXXX
 Moss, George D., Jr., XXXXXX
 Mowery, Robert W., XXXXXX
 Mowrey, Fred H., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Muck, Jack L., XXXXXX
 Muiznieks, Nikolaje E., XXXXXX
 Mullally, John S., XXXXXX
 Mullens, Frederick T., XXXXXX
 Mullett, John A., XXXXXX
 Mulvanity, Thomas W., XXXXXX
 Murphy, Patrick J., XXXXXX
 Murphy, Richard E., XXXXXXXX
 Murphy, Robert C., XXXXXX
 Murray, Hershell B., XXXXXXXX
 Murray, Marvin R., Jr., XXXXXX
 Murray, Matthew P., XXXXXXXX
 Murtha, Daniel F., XXXXXXXX
 Muschek, Robert W., XXXXXXXX
 Musselman, James A., XXXXXX
 Myerchin, Thomas S., XXXXXX
 Myers, Nathan J., XXXXXX
 Myers, Robert H., Jr., XXXXXX
 Mylks, Herbert W., XXXXXX
 Nartsissov, George, XXXXXX
 Nash, Norman W., XXXXXX
 Naughton, Richard L., XXXXXX
 Naumann, Terrel K., XXXXXX
 Neal, Donald M., XXXXXX
 Neale, Larry W., XXXXXX
 Neary, John F., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Needham, Walter D., XXXXXX
 Neely, Richard C., XXXXXX
 Neiger, John J., III, XXXXXX
 Neill, James K., XXXXXXXX
 Neitzke, Robert A., XXXXXXXX
 Nelson, Anthony C., XXXXXX
 Nelson, Landy T., XXXXXX
 Nelson, Raymond J., XXXXXX
 Nettles, John S., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Nevins, John R., XXXXXX
 Newsome, Joseph D., XXXXXX
 Nichols, Bruce P., XXXXXX
 Nichols, John J., XXXXXX
 Nichols, Willard L., XXXXXXXX
 Nicholson, Robert J., XXXXXX
 Nicholson, Thomas L., XXXXXXXX
 Nieberding, Michael W., XXXXXX
 Nitkowski, Jon F., XXXXXX
 Nitzsche, Ronald E., XXXXXXXX
 Nolan, William E., XXXXXXXX
 Norman, William L., XXXXXX
 Norris, Robert R., XXXXXXXX
 Northquest, William J., XXXXXX
 Norton, Dale F., XXXXXX
 Norwood, Thomas E., XXXXXX
 Noteboom, Donald A., XXXXXX
 Novak, Ladislav J., XXXXXX
 Nowlin, John B., XXXXXX
 Noyes, Garrett R., XXXXXXXX
 Nutt, Samuel C., XXXXXX
 Oaks, James F., III, XXXXXX
 Obermeier, Roger W., XXXXXX
 O'Brennan, Gerald, XXXXXX
 O'Brien, Richard T., XXXXXX
 O'Bryan, James D., XXXXXX
 O'Connor, Paul M., XXXXXX
 Offer, Robert D., Jr., XXXXXX
 Offringa, Peter J., XXXXXX
 Ogden, Royden K., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 O'Hara, William D., Jr., XXXXXX
 O'Keefe, Robert W., XXXXXX
 Old, Lenard A., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Olejniczak, Julian M., XXXXXX
 Olive, Sergei V., XXXXXX
 Oliver, John B., XXXXXX
 Oliver, Ralph H., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Oliver, Robert L., XXXXXX
 Ollie, Louis W., XXXXXX
 Olsen, Kenneth J., XXXXXX
 Oncale, Taylor A., XXXXXXXX
 O'Neal, William F., XXXXXX
 O'Neill, Michael E., XXXXXX
 Orlov, William S., XXXXXX
 Orr, Dundas S., Jr., XXXXXX
 Orsa, George, XXXXXX
 Orton, Robert D., XXXXXX
 Orzechowski, Richard L., XXXXXXXX
 Osburn, Gerald G., XXXXXX
 Osteen, James N., XXXXXXXX
 Overstreet, Joseph S., Jr., XXXXXX
 Owen, Dean M., XXXXXX
 Owens, John V., XXXXXX
 Paaso, Thomas H., XXXXXX
 Pachosa, Matthew H., XXXXXX
 Painting, Joseph P., XXXXXX
 Palletti, Lawrence H., XXXXXX
 Palmer, Paul C., Jr., XXXXXX
 Palmer, Richard H., XXXXXX
 Palmer, Walter L., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Panegue, Anthony L., XXXXXX
 Paolino, Michael A., XXXXXX
 Paone, Joseph F., XXXXXX
 Paris, John M., III, XXXXXX
 Parke, Robert F., XXXXXX
 Parks, Edward S., Jr., XXXXXX
 Parks, William I., Jr., XXXXXX
 Parsons, Wayland D., XXXXXX
 Partin, Tommy M., XXXXXXXX
 Patch, Robert W., XXXXXX
 Pate, Reuben M., XXXXXXXX
 Pattie, Thomas N., XXXXXX
 Paul, Gerald D., XXXXXX
 Paxson, Neil B., XXXXXX
 Payette, Ronald C., XXXXXX
 Percy, Charles G., XXXXXX
 Pedersen, Richard E., XXXXXX
 Pegueros, Albert C., XXXXXXXX
 Pell, Richard F., XXXXXX
 Pena, Alfonso V., XXXXXXXX
 Penrod, James L., Jr., XXXXXX
 Pentz, William H., Jr., XXXXXX
 Perham, Whitman C., XXXXXX
 Perino, George H., Jr., XXXXXX
 Perkins, Joseph L., XXXXXX
 Perkins, Stuart L., XXXXXXXX
 Peters, Glenn M., Jr., XXXXXX
 Peterson, Frank W., XXXXXX
 Peterson, Frederick, XXXXXXXX
 Petter, David T., XXXXXX
 Phelps, Russell M., XXXXXX
 Philippovic, Gordon, XXXXXX
 Phillips, John C., Jr., XXXXXX
 Phipps, Oren F., XXXXXX
 Pilanski, Paul L., XXXXXX
 Pinkerton, Billy B., XXXXXX
 Pinson, John M., XXXXXX
 Piotrowski, Karl P., XXXXXX
 Piotrowski, Leonard, XXXXXXXX
 Pipia, John F., XXXXXXXX
 Pirkle, Jerry D., XXXXXX
 Pitts, Riley L., XXXXXX
 Plate, Darold E., XXXXXXXX
 Ploger, Wayne D., XXXXXX
 Poe, Phillip W., XXXXXX
 Poelker, Richard J., XXXXXX
 Pojmann, David M., XXXXXX
 Polich, Victor J., Jr., XXXXXX
 Poole, Joseph L., XXXXXX
 Pope, Cecil D., XXXXXX
 Pope, William A., XXXXXXXX
 Popovich, Marko L., XXXXXX
 Porterfield, Edward G., XXXXXX
 Potter, Howard M., XXXXXX
 Powell, Beverley E., XXXXXX
 Powell, William E., XXXXXX
 Powers, Gary R., XXXXXX
 Powers, Sidney H., XXXXXX
 Prather, Lawrence H., XXXXXX
 Pratt, Clayton A., XXXXXX
 Pratt, Joseph, XXXXXX
 Prentice, Leland E., XXXXXX
 Pressley, Ronnie J., XXXXXX
 Price, David S., XXXXXX
 Protzman, Robert E., XXXXXX
 Provasi, Donald R., XXXXXX
 Pryor, Robert W., XXXXXX
 Pugh, Howard G., XXXXXX
 Purdy, John D., XXXXXX
 Pursch, William C., XXXXXX
 Pynes, Russell G., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Quandt, Ronald L., XXXXXX
 Quinn, Kenneth L., XXXXXX
 Quinn, Larry G., XXXXXX
 Quinn, Richard L., XXXXXXXX
 Quinn, Robert L., XXXXXXXX
 Quintarelli, Nichol, XXXXXXXX
 Racine, Armand E., XXXXXX
 Raffani, Joseph, Jr., XXXXXX
 Randall, Howard W., XXXXXX
 Randall, Michael A., XXXXXXXX
 Randall, Noel C., XXXXXX
 Rasch, Robert A., XXXXXXXX
 Rauch, Frank C., XXXXXX
 Rautter, Ernest H., XXXXXX
 Ray, Luther B., III, XXXXXX
 Ray, Roy G., XXXXXXXX
 Raymond, Conley T., XXXXXX
 Raynis, James B., XXXXXX
 Redding, Thomas S., XXXXXX
 Reed, Jean D., XXXXXX
 Reed, Lee S., XXXXXXXX
 Regan, Carl J., XXXXXX
 Regelski, Joseph R., XXXXXXXX
 Reichner, Lawrence, XXXXXXXX
 Reilly, James, XXXXXXXX
 Reinhard, Ramsford, XXXXXXXX
 Rekowski, James A., XXXXXX
 Renfro, Ronnie J., XXXXXX
 Renn, John W., XXXXXX
 Rennagel, Harry G., XXXXXX
 Reno, William H., XXXXXX
 Reppard, Richard A., XXXXXX
 Reynolds, Regis J., XXXXXX
 Reynolds, William E., XXXXXX
 Rhodes, Hugh H., XXXXXXXX
 Richards, David J., XXXXXX
 Richards, John F., XXXXXX
 Richards, Lawrence, XXXXXX

Richfield, Robert F., XXXXXX
 Richter, William D., XXXXXXXX
 Richetson, David M., XXXXXX
 Rickman, Jack R., XXXXXX
 Riddick, Larry G., XXXXXX
 Ridge, John H., XXXXXX
 Riekenberg, Warren B., XXXXXX
 Rieske, Terence E., XXXX
 Riggs, Ronald K., XXXXXXXX
 Righter, Christopher, XXXXXXXX
 Riley, James A., XXXXXX
 Riley, Paul K., XXXXXX
 Riley, William H., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Riley, Wilmot T., III, XXXXXX
 Ringmacher, Nelson E., Jr., XXXXXX
 Ritchie, David M., XXXXXX
 Rittgers, Courtney M., XXXXXX
 Rittman, Charles J., XXXXXXXX
 Rivard, David L., XXXXXX
 Rives, Jack D., XXXXXX
 Rizer, Gene C., XXXXXX
 Roberts, Howard H., XXXXXX
 Roberts, James J., XXXXXX
 Roberts, Kenneth J., XXXXXX
 Robertson, Gerald E., XXXXXXXX
 Robertson, Walter G., XXXXXX
 Robinson, John D., XXXXXX
 Robinson, Ronald M., XXXXXX
 Roche, Terrence L., XXXXXX
 Rodgers, Archie D., XXXXXX
 Rodriguez, Robert, XXXXXXXX
 Rogers, Rufus B., XXXXXX
 Roll, George E., XXXXXX
 Rollins, George N., XXXXXX
 Rondiak, Roman, XXXXXXXX
 Roney, Kenneth D., XXXXXX
 Rooney, Dennis M., XXXXXX
 Rose, Richard G., XXXXXX
 Rose, Thomas L., XXXXXX
 Rosenkranz, Robert B., XXXXXX
 Ross, Kenneth L., XXXXXX
 Ross, Richard H., XXXXXX
 Roth, Howard W., Jr., XXXXXX
 Rouse, Richard F., XXXXXX
 Rousseau, Thomas H., XXXXXXXX
 Royce, James B., XXXXXX
 Runkles, Charles E., XXXXXX
 Runnion, Lawrence G., XXXXXX
 Runyon, Floyd L., XXXXXXXX
 Russell, Jerry W., XXXXXX
 Russell, John R., XXXXXXXX
 Russell, Melvin W., XXXXXX
 Rutledge, Gerald E., XXXXXXXX
 Rutledge, John B., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Ryan, Terrance W., XXXXXX
 Ryan, Thomas F., XXXXXXXX
 Ryland, William J., XXXXXX
 Sabino, Anthony P., XXXXXX
 Sabre, Randolph E., XXXXXXXX
 Sadosky, John J., XXXXXX
 Saiki, Owen H., XXXXXX
 Salmon, Joseph F., XXXXXX
 Sampson, Connie G., XXXXXX
 Sande, Ralph C., XXXX
 Sanders, John P., XXXXXXXX
 Sanders, Marvin L., XXXXXX
 Sanderson, John O., XXXXXXXX
 Sandquist, David L., XXXXXX
 Sands, Philip J., XXXXXX
 Sanfilippo, Richard S., XXXXXXXX
 Sarff, Thomas E., XXXXXX
 Sarzanini, Andrea A., XXXXXX
 Saunders, David L., XXXXXXXX
 Saunders, Robert C., XXXXXX
 Sawtelle, Donald W., XXXXXX
 Sawyer, Neal W., XXXXXXXX
 Schably, John W., XXXX
 Schall, James E., Jr., XXXXXX
 Scharberg, Garry A., XXXX
 Schechtel, Lawrence, XXXXXXXX
 Schell, Tarey B., XXXXXX
 Schneider, Daniel P., XXXXXXXX
 Schnell, Hudson A., XXXXXXXX
 Scholes, Edison E., XXXXXX
 Schomburg, August, XXXXXXXX
 Schreiber, Kenneth, XXXXXXXX
 Schroeder, Daniel R., XXXXXX
 Schultz, Brian G., XXXXXX
 Schultz, Kenneth R., XXXXXXXX
 Schultz, Raymond J., XXXXXXXX
 Schwend, William H., XXXXXX
 Sciple, Carl B., XXXXXX
 Scott, Homer O., XXXXXX
 Scott, James A., III, XXXXXX
 Scott, Kenneth G., XXXXXX
 Scott, Kenneth R., XXXXXX
 Scott, Peter F., XXXXXX
 Scott, Richard M., XXXXXXXX
 Seamon, Frederic W., XXXXXXXX
 Seckinger, George M., XXXXXX
 Seguin, Robert P., XXXXXXXX
 Selgman, Norman L., XXXXXXXX
 Seltz, William E., XXXXXX
 Sentell, Jack H., XXXXXX
 Seylar, Roland F., XXXXXX
 Shaffer, Rohlf A., XXXXXX
 Shambarger, Bob E., XXXXXX
 Shank, Edward L., XXXXXXXX
 Shannon, James T., XXXXXX
 Sharber, Pete, XXXXXX
 Sharpton, Aubrey J., XXXXXXXX
 Shauf, Elton R., XXXXXX
 Shea, Robert E., Jr., XXXXXX
 Shearer, Cyrus N., XXXXXX
 Sheehan, John A., XXXXXX
 Sheffield, Robert W., XXXXXX
 Shehorn, Henry W., XXXXXXXX
 Sherburne, Thomas N., XXXXXX
 Sherman, John R., XXXXXX
 Sherwood, John T., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Shiner, Clyde R., Jr., XXXXXX
 Shipley, Dale W., XXXXXX
 Shoffner, Wilson A., XXXXXX
 Sholar, Robert C., XXXXXX
 Showalter, Ted A., XXXXXX
 Shugart, James W., XXXXXX
 Sievers, William H., XXXXXX
 Simmons, Herbert S., XXXXXX
 Simpson, Allan R., XXXXXX
 Sims, Jackie D., XXXXXX
 Singsank, James J., XXXXXXXX
 Sinkler, Paul F., XXXXXX
 Sisk, Francis G., XXXXXX
 Six, David W., XXXXXX
 Skaggs, Richard C., XXXXXX
 Skeins, Harry, Jr., XXXXXX
 Skotzko, Michael, XXXXXX
 Slack, Duane A., XXXX
 Smalley, Larry F., XXXXXX
 Smith, Clay R., Jr., XXXXXX
 Smith, David K., XXXXXX
 Smith, Don A., XXXXXX
 Smith, Douglas W., XXXXXX
 Smith, Frank T., XXXXXX
 Smith, George S., Jr., XXXXXX
 Smith, Horace M., XXXXXX
 Smith, Irving B., XXXXXX
 Smith, James C., XXXXXX
 Smith, Jimmy P., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Smith, John A., XXXXXXXX
 Smith, Paul L., XXXXXX
 Smith, Richard F., XXXXXX
 Smith, Robert A., XXXXXX
 Smith, Ronald H., XXXXXX
 Smith, Thomas J., XXXXXX
 Smith, Wade C., XXXXXX
 Smith, William H., XXXXXX
 Snyder, Charles R., XXXXXX
 Snyder, John F., XXXXXX
 Soderstrom, Robert C., XXXXXX
 Sollohub, Charles J., XXXX
 Solomon, John K., XXXXXX
 Spear, Walter W., XXXXXXXX
 Spence, George W., XXXXXX
 Spencer, Archie W., XXXXXX
 Spencer, James I., XXXXXX
 Spigarelli, Raymond F., XXXXXXXX
 Spiller, Winton, Jr., XXXXXX
 Spin, William A., XXXXXX
 Sprague, Ronald K., XXXXXX
 Spreha, Henry A., Jr., XXXXXX
 Sprinsky, William H., XXXXXX
 Sproul, Hugh B., III, XXXXXX
 Spunzo, Raymond A., XXXXXX
 Stanley, William K., XXXXXXXX
 Stacy, Tommy J., XXXXXX
 Staehler, Joseph C., XXXXXXXX
 Stageberg, Richard, XXXXXXXX
 Stahl, Roland W., XXXXXX
 Stamey, William K., XXXXXXXX
 Stanard, James R., XXXXXXXX
 Stanford, John H., XXXXXX
 Stanley, Richard P., XXXXXX
 Starsman, Raymond E., XXXXXX
 State, Donald L., XXXXXX
 Staten, Eugene B., XXXXXX
 Steadman, Gordon S., XXXXXXXX
 Steege, Robert J., XXXXXX
 Steele, Rowland G., XXXXXX
 Steen, Robert S., XXXXXXXX
 Stephens, Wayne R., XXXXXX
 Sterneckert, Richard W., XXXXXX
 Stevens, Thomas G., XXXXXX
 Stewart, Joseph W., XXXXXX
 Stewart, Peter, XXXXXXXX
 Stiehl, Gustav H., IV, XXXXXX
 Stokes, Charles E., XXXXXX
 Stokes, James M., XXXXXX
 Stombres, Richard A., XXXXXX
 Stone, Thomas R., XXXXXX
 Strachan, James D., XXXXXX
 Strickland, Morris, XXXXXXXX
 Stricklen, William O., XXXXXX
 Stringham, Joseph S., XXXXXX
 Stroud, Carl M., XXXXXXXX
 Struve, James E., XXXXXX
 Stuart, Alexander J., XXXXXX
 Stubblefield, Joel R., XXXXXX
 Stubbs, Frederic H., XXXXXX
 Stuhlmuller, Kimball R., XXXXXXXX
 Stupka, Michael B., XXXXXX
 Sturdivant, Clifford R., XXXXXXXX
 Sucher, Theodore R., XXXXXX
 Suhanin, William R., XXXXXX
 Suhosky, Robert J., XXXXXXXX
 Sullivan, Philip H., XXXXXXXX
 Summers, James B., XXXXXX
 Sutherland, Ian D. W., XXXXXX
 Sutton, John M., Jr., XXXXXX
 Sutton, William F., XXXXXX
 Suzuki, Daniel L., XXXXXXXX
 Swain, Charles M., XXXXXX
 Swanson, Charles T., XXXXXX
 Sykes, Phillip A., XXXXXX
 Sylvia, William H., XXXXXXXX
 Szeman, Edward R., XXXXXX
 Tacosky, Robert J., XXXXXX
 Taggart, Carl D., XXXXXX
 Tait, Donald A., XXXXXX
 Takamiya, Paul K., XXXXXX
 Tanner, Howard C., XXXXXX
 Tapparo, Frank A., XXXXXX
 Tassi, Gordon R., XXXXXXXX
 Tate, Arthur W., XXXXXX
 Taylor, Benjamin D., XXXXXX
 Taylor, Hurl R., Jr., XXXXXX
 Taylor, James B., XXXXXX
 Taylor, John B., Jr., XXXXXX
 Taylor, Stephen R., XXXXXX
 Taylor, Thomas H., XXXXXX
 Teal, David J., XXXXXX
 Tedrick, James L., XXXXXX
 Tellman, David W., XXXXXX
 Terry, William F., XXXXXX
 Theologos, John J., XXXXXX
 Thomas, Jerry A., XXXXXX
 Thomassy, Fernand A., XXXXXX
 Thompson, Charles R., XXXXXX
 Thompson, Claude S., XXXXXXXX
 Thoms, Herbert G., XXXXXX
 Thorne, Tommy L., XXXXXX
 Thornquist, Ronald P., XXXXXXXX
 Thornton, Robert C., XXXXXXXX
 Threefoot, Philip S., XXXXXX
 Thurman, James D., XXXXXX
 Tilghman, Ray L., XXXXXX
 Tillman, Clifford R., XXXXXX
 Tilton, Franklin T., XXXXXX
 Timmermeyer, Richard P., XXXXXXXX
 Tindler, William F., XXXXXXXX
 Tinsley, Robert C., XXXXXXXX
 Tittle, Grady F., Jr., XXXXXX
 Tobin, William G., Jr., XXXXXX
 Tomihiro, Walter T., XXXXXXXX
 Tomlinson, Gary V., XXXXXX
 Tompras, Nicholas C., XXXXXX
 Tompson, James D., XXXXXX
 Toomey, Samuel K., XXXXXXXX
 Townsend, Willis M., XXXXXXXX
 Tracy, James L., XXXXXX
 Traugott, David A., XXXXXX
 Treadwell, Clarence, XXXXXXXX
 Trinkle, Patrick M., XXXXXX
 Trotti, David L., XXXXXX
 Truumees, Vallo, XXXXXXXX
 Trzos, Frederick, XXXXXX

Tucker, Henry B., XXXXXX
 Turnage, John O., XXXXXX
 Turner, Joseph E., XXXXXXXX
 Turner, Julian H., XXXXXXXX
 Turpin, William P., XXXXXX
 Tyler, James W., XXXXXX
 Tyson, Richard L., XXXXXX
 Udick, Ralph A., XXXXXX
 Underwood, Michael L., XXXXXX
 Urette, Michael E., XXXXXX
 Vader, Paul F., Jr., XXXXXX
 Vahrenkamp, Marvin W., Jr., XXXXXX
 Valleant, John H., XXXXXX
 Valley, Paul E., Jr., XXXXXX
 Valvo, Paul V., XXXXXX
 Vamvakias, Nicholas, XXXXXXXX
 Van Gorder Henry P., XXXXXX
 Vander Els, Theodore, XXXXXX
 Vanderbush, Albert, III, XXXXXX
 Vargas, Rafael U., XXXXXXXX
 Vass, Steven, XXXXXX
 Vay, Nicolas R., XXXXXX
 Veatch, John D., XXXXXX
 Vegvary, Robert G., XXXXXX
 Vick, Gerald A., XXXXXX
 Vickers, George F., XXXXXXXX
 Vinc, Frank Jr., XXXXXX
 Voigt, Kenneth D., XXX
 Voigt, Volkert T., XXXXXXXX
 Votaw, John F., XXXXXX
 Vreeland, Richard W., XXXXXX
 Wagner, Clifford C., XXXXXX
 Wagner, Hans O., XXXXXX
 Wakefield, Samuel N., XXXXXX
 Walinski, Samuel H., XXXXXX
 Walker, Harvey J., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Walker, Larry T., XXXXXX
 Walker, Robert T., XXXXXXXX
 Walker, Steven C., XXXXXX
 Walker, Stuart A., XXXXXX
 Walsh, Martin W., Jr., XXXXXX
 Walter, Stephen, XXXXXX
 Walters, Anderson H., XXXXXX
 Walton, Jamie W., XXXXXXXX
 Wambsgans, Richard, XXXXXXXX
 Wands, Robert E., XXXXXX
 Wanner, F. Walton, XXXXXX
 Ward, Albert N., III, XXXXXX
 Ward, Michael, XXXXXX
 Ward, Peter H., XXXXXX
 Ward, William B., XXXXXXXX
 Warner, James I., XXXXXX
 Warren, Donald F., XXXXXXXX
 Washington, Raleigh B., Jr., XXXXXX
 Wasson, Herbert M., XXXXXXXX
 Waterman, Arleigh D., XXXXXX
 Watkins, Wayne C., XXXXXX
 Watlington, Donald W., XXXXXX
 Watson, Vaden K., XXXXXXXX
 Watt, Joseph F., XXXXXX
 Webb, Gary A., XXXXXX
 Webb, James R., XXXXXX
 Weber, James L., XXXXXX
 Weikle, Robert M., XXXXXXXX
 Weimer, Robert E., XXXXXX
 Wels, William A., XXXXXX
 Weisner, Richard R., XXXXXX
 Weitzel, Werner G., XXXXXXXX
 Wells, Albert L., XXXXXX
 Welsh, Charles R., XXXXXX
 Welsh, Elbert A., XXXXXX
 Welsh, Lawrence E., XXXXXX
 Wendler, Dale L., XXXXXXXX
 Wendt, Charles R., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Wenz, Henry E., XXXXXX
 Werner, David R., XXXXXX
 Wernitzig, Ronald E., XXXXXX
 West, Ronald P., XXXXXX
 West, William A., XXXXXX
 Westmoreland, Frank, XXXXXXXX
 Westmoreland, James A., XXXXXX
 Westpheling, Charles T., XXXXXX
 Wetzel, Allan R., XXXXXX
 Wharton, Gerald M., XXXXXX
 Whipple, Berkley A., XXXXXX
 Whisenhunt, J. Dee, XXXXXX
 Whisler, John C., XXXXXXXX
 Whitaker, Lewis H., XXXXXX
 White, Charles A., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 White, David W., XXXXXX
 White, Dewey E., XXXXXX

White, Gilbert A., XXXXXX
 White, James W., XXXXXX
 White, Lyman G., Jr., XXXXXX
 White, Travis W., XXXXXXXX
 Whiteside, Daniel L., XXXXXX
 Whitley, Donwell D., XXXXXXXX
 Whitley, Lee R., XXXXXX
 Wice, Leonard P., XXXXXX
 Wickliffe, Paul T., XXXXXXXX
 Wild, Allen R., XXXXXX
 Wilder, Samuel D., Jr., XXXXXX
 Wildermuth, John G., XXXXXXXX
 Willard, Jack T., Jr., XXXXXX
 Williams, Charles E., XXXXXX
 Williams, Charles E., XXXXXXXX
 Williams, Francis M., XXXXXX
 Williams, Frank L., XXXXXX
 Williams, James E., XXXXXXXX
 Williams, Lenton G., XXXXXX
 Williams, Lyons H., XXXXXX
 Williams, Onus V., XXXXXXXX
 Williams, Richard G., XXXXXX
 Williams, Robert B., XXXXXXXX
 Williams, Timothy P., XXXXXX
 Williams, Wayne R., XXXXXX
 Williamson, Donald A., XXXXXX
 Williamson, James R., XXXXXXXX
 Williamson, William R., XXXXXX
 Willis, Benjamin L., XXXXXX
 Wilson, David C., XXXXXX
 Wilson, James E., XXXXXXXX
 Wilson, John F., Jr., XXXXXX
 Wilson, Robert B., XXXXXX
 Winchester, Wayne, XXXXXX
 Windom, Jackson T., XXXXXX
 Winslow, Sidney W., XXXXXX
 Winters, James M., XXXXXX
 Wisdom, Thomas E., Jr., XXXXXX
 Wise, Glenn L., XXXXXX
 Witherspoon, Eugene S., XXXXXX
 Wolfarth, William M., XXXXXXXX
 Wolf, Keith B., XXXXXXXX
 Wolff, Robert R., XXXXXX
 Wolkowich, Walter E., XXXXXXXX
 Wolters, Robert A., XXXXXX
 Wood, Dallas C., XXXXXXXX
 Wood, James E., XXXXXX
 Wood, Merrill F., XXXXXXXX
 Woodall, Thomas J., XXXXXX
 Woods, Andrew D., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Woodson, William, XXXXXX
 Woodward, Joe L., XXXXXXXX
 Woolweaver, Robert, XXXXXXXX
 Wooten, R. J., XXXXXX
 Wooten, Windel E., XXXXXXXX
 Worsham, Kenneth P., XXXXXXXX
 Wright, Kenneth E., XXXXXX
 Wunsch, Harold J., XXXXXX
 Xenos, Michael J., XXXXXX
 Yablon, Stuart H., XXXXXXXX
 Yamachika, Roy T., XXXXXX
 Yarborough, William G., Jr., XXXXXX
 Yates, John R., XXXXXX
 Yaugo, Edward O., XXXXXX
 Yost, Richard G., XXXXXX
 Yost, William D., III, XXXXXX
 Young, Leon F., XXXXXX
 Yule, Richard G., Jr., XXXXXX
 Yurchak, Paul N., XXXXXX
 Zakas, Louis H., XXXXXX
 Zielinski, Robert F., XXXXXX
 Zimmerman, John B., XXXXXX
 Zimmers, Joe L., XXXXXX
 Ziolkowski, Dennis, XXXXXXXX
 Zouzalik, Ervan E., XXXXXX

To be captain, Chaplain

Geary, Wesley V., XXXXXXXX

To be captains, Women's Army Corps

Bennett, Mary J., XXXX
 Bradford, Loyce A., XXXX
 Frisk, Helen E., XXXX
 Grooms, Sally L., XXXX
 Hendry, Lois A., XXXX
 Leibst, Mitzl D., XXXX
 Perkins, Suzanne M., XXXX
 Ramsay, Claudia G., XXXX

To be captains, Medical Corps

Allison, Stanley C., XXXXXXXX
 Anderson, Daniel L., XXXX

Armitage, David T., XXXXXXXX
 Askins, James H., XXXXXXXX
 Barcia, Peter J., XXXXXXXX
 Barlow, Matthew J., XXXXXXXX
 Baur, Ogden T., XXXX
 Beeler, Henry S., XXXXXXXX
 Bobbitt, Ralph C., XXXXXXXX
 Bowen, Thomas E., XXXXXXXX
 Branch, Leslie B., XXXXXXXX
 Briggs, William, XXXXXXXX
 Brown, Luther E., XXXXXXXX
 Brown, Raymond L., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Brundage, Bruce H., XXXXXXXX
 Bucher, William C., XXXXXXXX
 Bunn, Simon M., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Burton, Francis C., XXXXXXXX
 Camarata, James C., XXXXXXXX
 Cameron, Richard D., XXXXXXXX
 Camp, Richard A., XXXXXXXX
 Caporossi, Paul V., XXXXXXXX
 Carmichael, Benjamin, XXXXXXXX
 Carson, Gordon C., XXXXXXXX
 Chamberlain, Terry, XXXXXXXX
 Chojnacki, Richard, XXXXXXXX
 Collin, Daniel B., XXXXXXXX
 Corder, Michael P., XXXXXXXX
 Coville, Frederick, XXXXXXXX
 Craig, David E., XXXXXXXX
 Crowley, James R., XXXXXXXX
 Culton, John W., XXXXXXXX
 Cutting, John W., XXXXXXXX
 Di Bella, Nicholas, XXXXXXXX
 Farnsworth, Lynn S., XXXXXXXX
 Frostad, Alvin L., XXXXXXXX
 Gardner, Horace B., XXXXXXXX
 Garretson, James A., XXXXXXXX
 Gibson, Eldon V., XXXXXXXX
 Glick, Benjamin, XXXXXXXX
 Gross, Richard H., XXXXXXXX
 Gunther, John S., XXXXXXXX
 Harner, Stephen G., XXXXXXXX
 Harvey, John E., XXXXXXXX
 Haskins, Ronald C., XXXXXXXX
 Haynes, Richard J., XXXXXXXX
 Heitzman, Martin, XXXXXXXX
 Hentz, Edwin C., XXXXXXXX
 Herzinger, Raymond, XXXXXXXX
 Howard, William B., XXXXXXXX
 Jones, Henry E., XXXXXXXX
 Kelly, Charles S., XXXXXXXX
 Kichler, Jack, XXXXXXXX
 Kief, John J., XXXXXXXX
 Kimball, C. Eve J., XXXXXX
 Kimball, Daniel B., XXXXXXXX
 King, John W., XXXXXXXX
 Konia, Harold, XXXXXXXX
 Kromash, Marvin H., XXXXXXXX
 Lacey, John R., XXXXXXXX
 Latham, George H., XXXXXXXX
 Lawrence, Larry L., XXXXXXXX
 Maraist, David V., XXXXXXXX
 Maroun, William J., XXXXXXXX
 Master, Franklin, XXXXXXXX
 McCracken, Joseph, XXXXXXXX
 McMeekin, Robert R., XXXXXXXX
 Merchant, Michael J., XXXXXXXX
 Middlemas, Robert O., XXXXXXXX
 Mouton, David E., XXXXXXXX
 Nelson, Kenneth E., XXXXXXXX
 Peck, Charles A., XXXXXXXX
 Petty, William C., XXXXXXXX
 Pierce, Homer I., XXXXXXXX
 Post, Albert A., XXXXXXXX
 Rankin, Edward A., XXXXXXXX
 Rau, Jerold M., XXXXXXXX
 Robertson, Theodore, XXXXXXXX
 Sapoznikoff, John B., XXXXXXXX
 Sawyer, Robert, XXXXXX
 Shaw, James W., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Shively, Harold H., XXXXXXXX
 Smith, Davis S., XXXXXXXX
 Smith, Gilbert A., XXXXXXXX
 Snyder, Alexander B., XXXXXXXX
 Spritzer, Harlan W., XXXXXXXX
 Steinberg, Sidney R., XXXXXXXX
 Stones, Carl, XXXXXXXX
 Strader, Wilbur J., XXXXXXXX
 Stroud, Michael B., XXXXXXXX
 Sullivan, John C., XXXXXXXX
 Sweet, Robert S., XXXXXXXX

Toledo, Tony M., [REDACTED]
 Wallace, Robert G., [REDACTED]
 Walter, Arthur K., [REDACTED]
 Weeks, Duke B., [REDACTED]
 Whitcomb, Michael, [REDACTED]
 Whitelaw, John M., [REDACTED]
 Wiles, Peter J., [REDACTED]
 Woodson, Drury L., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Ziegler, Herman F., [REDACTED]

To be captains, Dental Corps

Arroyo, Francisco, [REDACTED]
 Edmonds, Peter P., [REDACTED]
 Ellinger, Harley A., [REDACTED]
 Hahn, Eitel H., [REDACTED]
 Herrmann, John W., [REDACTED]
 Sering, Dale L., [REDACTED]
 Zurek, Dennis J., [REDACTED]

To be captains, Veterinary Corps

Ackerman, Larry J., [REDACTED]
 Armstrong, Tommy S., [REDACTED]
 Botard, Robert W., [REDACTED]
 Coats, Max E., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Cooper, James C., [REDACTED]
 Groves, Michael G., [REDACTED]
 Hickman, Robert L., [REDACTED]
 Howarth, Robert A., [REDACTED]
 Hysell, David K., [REDACTED]
 McGovern, Lawrence, [REDACTED]
 Pope, Conrad R., [REDACTED]
 Seedle, Clyde D., [REDACTED]
 Strahler, Eugene G., [REDACTED]

To be captains, Medical Service Corps

Amos, Oscar D., [REDACTED]
 Anderson, Charles H., [REDACTED]
 Anderson, Jon D., [REDACTED]
 Arkinson, Thomas E., [REDACTED]
 Beckham, Carl N., [REDACTED]
 Benson, Warren D., [REDACTED]
 Berchin, Richard J., [REDACTED]
 Bishop, Garland G., [REDACTED]
 Blakemore, Vaughan A., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Bouchellon, Horace C., [REDACTED]
 Bowles, Robert L., [REDACTED]
 Brouillette, Robert, [REDACTED]
 Bulger, Carl S., [REDACTED]
 Burris, Jimmie D., [REDACTED]
 Camp, Charles H., [REDACTED]
 Cantrell, James E., [REDACTED]
 Capps, Joseph H., [REDACTED]
 Christianson, Lloyd D., [REDACTED]
 Clark, Charles F., [REDACTED]
 Conner, Johnny L., [REDACTED]
 Constable, Joseph F., [REDACTED]
 Cundiff, David E., [REDACTED]
 Delap, Edward H., [REDACTED]
 Ditmars, Dennis L., [REDACTED]
 Dolbler, James A., [REDACTED]
 Drill, John C., [REDACTED]
 Dudek, Peter G., [REDACTED]
 Dunlevy, Bernard J., [REDACTED]
 Fitzgerald, Barry E., [REDACTED]
 Fowler, David L., [REDACTED]
 Fuller, Gary L., [REDACTED]
 Fulton, Robert C., [REDACTED]
 Fulton, William R., [REDACTED]
 Garber, David L., [REDACTED]
 Garrett, Richard L., [REDACTED]
 Gilchrist, Robert E., [REDACTED]
 Hall, Joseph A., [REDACTED]
 Hanson, Thomas M., [REDACTED]
 Harman, Richard B., [REDACTED]
 Harris, Jesse J., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Hauer, Richard W., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Hausler, George W., [REDACTED]
 Helton, Bobby K., [REDACTED]
 Hennessy, Albert G., [REDACTED]
 Heyen, George E., [REDACTED]
 Hill, Thomas W., [REDACTED]
 Hoxsey, George E., [REDACTED]
 Jackson, Johnnie R., [REDACTED]
 Janke, Thomas A., [REDACTED]
 Johnson, Reginald D., [REDACTED]
 Judy, Richard B., [REDACTED]
 Kash, Steven N., [REDACTED]
 Kelley, Hubert A., [REDACTED]
 Kistler, Thomas E., [REDACTED]
 Lamke, Charles L., [REDACTED]
 Leahey, Raymond, [REDACTED]

Lemmers, Dean P., [REDACTED]
 Lerro, Richard M., [REDACTED]
 Lombard, James E., [REDACTED]
 Longley, Karl E., [REDACTED]
 Loryea, Robert S., [REDACTED]
 Loucks, James R., [REDACTED]
 Lund, Nelson H., [REDACTED]
 Manaro, Arthur J., [REDACTED]
 Marchetti, Vincent, [REDACTED]
 Martin, Mathis G., [REDACTED]
 McDaniels, Melvin B., [REDACTED]
 McLean, John M., [REDACTED]
 Mills, Wade T., [REDACTED]
 Milne, Richard B., [REDACTED]
 Monk, Merrill E., [REDACTED]
 Murphy, Thomas W., [REDACTED]
 Newman, Ronald G., [REDACTED]
 Oberhofer, Thomas R., [REDACTED]
 Perry, William R., [REDACTED]
 Powell, Ronald M., [REDACTED]
 Romo, Jacob M., [REDACTED]
 Ryan, Lawrence J., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Sandifer, Calvin P., [REDACTED]
 Schafer, Thomas E., [REDACTED]
 Schultz, Claron G., [REDACTED]
 Schumacher, Leonard C., [REDACTED]
 Servis, Hubert T., [REDACTED]
 Severson, Joel S., [REDACTED]
 Shambora, Robert A., [REDACTED]
 Sheek, Alton J., [REDACTED]
 Shelton, Edward J., [REDACTED]
 Smith, James M., [REDACTED]
 Spiker, James E., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Tang, Douglas E., [REDACTED]
 Vance, William M., [REDACTED]
 Walker, James O., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Ward, John R., [REDACTED]
 Waters, George A., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Watt, James E., [REDACTED]
 Webber, James A., [REDACTED]
 Weidner, Douglass S., [REDACTED]
 Young, James R., [REDACTED]

To be captains, Army Nurse Corps

Bogle, Janeth C., [REDACTED]
 Brogan, Mary Ann K., [REDACTED]
 Budack, Marietta E., [REDACTED]
 Butler, Mary C., [REDACTED]
 Fenlon, Eileen M., [REDACTED]
 Foltz, Mary J., [REDACTED]
 Foster, Imogene, [REDACTED]
 Haupt, Irene T., [REDACTED]
 Hopson, Minnie L. E., [REDACTED]
 Humphries, Marilyn, [REDACTED]
 Irvine, Leona R., [REDACTED]
 La Montagne, Mary E., [REDACTED]
 Le Bel, Rita A., [REDACTED]
 Leach, Clara M., [REDACTED]
 McQuillan, Constance E., [REDACTED]
 Morton, Agnes R., [REDACTED]
 Norton, Frances L., [REDACTED]
 Powers, Kay S., [REDACTED]
 Prellwitz, Patricia K., [REDACTED]
 Smalley, Ruth H., [REDACTED]
 Sumner, Billie F., [REDACTED]
 Vuyk, June J., [REDACTED]
 Woodring, Anna L., [REDACTED]

To be captains, Army Medical Specialist Corps

Brewer, Jessie S., [REDACTED]
 Bury, Joanne, [REDACTED]
 Buss, Carole J., [REDACTED]
 Lavin, Jacqueline M., [REDACTED]
 Putnam, Joicey M., [REDACTED]
 Sager, Jane F., [REDACTED]

IN THE NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

Hal C. Castle, Jr., Midshipman (Naval Academy) to be a permanent ensign in the line of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-named graduates from Navy enlisted scientific education program to be permanent ensigns in the line of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

John D. Johnstone James D. Courville
 Larry J. McLain Cecil J. Folker
 Milton L. Senft Dennis W. Hurst

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

John A. Holland Charles C. Morrison
 John A. Hudson Dallas "H" Pope
 William R. Kammerer Timothy J. Sullivan
 Arthur Kaufman Ronald B. Williams
 Douglas B. McMullen Reginald P. Wray, Jr.
 Charles H. Mann

Leo J. O'Callaghan (civilian college graduate) to be a permanent lieutenant (junior grade) and temporary lieutenant in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

Vernice B. Selby (Naval Reserve officer) to be a permanent lieutenant commander in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

Matthew J. Pozen (Naval Reserve officer) to be a permanent lieutenant and a temporary lieutenant commander in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

Gustav R. Robertson, Jr. (Naval Reserve officer) to be a permanent lieutenant (junior grade) and a temporary lieutenant in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

QMCS Gordon K. Truesdell, to be warrant officer W-2, in the Navy, for temporary service, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-named temporary commissioned warrant officers to be permanent chief warrant officer W-2 and temporary chief warrant officer W-3 in the Navy, in lieu of permanent chief warrant officer W-3 as previously nominated and confirmed to correct grade, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

Howard P. Cady Frank Stephens, Jr.
 Frank R. Ketterer Williard F. Wasson
 Wayne E. Myers Heber D. White

Orlando L. Palombo (temporary commissioned warrant officer) to be a permanent chief warrant officer W-3 and temporary chief warrant officer W-4 in the Navy, in lieu of permanent chief warrant officer W-4 as previously nominated and confirmed to correct grade, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

Thomas E. Fitzpatrick, Jr. (Naval Reserve Officer Training Corps) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

Thomas J. Heffernan, U.S. Navy, for transfer to and appointment in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy in the permanent grade of lieutenant (junior grade) and in the temporary grade of lieutenant.

The following-named line officers of the Navy for transfer to and appointment in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy in the permanent grade of lieutenant (junior grade):

Wilmot F. Clarke Ronale I. Gregg
 William L. Forestell Frederick S. Hall
 Kenneth E. Fusch Harry M. Swyers

William L. Forestell, U.S. Navy, for transfer to and appointment in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy in the permanent grade of ensign.

Charles B. Peru (Naval Reserve officer), to be a permanent lieutenant in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Robert B. Drysdale
 William J. Sandusky