not wish to see such warnings fastened to it. I hope this will be the case.

But if cigarette manufacturers elect to continue advertising with such a warning as I've just suggested, an integral part of their copy, I feel sure it will do us more good than it will do them. One way or another, the disastrous effect of cigarette advertising on the health of our people, present and future, must be done away with.

BERGMAN. More points of view on how to deal with the hazards of smoking.

Thank you, gentlemen, for being with us today on Issues and Answers.

ANNOUNCER. Our guests were Sir George E. Godber, Chief Medical Officer of the British Ministry of Health; Dr. Lurther Terry, former Surgeon General of the United States; and Senator Frank Moss, Democrat of Utah. They were interviewed by ABC News Science Editor Jules Bergman.

SENATE

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 22, 1967

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

Rev. Clifford Francis Custer, former minister of the Tracy Presbyterian Church, now minister at large, San Jose, Calif., offered the following prayer:

God of our fathers, author of liberty, spirit of wisdom and truth, we pray Thy blessing upon each Senator of these United States. Grant that they who bear the awesome responsibility of representing the citizens of our land and of molding in great measure the destiny of Thy world may have the clear guidance of Thy spirit in these days of domestic strife and international conflict.

Give them the costly courage to damn tyranny—even when that tyranny is politically attractive, to stand for hard truth when easy falsehood promises personal gain but national loss. So illumine and inspire them that they may be judged by history as a Senate which found Thy will and followed it, and left the land they served closer to peace, more truly united under Thee.

We thank Thee, O Father, for every holder of this honored office. May the blessing of Thy love and holy spirit rest upon each one, today and always.

Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1160) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 by extending and improving the provisions thereof relating to grants for construction of educational television broadcasting facilities, by authorizing assistance in the construction of noncommercial educational radio broadcasting facilities, by establishing a nonprofit corporation to assist in establishing innovative educational programs, to facilitate educational program availability, and to aid the operation of educational broadcasting facilities; and to authorize a comprehensive study of instructional television and radio; and for other purposes, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 188) creating a commission to be known as the Commission on Noxious and Obscene Matters and Materials.

The message further announced that the House disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8718) to increase the annual Federal payment to the District of Columbia and to provide a method for computing the annual borrowing authority for the general fund of the District of Columbia; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MCMILLAN, Mr. ABERNETHY, Mr. WHITENER, Mr. NELSEN, Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia, and Mr. HARSHA were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11816) to provide certain benefits for law-enforcement officers not employed by the United States who are killed or injured while apprehending violators of Federal law; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. ASHMORE, Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. TENZER, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. SMITH of New York, Mr. MESKILL, and Mr. SANDMAN were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, September 21, 1967, be dispensed with.

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

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. 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.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session.

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

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Arthur J. Goldberg, of Illinois; William B. Buffum, of Maryland; L. H. FOUNTAIN, U.S. Representative from the State of North Carolina; WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD, U.S. Representative from the State of Michigan; and Adrian S. Fisher, of the District of Columbia, to be representatives of the United States of America to the 22d session of the General Assembly of the United Nations; and

I. W. Abel, of Pennsylvania, Robert S. Benjamin, of New York, Hector P. Garcia, of Texas, Mrs. Patricia Roberts Harris, of the District of Columbia, and Herbert R. O'Conor, Jr., of Maryland, to be alternate representatives of the United States of America to the 22d session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Thomas H. Nielsen, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

U.S. ARMY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Chaplain Ned Ralston Graves (colonel), U.S. Army, to be brigadier general.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK—AIR FORCE, ARMY, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS, AND MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Air Force, the Army, the Navy and Marine Corps, and the Marine Corps, which had been placed on the Secretary's desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

UNITED NATIONS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Committee on Foreign Relations this morning reported the nominations of the U.S. representatives to the 22d session of the General Assembly of the United Nations. I have cleared them with the distinguished minority leader.

I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered at this time.

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

The legislative clerk read the following nominations:

The following-named persons to be representatives of the United States of America to the twenty-second session of the General Assembly of the United Nations:

Arthur J. Goldberg, of Illinois.

William B. Buffum, of Maryland.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

L. H. FOUNTAIN, U. S. Representative from the State of North Carolina.

WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD, U.S. Representative from the State of Michigan.

Adrian S. Fisher, of the District of Columbia.

The following-named persons to be alternate representatives of the United States of America to the twenty-second session of the General Assembly of the United Nations:

I. W. Abel, of Pennsylvania.

Robert S. Benjamin, of New York.

Hector P. Garcia, of Texas.

Mrs. Patricia Roberts Harris, of the District of Columbia.

Herbert R. O'Conor, Jr., of Mayland.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Under authority of the order of the Senate of September 21, 1967,

The Secretary of the Senate, on September 21, 1967, received the following message from the House of Representatives:

That the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills; and they were signed by the Vice President:

H.R. 9547. An act 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; and

H.R. 12257. An act to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to extend and expand the authorization of grants to States for rehabilitation services, to authorize assistance in establishment and operation of a National Center for Deaf-Blind Youths and Adults, and to provide assistance for migrants.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL—WITHDRAWAL OF NOMINATION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on September 21, 1967, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 1956) to extend for 1 year the authority for more flexible regulation of maximum rates of interest or dividends, higher reserve requirements, and open market operations in agency issues; and withdrawing the nomination of Kenneth V. Petro, to be postmaster at Lakeport, Calif.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REPORT ON OVEREXPENDITURE OF AN APPROPRIATION

A letter from the Public Printer, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the Government Printing Office for the fiscal year 1967 has been overexpended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

AIR FORCE MILITARY CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, reporting, pursuant to law, the total military construction contracts awarded by competition by the Department of the Air Force during the 6-month period January 1, 1967 through June 30, 1967; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the Executive Secretary, Public Service Commission of the District of Columbia, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the calendar year 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on savings available if the Commodity Credit Corporation recovers interest costs on repaid price-support loans and on storage facility and equipment loans, Department of Agriculture, dated September 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 projects showing need for improvements in planning and supervision, Agency for International Development, Department of State, dated September 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 the need for improved planning and surveillance of economic development projects in India, Agency for International Development, Department of State, dated September 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

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

A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Administration, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on claims settled under the Military Personnel and Civilian Employees' Claims Act of 1964, for the period September 1, 1964, through June 30, 1965, and fiscal years 1966 and 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter from the Director of the U.S. Information Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, report of claims settled by this Agency during period September 1, 1966 through August 31, 1967 (with an accompanying report) to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON PROGRAM FOR SHARING MEDICAL FACILITIES

A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the activities of the Veterans' Administration during fiscal year 1967 in connection with programs for sharing medical facilities and the exchange of medical information (with an accompanying report) to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

BILL INTRODUCED

A bill was introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. GRUENING (for himself, Mr. FONG, and Mr. INOUYE):

S. 2454. A bill to amend section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920 in order to exempt from the provisions of such section the transportation of merchandise between points in the State of Alaska and points in the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on Commerce.

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

ALASKA AND HAWAII MUST BE LOOSED, AT LEAST IN PART, FROM THE SHACKLES OF THE JONES ACT

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the two newest States of the Union—Alaska and Hawaii—although strikingly different in climate are marvelously complementary in terms of natural resources and consumer requirements.

One thing Alaska and Hawaii have in common is the fact that each is noncontiguous to the continental United States and must depend almost completely on water transportation for the importation of everything needed to keep the State and its citizens alive. Although Alaska can be reached by overland transportation from the "lower 48," for purposes of importing merchandise, Alaska is almost as much an island as are the islands of Hawaii.

A distressing consequence of the facts of noncontiguity with the continental United States and dependence on water carriers for freight movement to the economy of both States is that costs of transportation are so extremely high that, especially in the case of Alaska, our people suffer from an unduly inflated cost of living. The Federal Maritime Commission has recently issued a study of the Alaska trade which demonstrates, with facts and figures researched and compiled by the Commission staff, that water transportation costs add an onerous burden to the cost of buying everything that must be imported into the State. Alaskans are seeking ways of reducing these costs. With the advice of the Federal Maritime Commission now published we are exploring possibilities of improving port facilities and otherwise encouraging the introduction of competition in the trade now completely lacking in the southeast and northwest sections of the State, a development which could bring lower costs. More than 4 years ago the infant State of Alaska

bonded itself in an amount of $23,000,000 to construct an imaginative and extremely useful marine highway—a system of ferries serving southeast ports which provides a framework for, hopefully, expanded and improved freight transportation at lower cost for this area.

Alaska's principal problem, borne out by the findings of the Federal Maritime Commission, has been the existence in the past of an absolute monopoly of Alaska water transportation by one Seattle-based company—the Alaska Steamship Co. Competition has improved that situation in parts of Alaska, namely the rail belt, but not in other parts of Alaska where the monopoly persists. Having no need to provide improved service at lower rates in those other areas, southeastern and northwestern Alaska, the tariffs have kept going up and up and up over the years in one increase after another. The predictable result has been that development of Alaska's resources of mineral and other natural wealth has been retarded, while the cost of living continues to rise. High transportation costs have prevented or impeded efforts at resource development that could well have advanced Alaska's progress a generation ahead of its 1967 status.

While Alaska has suffered especially from this source of unreasonable freight costs, another obstacle has made it impossible to reduce these costs—an obstacle also encountered by the State of Hawaii.

That is the restrictive effect of section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1920—the law which prohibits shipment of merchandise between domestic ports in vessels under foreign registry. Thus, neither Alaska nor Hawaii can gain the advantage of lower transportation costs which might be available if foreign freighters passing by both States on the way to foreign ports could be allowed to discharge cargo originating at commercial centers of the continental States.

The protection of our domestic shipbuilding industry and its workers has long been recognized as essential to the defense and the economy of many parts of the Nation. This policy has served well to achieve objectives for which it was designed.

However, the time has now come to examine the validity of the premise of the cabotage laws as applied to trade with Alaska and Hawaii—new States in a state of political and economic development undreamed of at the time section 27 was first enacted. As the natural resources of Alaska have been explored and developed and as the economy and population of the State of Hawaii have grown it becomes apparent the latter need the former and that trade between the two new States could be vastly expanded to the benefit of both. Hawaii needs the mineral, timber, and fuel resources abundant in Alaska and lacking in Hawaii while Alaska could be the beneficiary of fruits, vegetables, and other products of Hawaii. The economy of Alaska, long stifled and restrained by the high cost of doing business there, could be healthily stimulated by the growth of new markets in Hawaii, which, in turn, could benefit by receiving directly such products as liquefied natural gas which it needs and Alaska is about to produce, if a cheaper form of water transportation were made available to move the cargo.

Unfortunately, this beneficial state of affairs cannot be achieved under the existing restrictions of the Jones Act.

This aspect of the water transportation problem has come dramatically to light with the increasing development of trade relations between Alaska and Japan. Japanese businessmen have long been active in the lumber industry of southeast Alaska. Their cargoes of timber products have been moving regularly for years from their plants at Wrangell and Sitka, via Japanese ships, to the industrial centers of Japan.

Last May two major petroleum companies announced the beginning of construction, in the Kenai Peninsula, of a great new plant for the liquefaction of natural gas, found in vast quantities in Alaska. At this time it is planned that the entire production of this plant will be shipped across the Pacific—to be delivered at a rate of 139 million cubic feet of gas a day—to Japan. Fuel-short Japan, which sought this supply of Alaska natural gas, will be supplied at a lower cost for this essential commodity by the liquefied gas of Alaska than it could be by other means explored.

As this product of the Kenai Peninsula of Alaska travels across the Pacific Ocean to Japan, it will pass right by another fuel-short region under the American flag—the State of Hawaii. The Hawaiians, as in the case of the Japanese, are seeking a supplemental supply of fuel to provide energy requirements of an ever-expanding economy and ever-growing population. But the Hawaiian citizens of the United States will have no chance at purchasing this greatly needed gas. This is because the tankers in which it is destined to travel to Japan will be constructed in Sweden. The necessity for construction of a specially designed vessel for this unusual trade caused the companies involved to seek the lowest cost ship construction available. As is common knowledge, U.S. ship construction costs are the highest in the world. If the liquefaction project is to be feasible at all, low-cost vessels are absolutely essential and U.S. construction is so costly as to be out of the question.

As in the case of shipping costs to Japan, so shipment to Hawaii from Alaska in American-built vessels would raise the price of Alaska's liquefied gas to a point at which the trade would not be economically feasible. However, Hawaii's need for low-cost fuel to provide low-cost power could be accommodated if the gas could be delivered in Hawaii as an intermediate transaction on the way of the vessel to Japan. How ironical that oriental countries can receive an American product at a far lower price than an American area, especially one which lies nearer the source of supply than are the Asian countries.

The same factor of exorbitant shipping costs via American-constructed vessels also prohibits shipment to Hawaii of Alaska's other resources, especially our badly needed forest products.

Since it is irrational to stifle the supply by Alaska of its sister State, Hawaii, of commodities needed by the people of Hawaii, I believe we must amend section 27 of the Jones Act to allow the use of foreign carriers in this important trade.

Accordingly, I introduce today a bill cosponsored by our colleagues from Hawaii, Senator FONG and Senator INOUYE, to remove—in part at least—the Jones Act shackles which now prevent a promising, thriving, industrial traffic between two States who need each other.

It is my reasoned judgment and hope that the opposition which has manifested itself in the past to changes in the Jones Act whenever Alaska has sought them should not and need not be mobilized against this legislation, for it is most unlikely that the American shipping industry would construct ships specifically to carry liquefied gas from Alaska to Hawaii. In other words, if this legislation becomes law, it should not curtail or interfere with any new development in our own merchant marine, but would improve the economy of both Alaska and Hawaii. It is to be hoped that these facts will be sufficiently appreciated so that this legislation may not run the gauntlet of the opponents of any substantial change in our cabotage laws.

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

The bill (S. 2454) to amend section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1920, in order to exempt from the provisions of such section the transportation of merchandise between points in the State of Alaska and points in the State of Hawaii, introduced by Mr. GRUENING (for himself, Mr. FONG, and Mr. INOUYE), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2454

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, as amended (46 U.S.C. 883), is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a colon and the following: *"And provided further,* That this section shall not apply to the transportation of merchandise between points in the State of Alaska and points in the State of Hawaii".

EXTENSION OF LIFE OF CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 338

Mr. THURMOND submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H.R. 10805) to extend the life of the Civil Rights Commission, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, my name be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 2431) to provide more effectively for the regulation of the

use of, and for the preservation of safety and order within, the Executive Mansion and grounds, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 2453) to facilitate the entry into the United States of aliens who are brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens, and for other purposes. I make this request on behalf of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD].

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

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF AMENDMENT

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of amendment No. 307, my amendment to S. 1125 which would allow a minimum annual allotment of $100,000 to each State for the education of the handicapped, the name of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] be added as a cosponsor.

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

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. THURMOND:

Editorial entitled "For ABM Policy U-Turn, McNamara Awakened Late," published in the Nashville Banner of September 20, 1967.

Editorial entitled "Defense Against Missiles," published in the Charleston, S.C., News and Courier of September 20, 1967.

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia:

Article entitled "More Politics Than Logic Seen in New Decisions," written by Crosby S. Noyes, and published in the Washington Evening Star of September 21, 1967.

Editorial entitled "Rat Act Reversal," published in the Richmond Times Dispatch of September 22, 1967.

By Mr. JACKSON:

Correspondence between C. Wilson Harder, president, National Federation of Independent Business and President Johnson, relating to proclamation of a day of recognition for firefighters.

By Mr. CHURCH:

Article entitled "Bureau of Land Management Uses Cost-Free Wire Winder," published in the Caldwell News-Tribune of Saturday, September 16, 1967.

FIFTY MONTHS IS TIME ENOUGH—SENATE SHOULD ACT NOW ON HUMAN RIGHTS CONVENTIONS—CXLII

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, 50 months ago today, on July 22, 1963, President Kennedy submitted to the Senate for this body's advice and consent three human rights conventions: Convention on Forced Labor, Convention on Political Rights of Women, and the Supplementary Convention to the Abolition of Slavery.

Now, after 50 months, the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate is about to meet in executive session to consider the reporting of these three conventions to the full Senate.

I believe it would be especially appropriate at this time to recall the message of President Kennedy when he submitted these three conventions to the Senate:

I have today transmitted to the Senate three conventions with a view to receiving advice and consent to ratification. These are:

1. The Supplementary Convention to the Abolition of Slavery, the Slave Trade, and Institutions and Practices Similar to Slavery, prepared under the direction of the United Nations in 1956, to which 49 nations are now parties.

2. The Convention on the Abolition of Forced Labor, adopted by the International Labor Organization in 1957, to which 60 nations are now parties.

3. The Convention on the Political Rights of Women, opened for signature by the United Nations, in 1953, to which 39 nations are now parties.

I might point out that in each case a large number of nations have ratified these individual conventions in addition to the ones that President Kennedy cited in his letter of more than 4 years ago.

The letter from President Kennedy goes on:

United States law is, of course, already in conformity with these conventions, and ratification would not require any change in our domestic legislation. However, the fact that our Constitution already assures us of these rights does not entitle us to stand aloof from documents which project our own heritage on an international scale. The day-to-day unfolding of events makes it ever clearer that our own welfare is interrelated with the rights and freedoms assured the peoples of other nations.

These conventions deal with human rights which may not yet be secure in other countries: they have provided models for the drafters of constitutions and laws in newly independent nations; and they have influenced the policies of governments preparing to accede to them. Thus, they involve current problems in many countries.

They will stand as a sharp reminder of world opinion to all who may seek to violate the human rights they define. They also serve as a continuous commitment to respect these rights. There is no society so advanced that it no longer needs periodic recommitment to human rights.

The United States cannot afford to renounce responsibility for support of the very fundamentals which distinguish our concept of government from all forms of tyranny. Accordingly, I desire, with the constitutional consent of the Senate, to ratify these Conventions for the United States of America.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

NIKOLA PETKOV—VICTIM OF BULGARIAN COMMUNIST REGIME

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Nikola Petkov was the most courageous and consistent champion of democracy in the Balkans during the last war, and during the 2 postwar years, until his judicial murder by the Communist regime in Bulgaria. In taking such a stout stand he became the foremost foe of communism, and as such he was marked for liquidation by his heartless foes.

Toward the end of the last war Bulgarian politics was something of a tug-of-war, mostly between the Communists and anti-Communists. But when the country was "liberated" by the advancing Red army, then it was clear that the Communists were to have the upper hand, to the definite disadvantage of all other groups. Among these was the Agrarian Party, with its large following led by Nikola Petkov. It was the most powerful party, and its leader thought that in any open show of hand, or elections, he and his party would win out. But Petkov and his associates did not realize at the time that when dealing with Communists the majorities and popular following do not always count, for with the Communists force has usually been the decisive factor in their dealings with their adversaries. Having no scruples, the Communists rely on steamroller tactics, smothering all opposition.

The postwar regime installed in Bulgaria was Communist, backed to the hilt by the Soviet authorities. Even though Communists formed a small part of the population, and were not even strong enough to fill all Government posts, they managed to control all important and key posts throughout the country. To maintain their control, they resorted to all sorts of tricks and treachery, always accusing their opponents as "enemies of the people," and stooges of imperialists, their goal being to discredit the leaders of their adversaries, and then to liquidate them. By such tactics they succeeded in the course of 2 years in silencing and then eliminating all their critics except Nikola Petkov.

For more than a year the rump Parliament, the result of a rigged election, kept the appearance of democracy of a sort in the country. Petkov himself was a member of this Parliament, and was most critical of the way matters were handled. He was a disturbing and discordant factor in Government, and on one occasion Prime Minister Dimitrov warned Petkov that he would "lose his head" if he did not put a stop to his criticism of the Government. Unhappily Dimitrov kept his word, for early in June 1947 Petkov was arrested, tried on certain trumped-up charges, and then hanged on September 23. Today in recalling the passing of this gallant spokesman of freedom in Communist-dominated Bulgaria, we pay tribute to his memory.

EXCELLENT POSTAL SERVICE PROVIDED AMERICAN SERVICEMEN IN VIETNAM

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I should like to comment this morning on what appears to me to be the very excellent postal service being provided American servicemen in Vietnam. In recent months, I have received mail from Vietnam with some regularity, and I have been well impressed with the expeditious way in which it has been handled.

This week I received a letter on Wednesday, September 20, which had been written and dated in Vietnam on Sunday, September 17. I was even more

impressed with that record of mail service—a letter written by an enlisted marine in Vietnam on Sunday, September 17 being delivered here in Washington on Wednesday, September 20. Sometimes it takes almost that long to get a letter from Alexandria across the Potomac over here to the city of Washington.

When we realize that Vietnam is some 12,000 miles away from Nation's Capital, I think it worthy of mention in the Senate that our military personnel are being supplied with very rapid mail service in Vietnam.

In that connection, in checking on the matter this morning, it is my understanding that the Army has the single managerial responsibility for the handling of the military mail. Of course, it is a joint endeavor once it reaches the United States. Then the Post Office Department takes charge of it.

So I would like this morning to commend those who handle the military mail from Vietnam, both those in the postal service and those in the military service.

I should like to read into the RECORD the names of those officers, first, who have overall responsibility in the handling of this Vietnam mail.

For the Army, it is Lt. Col. John M. Godwin.

For the Air Force, it is Col. Andrew Di Antonio.

For the Navy it is Lt. Cmdr. William R. Knapp.

For the Marines, 1st Lt. Paul Siemsko.

The responsibility for the Far East Postal Service rests in the following officers:

For the Army, Lt. Col. Paul Wildman.

For the Air Force, Lt. Col. Perry McElroy.

For the Navy, Lt. Owen R. Smith.

For the Marines, 1st Lt. Orville L. Sayre.

It seems to me it is vitally important to the morale of our troops in the field that they do have fast and good mail service. It is also important to the morale of the parents here in the United States that this mail be handled with rapidity.

I think it is also desirable that the Congress arrange that the mail from the serviceman in Vietnam should come postage free. This tends to encourage the serviceman to communicate with his family and his friends, not just because of the elimination of the cost involved in a postage stamp, but because of the convenience in not having to concern himself with putting stamps on his mail.

Again I want to commend those who have the responsibility of getting mail to and from the military personnel in Vietnam.

My impression, from the large number of letters which I have received from Vietnam, is that the postal service is being handled in a very able way.

Since Vietnam has been mentioned, I should like to cite the casualties of last week. Slightly more than 2,000 Americans were casualties in Vietnam this past week; that is both killed and wounded.

I wish to state for the record also, Mr. President, the figures for the period January 1, 1967, to September 16, 1967. During that 8½-month period, U.S. casualties totaled 52,426. For the period, the casualties among the South Vietnamese totaled 29,278.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

EFFORTS TO INTIMIDATE CONGRESS SHOULD BE REBUFFED

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the continuing efforts of groups that seek special privileges to disturb the work of Congress constitute a growing menace to our cherished democratic way of life. A few days ago, demonstrators opposing their country's policies in Vietnam dropped leaflets from the Senate gallery. This week, what the press described as "angry welfare recipients" staged a wait-in or a sit-in demonstration in the hearing room of the Senate Finance Committee. They did so because they objected to proposals that would cause some of those on relief to have to go to work, and that would limit the number of children on welfare.

Mr. President, where are these disorders taking us? To what is the Congress to be subjected next? I, for one, do not regard such pressure techniques lightly. I am dismayed that so many persons in positions of responsibility and authority exhibit such timid toleration for sit-ins, lie-ins, wait-ins, and drop-ins.

Unless we act to stop them, these things may well become throw-ins or shoot-ins. For I am convinced that inaction against them can only lead to a more difficult and more serious situation. If those who can take action against these revolutionary developments do not do so, they may well find that they have permitted a new kind of Frankenstein's monster to be created in our midst.

It is time, Mr. President, for the Members of Congress and for public officials in all branches of the Government not only to speak out against such mob demonstrations, but also to take appropriate action to prevent them. The orderly processes of government must go on without such interruptions. I would not wish to visit retribution on persons such as those misguided women who demonstrated in the Senate Finance Committee room; but I think it should be made clear to them and to others that such efforts at intimidation will not be permitted and will not be tolerated by the Congress of the United States. I think it should further be made clear to them and to all who may think they can gain their dubious ends by demonstrations and threats that such displays serve only to prejudice Members of Congress, as well as to prejudice a wide segment of the public, against their cause. Those who participate in such activities, in short, hurt rather than help themselves; and in so doing, they hurt this Republic.

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I believe, Mr. President, that there is a sinister design in these growing efforts to interrupt, to disrupt, to harass, and to intimidate. In my opinion, they fit into a revolutionary pattern inspired, if not planned, by those who would drastically change our system and our way of life.

Almost a year ago, I warned on this floor that a "strategy for political crisis" was being advocated by certain individuals and groups who would like to see welfare recipients organized to blackmail Congress. I referred, in that speech last year, to an article written by Richard Cloward and Frances Fox Piven entitled "A Strategy to End Poverty." I believe that the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] also, at that time, about a year ago, made reference to the same article, written by Cloward and Piven, which appeared in the May 2, 1966, issue of the Nation. I refer to it again today.

Mr. Cloward was then a professor of social work and Mrs. Piven was a research associate in the Columbia University School of Social Work. I quote again today from their article, which I brought to the Senate's attention last year:

> How can the poor be organized to press for relief from poverty? How can a broad-based movement be developed . . . It is our purpose to advance a strategy which affords the basis for a convergence of civil rights organizations, militant anti-poverty groups and the poor. If this strategy were implemented a political crisis would result that could lead to legislation for a guaranteed annual income and thus an end to poverty.
>
> The strategy is based on the fact that a vast discrepancy exists between the benefits to which people are entitled under public welfare programs and the sums which they actually receive.
>
> The discrepancy is not an accident stemming from bureaucratic inefficiency; rather, it is an integral feature of the welfare system which, if challenged, would precipitate a profound financial and political crisis. The force for that challenge, and the strategy we propose, is a massive drive to recruit the poor *onto* the welfare rolls . . .
>
> The right to income must be guaranteed, or the oppression of the welfare poor will not be eliminated . . .
>
> In order to generate a crisis, the poor must obtain benefits which they have forfeited . . .
>
> The idea of "welfare rights" has begun to attract attention in many liberal circles . . .
>
> By crisis, we mean a *publicly visible* disruption in some institutional sphere. Crisis can occur spontaneously (e.g., riots) or as the intended result of tactics of demonstration and protest which either generate institutional disruption or bring unrecognized disruption to public attention. Public trouble is political liability; it calls for action by political leaders to stabilize the situation. Because crisis usually creates or exposes conflict, it threatens to produce cleavages in a political consensus which politicians will ordinarily act to avert.

So, Mr. President, what is being proposed by the authors of this article, as I stated previously, is a revolution, a destruction of established systems, and I repeat that statement and that warning today.

Since the time that I spoke on the floor of the Senate last year, we have seen this plan implemented, to a degree at least, by the riots, by the demonstrations conducted on the part of and participated in by welfare recipients, by the stimulation of demonstrations by some anti-poverty groups, and by the most recent

sit-in in the Senate Finance Committee room.

The "irate welfare mothers," as the press called the demonstrators who attempted to force their demands on the Senate Finance Committee, seem to me to fit precisely into the announced strategy for political crisis.

These are not just spontaneous things that are happening by accident. They are outrageous things that are happening according to a calculated plan.

It is a strategy of intimidation and political blackmail to which all of us submit only at our peril.

Threats, such as the Finance Committee demonstrators made, that there would be a "holocaust in every city" if certain welfare changes do become law, are as offensive and as abominable to me—and should be to every right-thinking American—as the growing demand for something for nothing and the threats by black power advocates. In my opinion, these things can no longer be shrugged off, nor dismissed. I do not think they can be accepted as just a part of the times in which we live. I think they should be cause for serious alarm in the executive branch. They should be cause for serious alarm in the legislative branch. And they should be cause for serious alarm in the judicial branch.

These disturbing developments are part of the overall strategy of revolution that is developing in this country and that has been developing in this country clearly now for the past 3 or 4 years—a revolution which began with the first intentional mass violation of a municipal ordinance in American cities, a revolution that began with the first march down the streets under the pretense of so-called civil disobedience, a revolution that was encouraged by many well-thinking, but misguided, citizens who encouraged and joined with publicity-seeking agitators in an epidemic of demonstrations often in violation not only of local laws and State statutes but also of court orders. There the wind was sown; we are now reaping the whirlwind.

Mr. President, Edwin Markham wrote a bit of verse which I feel may have presaged the alarming things that are beginning to happen in this Republic. Markham may not have foreseen the decline of this Republic, but his poem was indeed prophetic. I shall attempt at this moment to recall it:

THE FEAR FOR THEE, MY COUNTRY

In storied Venice, where the night repeats
The heaven of stars down all her rippling streets,
Stood the great Bell Tower, fronting seas and skies—
Fronting the ages, drawing all men's eyes;
Rooted like Teneriffe, aloft and proud,
Taunting the lightning, tearing the flying cloud.

It marked the hours for Venice: all men said
Time cannot reach to bow that lofty head:
Time, that shall touch all else with ruin, must
Forbear to make this shaft confess its dust.
Yet all the while, in secret, without sound,
The fat worms gnawed the timbers underground.

The twisting worm, whose epoch is an hour,
Caverned his way into the mighty tower;
Till suddenly it shook, it swayed, it broke,
And fell in darkening thunder at one stroke.
The strong shaft, with an angel on the crown,
Fell ruining: a thousand years went down!

And so I fear, my country, not the hand
That shall hurl night and whirlwind on the land;
I fear not Titan traitors who shall rise
To stride like Brocken shadows on our skies;
These we can face in open fight, withstand
With reddening rampart and the sworded hand.

I fear the vermin that shall undermine
Senate and citadel and school and shrine—
The Worm of Greed, the fatted Worm of Ease,
And all the crawling progeny of these—
The vermin that shall honeycomb the towers
And walls of State in unsuspecting hours.

Mr. President, in my humble judgment, what we are witnessing in America today is in many ways summed up in Edwin Markham's lines.

The worm of greed—the spreading desire to get something for nothing—and the proliferating worm of ease are insidiously gnawing at the roots of the Republic. And all the crawling progeny of these are threatening the structure itself.

It seems to me no mere poetic license to liken the threatmakers, the rioters, and the inciters to vermin that are honeycombing the fabric of this Nation. And once the foundation is undermined, the fabric must fold.

Mr. President, it is my opinion that Congress and the Nation have had enough of threats from agitators of any stripe who propose to set off new holocausts in our cities if Congress does or does not take certain actions.

The time is now for men in this Government to take a stand and for the people of the United States to become aroused.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the articles from the newspapers to which I have alluded; also, that additional extracts from the article which appeared in the Nation, authored by Cloward and Piven, be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 20, 1967]

IRATE WELFARE MOTHERS HOLD "WAIT-IN"

(By Eve Edstrom)

A bitter band of welfare mothers staged a "wait-in" for the entire Senate Finance Committee yesterday after testifying that there would be a "holocaust in every city" if restrictive House-passed welfare changes become law.

Angered because only two Committee members heard their noontime testimony opposing House-approved work requirements for mothers and a freeze on welfare for children, they refused to budge from the Committee hearing room from 1 p.m. until 3:45 p.m.

With police ringing both the hearing room and outside corridors, the mothers, some with youngsters in their arms, finally walked out.

George A. Wiley, director of the Poverty Rights Action Center here who had mobilized the mothers, said they left because Capitol police threatened them with "arrest for unlawful entry."

The hearing on the Social Security and welfare package had been scheduled to resume at 2 p.m. with other witnesses. But with the mothers insisting on finishing their testimony, reporters were barred from the hearing room and camera crews were ordered to leave the area. Senate Finance Committee Chairman Russell B. Long (D-La.) entered about 2:45 p.m. to formally recess the hearing until today.

Mrs. Johnnie Tillmon, who lives in the Watts section of Los Angeles and is chairman of the National Welfare Rights Organization that Wiley has organized, said Long was "very angry and red in the face." Others reported that he banged the gavel so hard that its head flew off.

In a statement issued for delivery to Long, Mrs. Tillmon asked, "What happened to the hearing?" noted that her group had been "peaceful and patient," and had thought Long was "intelligent enough to listen to both sides."

Long and Sen. Fred R. Harris (D-Okla.) had listened to the mothers for an hour, longer than any other public witnesses. The mothers were unmoved by Harris' explanation that other Senators were absent because they were voting on a money bill that included funds for model cities and rent supplements.

"Look at all those empty seats," said Mrs. Hazel Leslie of Philadelphia. "We're just being completely ignored. They don't want to hear what we have to say."

Mrs. Etta Horn of Washington said the Nation's Capital is a "powder keg" that will "blow" if the Senate approves House-passed welfare measures that would force mothers to work and freeze the number of children on relief.

"The only time you listen to it is when the cities are burning and the people are dying," she said. "The time to listen is now."

TERRIBLE DISGRACE

She declared the welfare bill is a "terrible disgrace" because it says that "children in America are not to be fed but if they live long enough they can fight for their country."

Mrs. Alice Nixon of Pittsburgh asked "why not take your heads out of the sand" and then "you will stop wondering why we're burning down our houses."

The people in the ghettos are going to stop mumbling," she said. ". . . There's coming a time when your children are going to have to suffer, too."

Beulah Sanders of New York City said the present welfare system is "rotten." But she said it isn't going to be improved by training programs that lead to dead-end jobs and by forcing mothers out of the home so their children are on the streets and are picked up by police.

"We can't live by your law," she said. "Get rid of that bill. Give us a guaranteed income, give us jobs with a future."

Mrs. Dorothy DiMascio of Rochester, N.Y., described the welfare restrictions as a "dictatorship" that imposes changes on "our lives, our children, our husbands and yet we haven't been asked about them."

The welfare amendments, aimed at reducing spiraling relief rolls, were hammered out in closed sessions of the House Ways and Means Committee and brought up on the House floor under a rule that permitted no changes.

JAVITS ASKS REFORMS

In earlier testimony, Sen. Jacob K. Javits (R-N.Y.) called for "welfare reform, not punitive action." He proposed spending $10 million to experiment with a children's allowance system, similar to payments now in existence in 40 countries.

Another indictment of the welfare amendments was delivered by AFL-CIO President George Meany. He criticized them as a "seriously misguided effort" to force mothers and older children into a "very badly conceived work and training program."

But most of Meany's testimony was concentrated on the House cuts in President

Johnson's proposed cash increases for Social Security beneficiaries.

Meany said the House-passed 12½ per cent increase would leave most beneficiaries "in the mire of poverty." The President's proposed increase of 15 to 20 per cent would be a modest down-payment toward the 50-per-cent boost that is required for an adequate level of payments, he said.

Meany recommended raising the wage base for Social Security taxes even higher than the President proposed. But he said the tax rates are probably the maximum that workers should be expected to pay. Therefore, he said, there should be a gradual introduction of general revenue funds into the Social Security system.

U.S. Chamber of Commerce spokesman Henry H. Chase testified for a 9-to-10-per-cent Social Security increase without raising the taxable wage base.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 21, 1967]

PROTESTING WELFARE MOTHERS REBUKED

(By Eve Edstrom)

Senate Finance Committee Chairman Russell B. Long (D-La.) declared yesterday that protesting welfare mothers had "hurt their own case" by their "deliberately insulting" behavior.

Neither his Committee nor Congress, he said, would be "intimidated" into bowing to their demands for changes in House-approved restrictive welfare measures.

"If they can find time to march in the streets, picket, and sit all day in committee hearing rooms, they can find time to do some useful work," Long said.

The mothers, representing the National Welfare Rights Organization, staged a three-hour "wait-in" at the Finance Committee's hearing room Tuesday. They wanted more Senators to hear their objections to House-passed measures that would force mothers on relief to go to work and would limit the number of children on relief.

After being threatened with arrest by Capitol police they left but returned yesterday when hearings on the Social Security welfare package resumed. Police barred them from entering the hearing room.

Inside, Long was being lauded as a friend of the poor. The leadoff witness was Rep. Phillip Burton (Calif.), one of the most liberal Democrats in the House.

He declared that Long was "responsible for helping more poor people receive some measure of economic security than any member" of either the House or Senate.

Burton was followed by New York Welfare Commissioner George K. Wyman who agreed with Long that the mothers had hurt their cause. Later, in an interview, Wyman said "you don't kick your friends in the teeth," and that the mothers conduct would "adversely affect the attitude of the Committee."

The Administration, along with numerous national welfare leaders, hoped that Long's Committee would soften the House welfare provisions.

But Long, in a televised broadcast, said, "We don't intend to help those who refuse to help themselves," that they could be "picking up litter in front of their homes" instead of impeding the work of Congress.

Meanwhile, the mothers had moved across the street from the Senate Office building for sidewalk interviews. They were accompanied by George A. Wiley, director of the Poverty Rights Action Center in Washington, who created the National Welfare Rights Organization.

Wiley and Mrs. Johnnie Tillmon, chairman of the national mothers' organization and a resident of the Watts section of Los Angeles, said the women would return to their home communities where they would hold their own hearings to show "what a rotten mess welfare is."

Mrs. Tillmon said that she would tell the people "what they have to do," and if this means trouble, "that's not my problem."

Yesterday's formal testimony also centered on the need to increase Social Security cash benefits beyond the 12½ per cent voted by the House and to eliminate restrictions on the Medicaid program of health care for the poor. Between 600,000 and 900,000 persons in New York would be denied medical benefits if the restrictions become law, Wyman said.

[From the Washington Star, Sept. 20, 1967]

ANGRY WELFARE GROUP HOLDS HILL SIT-IN

(By Barry Kalb)

A group of about 50 angry welfare recipients staged a 2½ hour sit-in in a hearing room of the Senate Finance Committee to demand more time for airing their opposition to House-approved welfare restrictions.

Members of the National Welfare Rights Organization, who had come to testify yesterday on a bill amending the Social Security Act, sat in the room from 1 p.m., when Sen. Fred Harris, D-Okla., adjourned the hearing, until 3:45, when police threatened them with arrest if they did not leave.

Other members of the welfare group—along with Capitol police and Metropolitan police—milled noisily in the hall outside the hearing chamber while the sit-in was in progress.

The bill in question contains two sections which would seriously affect welfare recipients.

One provision would require mothers on welfare to take job training, which, the welfare group contends, would force them to neglect their children.

The other would freeze aid to families with dependent children (AFDC) rolls at the Jan. 1, 1967 level.

POINT OF CONTROVERSY

Yesterday's controversy apparently arose over the question of what constitutes adequate testimony.

Harris said last night that the welfare group had been allowed more than 30 minutes to testify, while most witnesses are being allowed only 10 minutes.

He also said that by the time he adjourned the meeting, "the welfare group had ceased making affirmative statements, and had started to ask questions of me."

But Dr. George A. Wiley, executive director of the Poverty Rights Action Center in Washington, which coordinates the activities of the national organization, contended that a case like the present one cannot be adequately heard in the normal manner.

"TAKE HEARING TO PEOPLE"

"This hearing should be taken to the people," he said. "This so directly and vitally affects poor people, that I don't think this would be unheard of."

The welfare contingent, composed of Negroes and Puerto Ricans arrived in Washington Monday. Most of them are from East Coast cities, although the national chairman, Mrs. Johnnie Tillmon, is from Los Angeles.

Wiley said that originally, only he was scheduled to testify. But when he went to the witness table, he said, he took six members of the group with him, and Committee Chairman Russell B. Long, D-La., allowed these women to speak in Wiley's place.

The hearing was interrupted several times by the roll call bell, and on one occasion, both Long and Harris, the only members of the committee present yesterday, left to go to the Senate floor.

Harris soon returned alone.

About 1 p.m., Harris announced that he was recessing the committee to answer another roll call, but that he would return in about an hour. Then, he said, he reversed himself, and announced that the hearing could be reconvened only at the discretion of Sen. Long.

Most of those in the room, under the impression that the hearing would soon resume, sat and waited for the afternoon session to begin, Wiley said. He said Harris' announcements were "ambiguous."

NEWSMEN BARRED

At this point Capitol police asked newsmen in the room to leave, and barred the entrances. The few members of the welfare group who left to get something to eat protested loudly when they were refused readmittance.

In the ensuing confusion, television crews said, Finance Committee counsel Thomas Vail pulled their power plugs and refused to let them continue filming outside the hearing room.

At 2:45, Long made a brief appearance, announced that the hearing was formally adjourned, and walked out.

Those in the room reported that Long banged his gavel so hard it broke, and Mrs. Hazel Leslie, chairman of the group's Philadelphia unit, said:

"He just stalked out. Was he ever livid."

JAVITS TALKS TO SOME

Then an aide of Sen. Jacob K. Javits, R-N.Y., appeared in the hall and said that the senator would speak with a contingent of welfare delegates from New York.

Five delegates went to Javits' office. They reported later that Javits told them, "I will try to arrange time for you to testify. I will do my best."

Javits said he would talk to Long personally, but by this time, over 50 policemen, including many usually on duty at the House office buildings, had arrived to clear the room in the New Senate Office Building.

At 3:45, the doors opened and the protestors filed out. Their colleagues cheered.

The protestors announced that police had threatened to arrest them for unlawful entry if they did not leave.

Wiley said his group would try to testify again, but most of those here yesterday had to leave for home. As Mrs. Meggie Nord of Brooklyn said, "I have a sick husband and five kids at home. I can't stay here."

EXTRACTS FROM CLOWARD-PIVEN ARTICLE

How can the poor be organized to press for relief from poverty? How can a broad-based movement be developed and the current disarray of activist forces be halted? These questions confront, and confound, activists today. It is our purpose to advance a strategy which affords the basis for a convergence of civil rights organizations, militant anti-poverty groups and the poor. If this strategy were implemented, a political crisis would result that could lead to legislation for a guaranteed annual income and thus an end to poverty.

The strategy is based on the fact that a vast discrepancy exists between the benefits to which people are entitled under public welfare programs and the sums which they actually receive.

* * * * *

The discrepancy is not an accident stemming from bureaucratic inefficiency; rather, it is an integral feature of the welfare system which, if challenged, would precipitate a profound financial and political crisis. The force for that challenge, and the strategy we propose, is a massive drive to recruit the poor onto the welfare rolls.

The distribution of public assistance has been a local and state responsibility, and that accounts in large part for the abysmal character of welfare practices * * * public welfare systems try to keep their budgets down and their rolls low by failing to inform people of the rights available to them; by intimidating and shaming them to the degree that they are reluctant either to ap-

ply or to press claims, and by arbitrarily denying benefits to those who are eligible.

A series of welfare drives in large cities would, we believe, impel action on a new federal program to distribute income, eliminating the present public welfare system and alleviating the abject poverty which it perpetrates. Widespread campaigns to register the eligible poor for welfare aid, and to help existing recipients obtain their full benefits, would produce bureaucratic disruption in welfare agencies and fiscal disruption in local and state governments. These disruptions would generate severe political strains, and deepen existing divisions among elements in the big-city Democratic coalition: the remaining white middle class, the white working-class ethnic groups and the growing minority poor. To avoid a further weakening of that historic coalition, a national Democratic administration would be constrained to advance a federal solution to poverty that would override local welfare failures, local class and racial conflicts and local revenue dilemmas. By the integral disruption of local bureaucratic practices, by the furor over public welfare poverty, and by the collapse of current financing arrangements, powerful forces can be generated for major economic reforms at the national level.

The ultimate objective of this strategy—to wipe out poverty by establishing a guaranteed annual income—will be questioned by some. Because the ideal of individual social and economic mobility has deep roots, even activists seem reluctant to call for national programs to eliminate poverty by the outright redistribution of income * * * many of the contemporary poor will not rise from poverty by organizing to bargain collectively. They either are not in the labor force or are in such marginal and dispersed occupations (e.g., domestic servants) that it is extremely difficult to organize them. Compared with other groups, then, many of today's poor cannot secure a redistribution of income by organizing within the institution of private enterprises. A federal program of income redistribution has become necessary to elevate the poor en masse from poverty * * * the right to income must be guaranteed, or the oppression of the welfare poor will not be eliminated. Because benefits are conditional under the present public welfare system, submission to arbitrary government power is regularly made the price of sustenance. People have been coerced into attending literacy classes or participating in medical or vocational rehabilitation regimes, on pain of having their benefits terminated. Men are forced into labor on virtually any terms lest they forfeit their welfare aid. One can prize literacy, health and work, while still vigorously opposing the right of government to compel compliance with these values.

Conditional benefits thus result in violations of civil liberties throughout the nation, and in a pervasive oppression of the poor.

* * * * *

In order to generate a crisis, the poor must obtain benefits which they have forfeited. Until now, they have been inhibited from asserting claims by self-protective devices within the welfare system: its capacity to limit information, to intimidate applicants, to demoralize recipients, and arbitrarily to deny lawful claims.

Ignorance of welfare rights can be attacked through a massive educational campaign. Brochures describing benefits in simple, clear language, and urging people to seek their full entitlements, should be distributed door to door in tenements and public housing projects, and deposited in stores, schools, churches and civic centers. Advertisements should be placed in newspapers; spot announcements should be made on radio. Leaders of social, religious, fraternal and political groups in the slums should also be enlisted to recruit the eligible to the rolls. The fact that the campaign is intended to inform people of their legal rights under a government program, that it is a civic education drive, will lend it legitimacy.

But information alone will not suffice. Organizers will have to become advocates in order to deal effectively with improper rejections and terminations. The advocate's task is to appraise the circumstances of each case, to argue its merits before welfare, to threaten legal action if satisfaction is not given. In some cases, it will be necessary to contest decisions by requesting a "fair hearing" before the appropriate state supervisory agency; it may occasionally be necessary to sue for redress in the courts. Hearings and court actions will require lawyers, many of whom, in cities like New York, can be recruited on a voluntary basis, especially under the banner of a movement to end poverty by a strategy of asserting legal rights. However, most cases will not require an expert knowledge of law, but only of welfare regulations; the rules can be learned by laymen, including welfare recipients themselves (who can help to man "information and advocacy" centers). To aid workers in these centers, handbooks should be prepared describing welfare rights and the tactics to employ in claiming them.

Advocacy must be supplemented by organized demonstrations to create a climate of militancy that will overcome the invidious and immobilizing attitudes which many potential recipients hold toward being "on welfare." In such a climate, many more poor people are likely to become their own advocates and will not need to rely on aid from organizers.

As the crisis develops, it will be important to use the mass media to inform the broader liberal community about the inefficiencies and injustices of welfare. For example, the system will not be able to process many new applicants because of cumbersome and often unconstitutional investigatory procedures (which cost 20c for every dollar disbursed). As delays mount, so should the public demand that a simplified affidavit supplant these procedures, so that the poor may certify to their condition. If the system reacts by making the proof of eligibility more difficult, the demand should be made that the Department of Health, Education and Welfare dispatch "eligibility registrars" to enforce federal statutes governing local programs. And throughout the crisis, the mass media should be used to advance arguments for a new federal income distribution program.

* * * * *

The idea of "welfare rights" has begun to attract attention in many liberal circles.

* * * * *

To generate an expressly political movement, cadres of aggressive organizers would have to come from the civil rights movement and the churches, from militant low-income organizations like those formed by the Industrial Areas Foundation (that is, by Saul Alinsky), and from other groups on the Left. These activists should be quick to see the difference between programs to redress individual grievances and a large-scale social-action campaign for national policy reform.

* * * * *

The plan has the extraordinary capability of yielding mass influence without mass participation, at least as the term "participation" is ordinarily understood. Mass influence in this case stems from the consumption of benefits and does not require that large groups of people be involved in regular organizational roles.

Moreover, this kind of mass influence is cumulative because benefits are continuous. Once eligibility for basic food and rent grants is established, the drain on local resources persists indefinitely.

* * * * *

The ultimate aim of this strategy is a new program for direct income distribution. What reason is there to expect that the federal government will enact such legislation in response to a crisis in the welfare system?

We ordinarily think of major legislation as taking form only through established electoral processes. We tend to overlook the force of crisis in precipitating legislative reform, partly because we lack a theoretical framework by which to understand the impact of major disruptions.

By crisis, we mean a publicly visible disruption in some institutional sphere. Crisis can occur spontaneously (e.g., riots) or as the intended result of tactics of demonstration and protest which either generate institutional disruption or bring unrecognized disruption to public attention. Public trouble is a political liability; it calls for action by political leaders to stabilize the situation. Because crisis usually creates or exposes conflict, it threatens to produce cleavages in a political consensus which politicians will ordinarily act to avert.

* * * * *

The electoral context which made crisis effective in the South is also to be found in the big cities of the nation today. Deep tensions have developed among groups comprising the political coalitions of the large cities—the historic stronghold of the Democratic Party. As a consequence, urban politicians no longer turn in the vote to national Democratic candidates with unfailing regularity. The marked defections revealed in the elections of the 1950s and which continued until the Johnson landslide of 1964 are a matter of great concern to the national party. Precisely because of this concern, a strategy to exacerbate still further the strains in the urban coalition can be expected to evoke a response from national leaders.

* * * * *

A crisis in public welfare would expose the tensions latent in this attenuated relationship between the ghetto vote and the urban party leadership, for it would thrust forward ghetto demands and back them with the threat of defections by voters who have so far remained both loyal and quiescent.

In the face of such a crisis, urban political leaders may well be paralyzed by a party apparatus which ties them to older constituent groups, even while the ranks of these groups are diminishing. The national Democratic leadership, however, is alert to the importance of the urban Negro vote, especially in national contests where the loyalty of other urban groups is weakening. Indeed, many of the legislative reforms of the Great Society can be understood as efforts, however feeble, to reinforce the allegiance of growing ghetto constituencies to the national Democratic Administration. In the thirties, Democrats began to put forward measures to circumvent the states in order to reach the big-city elements in the New Deal coalition; now it is becoming expedient to put forward measures to circumvent the weakened big-city mayors in order to reach the new minority poor.

Recent federal reforms have been impelled in part by widespread unrest in the ghetto, and instances of more aggressive Negro demands. But despite these signs that the ghetto vote may become less reliable in the future, there has been as yet no serious threat of massive defection. The national party has therefore not put much pressure on its urban branches to accommodate the minority poor. The resulting reforms have consequently been quite modest (e.g., the war against poverty, with its emphasis on the "involvement of the poor," is an effort to make the urban party apparatus somewhat more accommodating).

A welfare crisis would, of course, produce dramatic local political crisis, disrupting and exposing rifts among urban groups. Conservative Republicans are always ready to

declaim the evils of the public welfare, and they would probably be the first to raise a hue and cry. But deeper and politically more telling conflicts would take place within the Democratic coalition. Whites—both working-class ethnic groups and many in the middle class—would be aroused against the ghetto poor, while liberal groups, which until recently have been comforted by the notion that the poor are few and, in any event, receiving the beneficent assistance of public welfare, would probably support the movement. Group conflict, spelling political crisis for the local party apparatus, would thus become acute as welfare rolls mounted and the strains on local budgets became more severe. In New York City, where the Mayor is now facing desperate revenue shortages, welfare expenditures are already second only to those for public education.

* * * * *

If this strategy for crisis would intensify group cleavages, a federal income solution would not further exacerbate them. The demands put forward during recent civil rights drives in the Northern cities aroused the opposition of huge majorities. Indeed, such fierce resistance was evoked (e.g., school boycotts followed by counter-boycotts), that accessions by political leaders would have provoked greater political turmoil than the protests themselves; for profound class and ethnic interests are at stake in the employment, educational and residential institutions of our society. By contrast, legislative measures to provide direct income to the poor would permit national Democratic leaders to cultivate ghetto constituencies without unduly antagonizing other urban groups, as is the case when the battle lines are drawn over schools, housing or jobs. Furthermore, a federal income program would not only redeem local governments from the immediate crisis but would permanently relieve them of the financially and politically onerous burdens of public welfare—a function which generates support from none and hostility from many, not least of all welfare recipients.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from West Virginia for his very effective and inspirational presentation of the problem which he has discussed.

Tragically, we are not within our country giving adequate recognition to the dangers that are directly facing us.

The many demonstrations that are taking place are attributed in many instances to alleged social injustices without any recognition being given to the fact that the character of the disorders and injustices is of an identical type.

The Senator from West Virginia mentioned the demonstration that took place on the floor of the Senate approximately 1 week ago. He mentioned the demonstration that was staged in the meeting room of the Committee on Finance approximately 2 days ago. In each instance, the demonstrators threatened that unless their demands were granted, disorders and disturbances would follow.

In the District of Columbia, yesterday and the day before yesterday, I believe, approximately 100 prisoners demonstrated.

The Senator from West Virginia mentioned the paper written last May by a Dr. Cloward and a Mr. Piven. That paper should be read by every citizen, especially by every Member of Congress. It urges civil disobedience.

I discussed the subject the day before yesterday, and I ask unanimous consent that a transcript of what I said at that time be printed in the RECORD at this point, in connection with what the Senator from West Virginia has said.

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

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, during the day there has been a discussion about the causes of riots, insurrection, and rebellion. A discussion was carried on by the Senator from New York dealing with what is the anatomy of riots. The impression is left that the cause of riots within our country should be laid to the misdeeds and misconduct and cruelty and inhumanity of our Government. I cannot go along with that charge.

Not one word is spoken about causes, except that which was just mentioned by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT]—that there are many who are not concerned about improving the housing, educational, recreational, and health facilities of our country, but are only concerned with the creation of disorder.

It is on this subject that I want to speak primarily at this time. Mr. President, I shall read, substantially, from an article written by Alice Widener and published in Barron's magazine. The title of the article is "The East-West Ballroom—A Report on the Second Conference of Socialist Scholars":

"While ordinary out-of-towners were registering at the reception desk in the main lobby of the Hotel Commodore in New York City, Friday evening, September 9, 1966, more than two thousand members of the Old and New Left were registering at tables set up in ballroom floor hallways to attend the Second Annual Conference of Socialist Scholars."

Miss Widener further writes:

"The New Left movement in the country is generally described as a spontaneous, amorphous grouping of rebellious youth. It is not. Any observer who attended the conference during the week-end of September 9–11, would have recognized that most members of the New Left are activists who are instigated, controlled and manipulated by disciplined members of the Communist Party, working in a united front with Marxian ideologists."

This conference was held a little less than a year ago. I anticipate that there will be another one in October 1967. Two thousand Socialist scholars assembled at this annual conference of Socialist scholars.

I shall, as I proceed, invite the attention of Senators to arguments made at that conference. I read further:

"At the Socialist Scholars' discussion of 'poverty and powerlessness,' panelist James Haughton, director of the Harlem Unemployment Center, ranted into the microphone on the dais:"

I now call the Senate's attention specifically to what he said:

"Specifically, yes, the welfare system is rotten, but so is the whole American system rotten. You can't look anywhere in this country and see anything but rottenness. . . . Wherever the American octopus reaches out its tentacles, there you will find exploitation, cruelty, poverty, mass impoverishment."

"Dr. Haughton called for 'revolutionary change, not reform' . . . .

"The applause in the ballroom was deafening."

With due respect and humility, I ask, how do the words that are spoken in this Chamber differ from the words of this man, who labeled the U.S. Government an octopus, exploiting everywhere its tentacles could reach?

I repeat:

"Specifically, yes, the welfare system is rotten, but so is the whole American system rotten."

Mr. President, I reject those words. They are not true. They are not the words of a man who believes in our country. They are against our Government, and they indicate a purpose of those who uttered them to look toward the achievement of the destruction of this great system for the preservation of which so many lives have been given and so many bodies broken during the history of the existence of the Nation.

But this is not all that was said. I quote Alice Widener further:

"Haughton's impassioned speech had followed a calmly academic but insidiously dangerous paper presented by Prof. Richard A. Cloward of Columbia, whose work in sociology has greatly influenced the scandal-ridden, multi-million dollar Mobilization for Youth program in New York City, and also the multi-billion dollar federal Poverty Program and Job Corps project. Dr. Cloward is a member of Citizens Crusade Against Poverty, the group organized by Walter Reuther.

"Written with associate sociologist Frances Piven of Columbia, Dr. Cloward's paper for the Socialist Scholars opened with a call for a systematic strategy of 'irregular and disruptive tactics' among the poor, urging them to overburden city and state governments with their 'demands'."

Hear this noted sociologist, listened to by 2,000 people, making a call for a systematic strategy of irregular and disruptive techniques among the poor, urging them to overburden city and State governments with their demands.

It grows worse as the meeting goes on. It grows so bad that every lover of this country ought to become alarmed when he hears what has been said:

"Prof. Cloward explained that each welfare client in New York City is entitled under existing law to special benefits for clothing, blankets, etc. He said that in 1965 city special benefits welfare payments amounted to 'about $40 per client' and he called for each welfare client to demand $100 to $1,000 in such benefits."

Why demand $1,000 a month benefits, and, unless you get them, engage in disruptive demonstrations, if it is not for the purpose of paralyzing the normal operations of our Government?

He said there are now 550,000 welfare clients in the city, but that by 1967 there probably will be 600,000.

He tried to point out that 600,000 persons demonstrating can achieve their demands, because Government will give in, and give them whatever they ask for.

Cloward further went on to say that the previous month he had participated in "a national conference to organize the welfare recipients movement."

Mr. President, my query is: Does this indicate a sole purpose of trying to improve the social and economic life of the ones who protested, or is the purpose to create disorder and disruption, and thus paralyze the Government?

I come now to what is the most telling and most frightening part of what took place.

"The prospects—"

Outlined by Dr. Cloward—

"delighted Prof. William Ryan, formerly of Harvard, now of Yale, who described himself to the audience as 'a radical without portfolio.' He said, 'I have been enchanted with the Cloward strategy of blowing a fuse in the welfare agencies, housing developments, and among unmarried mothers. I wonder what would happen if there was a really systematic overload.' "

Overload of what? Overload of the demands made upon the Treasury.

Are we trying to put an overload upon the Treasury which some day might blow out the fuse?

I continue to read:

"When a member of the audience asked whether Dr. Cloward's strategy is a substitute for 'socialist organization of the proletariat,

the industrial factory workers,' Dr. Frances Piven of Columbia replied from the dais: 'I really only want to make one point—the disruption of the system. Welfare rolls will begin to go up; welfare payments will begin to go up—the impact will be very, very sharp. The mounting welfare budget will increase taxes, force cities to turn to the federal government. We have to help people to make claims; for this they will organize and act.'"

Mr. President, my only purpose in discussing what took place at that Conference of Socialistic Scholars was to give one added element to this anatomy of riots. Our country has been humane and generous. It has tried diligently and effectively to help the poor.

There are those, however, who would gladly see the collapse of the Government and are prepared to place upon the Treasury a tax burden that will blow the fuse.

I do not propose to be stampeded. I want to help, but I am going to help within limits that are reasonable, without being intimidated and threatened by demonstrators. I want solely to perform my duty to my Government and to all the people of our Nation.

Mr. President, I subscribe to the words spoken by the Senator from Colorado. I want to go along in part with this program, but I do want it clearly understood that we should beware and should understand that if we continue to yield to demonstrations and riots artificially stimulated by socialistic scholars, as evidenced in this meeting in New York City, we will never satisfy the demands of those who are pounding on the doors of the U.S. Treasury for inordinate expenditures.

I should like to discuss the fiscal status of our country. However, I know that that subject has been adequately discussed in the past. Therefore, I shall not do so.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Our country was established with the understanding that through peaceful conferences by legislative bodies, social and economic advances would be made; the poor would be protected; the powerfully rich would be stopped whenever they attempted to use their power improperly. Through more than 170 years we have moved under that principle. Today, it is no longer that.

I am in the twilight of my life, and it is the first time, after 35 years of public service, that I am observing, practically every day, manifestations of the belief that peaceful methods, through our legislators and Congress, are improper in achieving goals.

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

Mr. LAUSCHE. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

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

Mr. LAUSCHE. I had compassion for the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], who alone was in the room the day before yesterday when he was told that unless the committee yields, there will be further disorder and violence.

Our citizenry must wake up; and the law enforcement officials must recognize that unless law and order is maintained, anarchy must come into existence. And when there is anarchy, the innocent individuals, the weak, are the ones who pay the price.

Golden liberty was the thought of our forefathers. Achieve your objectives through peaceful means. Cast aside the gun and the club and the bullet, and proceed in the democratic processes to achieve your end. That is no longer the principle that prevails. The principle is, "Create disaster wherever you can, and you will achieve your objective."

Mr. President, I thank the Senator from West Virginia for his brilliant presentation. The subject should be discussed every day on the floor of the Senate, and those who are precipitating and in many instances innocently participating in the demonstrations should be taught that they are the ones who will pay the most painful price if the process is continued. My commendations go to the Senator from West Virginia.

Does the Senator have the paper which quotes what one of the women said about "unless you give in, there will be further disorders?"

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I shall read the first paragraph of the article that the Senator from West Virginia asked to have printed the RECORD:

> A bitter band of welfare mothers staged a "wait-in" for the entire Senate Finance Committee yesterday after testifying that there would be a "holocaust in every city" if restrictive House-passed welfare changes become law.

A holocaust—the burning down of buildings, private and public, in every city in the Nation. Are we going to give in? If we do, we might as well turn out the lights, pull down the flag, and say that our democracy is gone.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank the Senator from Ohio for his remarks.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from West Virginia and the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

It is time that we start developing a sincere dialog in Congress, so that we can, through mandate of law, prevent the occurrences which have been taking place not only in Congress, but also throughout the vast expanse of this land.

The right of petition, guaranteed under the Constitution of the United States, is being subverted by those who seek its shelter. Before too long, this very important and sacred provision of our Constitution will be eroded by those it seeks to help, and eventually our Constitution, the sacred document which guarantees the establishment and endurance of all our institutions, will be no more, except in letter. The spirit will be stolen from it by those who trample upon it.

It is time that we in Congress assure to ourselves, and for the health of this country, in free deliberation, that these people will not come upon the Capitol, that these people will not come upon the grounds of the White House or any other Federal building, to try to disrupt the just and true deliberations on the part of those who have been entrusted to handle the helm of Government.

I am in sympathy with the bill which has been introduced and which is being considered by the Committee on Public Works, to try to develop a course of behavior which, if violated, will constitute a grave offense against the dignity of our institutions as guaranteed under the Constitution of the United States.

In addition to the legislation which is confined to behavior on the Capitol Grounds, I have introduced a separate measure which will prescribe a definite mandate for course of behavior on the White House Grounds, so that our Vice President and President can handle the affairs of Government without threats, without unfair demonstrations, without any demonstrations which violate the sanctity of the right of petition or take advantage of it unjustly.

Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator from West Virginia for his very concrete and fine statement and for his observations in this respect.

It is about time that we in Congress put a glaring light upon this type of demonstration and that we encourage our State legislatures and our municipalities to pass laws and ordinances so that these demonstrations can be controlled within the purview and spirit of the right of petition so that our institutions will not be jeopardized by this undemocratic behavior on the part of many who want to subvert our Constitution and all that it stands for.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for 30 seconds?

Mr. MONTOYA. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator from New Mexico for his statement.

Mr. President, I ask that the Senator permit me to become a cosponsor of the measure about which he spoke.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that that be done.

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me briefly?

Mr. MONTOYA. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator for his kind reference to my speech.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I listened with interest to the speeches today, and I am delighted that emphasis has been placed on constitutional processes including the right to petition as against the forces of pressures and coercion. I think it is about time that these matters were faced up to. I think that it is about time, as do the Senator from New Mexico and my other colleagues, that we observe not only the spirit of the Constitution, but the letter as well. The Constitution has served this Republic very well since its adoption, and in my opinion it is just as good today, and applies with the same effect as it did in the beginning.

AMBASSADOR GOLDBERG'S SPEECH BEFORE THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, Ambassador Goldberg made a speech before the General Assembly yesterday. The point of Ambassador Goldberg's speech before the General Assembly yesterday was that the Vietnamese problem is a world problem; that a solution in Vietnam would be in the interest of all nations.

I would hope, on the basis of this speech, which I thoroughly approve of

because I think it is a sound step forward, that the United Nations would face up to its responsibility and stop placing the emphasis on other areas and other problems because in my opinion the most urgent problem facing the world is Vietnam and Southeast Asia.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a fine editorial which was published in the Baltimore Sun of today, entitled "Goldberg's Restatement."

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

GOLDBERG'S RESTATEMENT

The point of Ambassador Goldberg's speech before the General Assembly yesterday was that the Vietnamese problem is a world problem; that a solution in Vietnam would be in the interest of all nations, even the "micronations" of which Secretary General U Thant spoke the other day. Not that the United Nations is likely to agree to try to seek a solution. Russian opposition alone would prevent that, and many other countries are reluctant to involve themselves in so tangled and thorny a matter.

It was still proper for Mr. Goldberg to bring the issue up, and to put forward again, this time in the forum of the Assembly, the fundamental American position. This is that the Untied States wants peace talks, at any time and in any place, and that we continue to await any authoritative message from Hanoi that a cessation of the bombing would lead to negotiations. To many of his listeners this undoubtedly seemed sterile stuff, repeated so often as virtually to have lost meaning. But Mr. Goldberg insisted also on another aspect of the American policy. It is his Government's conviction, he said, that a military victory is not the answer in Vietnam. That is, he emphasized once more the still-limited nature of the American commitment—not a total war of annihilation, but war with force enough to persuade the enemy that he himself cannot win militarily, and so bring him to a settlement that neither destroys his own state nor permits him to achieve domination over another.

This portion of Mr. Goldberg's address will surely stick in some minds, even though the Assembly as a body is prevented from approving it.

UNITED STATES-JAPANESE RELATIONS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in our great concentration on the conflict in Vietnam, we tend to relegate our international situations to the background. With us, it is understandable that Vietnam should come first with us. By the same token, however, it should be recognized that other nations may also be preoccupied with issues of primary concern to them. Japan is a case in point. There is, at this time, a heavy pressure emanating from that nation for a prompt adjustment in the status of the Bonins—including the Volcanos—and the Ryukyu Islands.

The Senate will recall that the United States has administered these island groups since the end of World War II. We exercise this administrative authority, however, in the context of a treaty—commitment, to the effect that the islands remain Japanese territory and shall revert to full Japanese control at an appropriate time.

The question of what would be an appropriate time has been involved for many years with problems of security of the United States, Japan, and other nations of the western Pacific. During these years, the United States has developed at great cost on the island of Okinawa an enormous military base complex of immense power.

In remarks which I made in Japan last week I dwelt at some length on the question of Okinawa. Among other things, I suggested that it might be helpful to a satisfactory final Japanese-United States resolution of this question if there could be, first, a tripartite conference. First, we would know better what to do about the bases on Okinawa and when if we had an exchange of views, as among Japan, the United States, and the Soviet Union on the prospects for peace in the western Pacific and other questions of that region.

On the basis of an exploration of that kind, it seems to me that the United States could proceed with Japan, as we must at some point, to a satisfactory bilateral solution of the security issues which are involved in the Okinawan reversion. In a similar fashion, moreover, it seems to me that Japan and the Soviet Union might also subsequently be able to find a satisfactory bilateral settlement of the problem of the Habomais and Shikotan, Etorofu and Kunashiri—the southern Kuriles—all islands which are claimed by Japan but are held by the Soviet Union at the northern end of the Japanese chain.

There was considerable disagreement expressed in the Japanese press and elsewhere with the proposed tripartite approach. In general, the disagreement appeared to arise primarily from a Japanese concern about possible complications or a postponement in the settlement of the Okinawan problem. The Japanese clearly desire to have Okinawa returned to Japanese control without delay.

I can understand these anxieties, Mr. President, and insofar as the nonmilitary aspects of the Okinawan question are involved, I do not think, as I made clear in my statement, that there ought to be any undue delay in seeking agreement. However, I still think that the possibilities of arriving at a sensible bilateral resolution of the military aspect of the Okinawan problem, as between Japan and the United States, would be greatly enhanced by a better understanding of Soviet intentions and other insights which might result from a prior tripartite meeting.

In any event, Mr. President, the discussion which has been stimulated by the proposal for a tripartite conference seems to me to be a contribution to clearing the air of United States-Japanese relations and to bringing the issue into a better perspective. In spite of Vietnam, Mr. President, I would urge that the matter be pursued most attentively. The issue of Okinawa has become, quite suddenly, a central problem in the U.S. relationship with Japan. And there is no other relationship of greater significance to the interests of the United States in the Pacific and to the peace of that region.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my address to the Japanese-American Assembly on United States-Japanese relations which was given on September 15, 1967, in Shimoda, Japan, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

UNITED STATES-JAPANESE RELATIONS: PROPERTIES, PROBLEMS, AND PROSPECTS

(Address of Senator MIKE MANSFIELD before the Japanese-American Assembly, Shimoda, Japan, September 15, 1967)

It is a long way from Washington to Shimoda but Mrs. Mansfield and I were delighted with the opportunity to make the journey. As we anticipated on the basis of past visits, a brief exposure to Japanese hospitality has served to dissolve the great distances. We are happy to be with you and I am deeply moved by the privilege of addressing this distinguished gathering.

Each of us who is in attendance has come to Shimoda for a different complex of reasons. Yet I believe we are also drawn here by a common consideration. It is that we attach a high significance to the preservation of good relations between Japan and the United States. Most of us are old enough to remember a time and pain when these relations had deteriorated to such a degree that they were, in the end, consumed by war. We can remember the gulf of devastation over which it was necessary to try to build a bridge of conciliation.

After the conflict, we did try and we managed—Japanese and Americans—to construct that bridge. For two decades, effective ties have been maintained between our countries. They are ties which have enriched our lives and contributed to the prosperity and progress of both nations. They are ties which have been a mighty factor in the preservation of the peace of the Pacific.

I think the question which should engage us most profoundly at this time is whether we can continue in the pattern of the past two decades. Can the effectiveness of the U.S.-Japanese relationship persist, in the decade ahead, even as the ties themselves are woven into new forms for new times?

If the source of the U.S.-Japanese relations were solely contacts among those attending this Japanese-American Assembly, the question would pose no dilemmas. Without any hesitation, the properties of U.S.-Japanese relations could then be described as excellent, the problems as negligible and the prospects as unlimited.

The same would be true if it were simply a matter of commerce between Japan and the United States. The two nations buy and sell from one another with great liberality. Current trade is at a new high level and on a very profitable mutual basis. Japan is second in the world after Canada, as a purchaser of U.S. exports. The United States, in turn, takes something like 30 per cent of all of Japan's exports. Japanese industrial techniques, moreover, are highly respected and the products of Japan's brilliant design are currently very much in demand in the United States.

If I may digress, I can personally attest to the great acceptability of these products. My ears have become attuned to the subtle difference between the "putt-putt" of a Honda and that of a Suzuki and the "purr-purr" of a Datsun and that of a Toyota. These and other Japanese vehicles are to be found in considerable numbers and are in great favor in most of the neighborhoods of the United States—except late at night.

Insofar as trade is concerned, then, any difficulties between Japan and the United States would seem to be more in the nature of removable irritants rather than major headaches. The sum of Japanese-U.S. relations, however, is not calculated solely on the

computers of commerce. Nor is the tone of the relationship established only by the warm dialogues of groups such as this Japanese-American Assembly. The relationship, rather, reflects the continuous flow of change within each nation and takes form in the complex international politics of the Western Pacific and the world.

Let me emphasize that the thoughts which I am about to voice are those of one Senator of the United States. I do not speak for the Senate of the United States or any segment of its Membership. Nor do I speak for the President of the United States even though we are of the same political party. I speak for myself and only myself. But I speak freely and frankly, as a student, a teacher and a Member of the Senate who has been deeply concerned for many years with the problems of foreign relations.

In asserting this independence, I would not wish to create the impression that the Senate is in constant conflict with the Executive Branch of the United States government. Seen from this distance and through the prisms of the press that may sometimes appear to be the case. The reality, however, is to the contrary. The President of the United States and the Senate are in frequent consultation and far more often than not, in agreement. The United States government, in short, proceeds most of the time, with its component bodies moving in separate orbits but in substantial harmony. That is true in matters of foreign policy no less than domestic policy.

I stress these systemic details, because I wish to emphasize that I am not here to transmit the official views of the United States government. Only the President and his emissaries are able to speak in that fashion. I am here as all of us are here—as an interested person. I am here to express to you my understanding, my concern and my hope for U.S.-Japanese relations. I am here in the expectation of returning to the United States with new and enriched insights into these relations.

With that as background, let me say first, that the official U.S.-Japanese relationship appears to me to be satisfactory at this time. If the bell does not ring perfectly in every instance, nevertheless, it continues to ring with a certain mellowness of tone. I have already alluded to the value and mutuality of our commercial contacts. It can be noted, too, that our governments do not denounce each other in communiques. On the contrary, our diplomats work together with civility and understanding.

Over the years these public servants who are at the very tip of contact between the two nations have met their responsibilities with great energy, high skill and exceptional dedication. We have been particularly fortunate in the caliber of the Ambassadors who have served both countries. Professor Reischauer, for example, is widely regarded in the United States and by both the Administration and the Senate as one of the most effective representatives our country has ever sent abroad. Ambassador Takeuchi, who recently returned to Japan after a four year assignment, was greatly admired in the United States for, as was said in a Washington newspaper, "his good sense, good manners, and good diplomacy." The present Ambassadors, Mr. Johnson and Mr. Shimada, are the inheritors of an exemplary tradition to which they are in the process of adding contributions.

An able diplomacy, then, has been a critical element in fashioning the effective ties which exist between Japan and the United States. Over the years, it has been a diplomacy which has faced difficulties in a temperate fashion. It has been a diplomacy which has devised timely adjustments of policies to meet these difficulties.

That kind of diplomacy is an imperative if the quality of the U.S.-Japanese relationship is to endure in the new situation which is emerging in the Western Pacific. Perhaps "new situation" is not precisely the term. What is transpiring in this region, as I see it, is a reassertion of an historic situation in up-to-date form.

The decisive element in the new situation is the reemergence of Japan. Great material strength is, of course, a part of this development. The Japanese economy has displayed an extraordinary dynamism which has already restored this nation to the first rank of the industrialized nations of the world.

Yet there is more involved than economic virtuosity. An emergent Japanese leadership, I believe, derives a world-wide acceptability from new and perceptive approaches to the rest of the world and its needs. These approaches may well have been forged in the tragedy of World War II and tempered by the profound postwar experiences of this nation.

In this context, Japan's enormous achievements in every field of modern human endeavor have special relevance to the old-new nations of Asia and to the entire world in the search for human progress and a stable peace. Japan is already making significant contributions in the Asian Development Bank and the United Nations and in other regional and world-wide organizations. The Japanese nation can play, if it so chooses, a part of even greater importance, particularly in the process of integrating an economic modernization with a responsible nationalism, within a framework of multilateral cooperation.

The unfolding of the international capabilities of Japan has coincided with a degree of redirection in the American effort with respect to the underdeveloped nations. There has been a kind of dovetailing of adjustments as between Japanese and U.S. policies in connection with economic development, with the one rising towards its potential and the other falling from what has long been, in my judgment, an abnormal level, particularly in this part of the world.

There has also been a dovetailing of policies with regard to the defense of the Western Pacific. Over the years, significant adjustments have been made in the largely unilateral American military base upon which this defense has rested. It is not so long ago, for example, that there were tens of thousands of American soldiers quartered in every part of Japan. It is not so long ago, that these forces constituted the only military defense of Japan. It is not so long ago, too, that this nation served as a point of departure for massive American forces bound for the war in Korea.

As you know, all this has changed. May I say that it is a relief to the people of the United States that it is no longer necessary to keep massive forces in Japan and I expect that that is also a relief to the people of Japan.

Other changes of this kind will be made by an alert diplomacy, I am sure, as the desirability is indicated. With respect to Okinawa, obviously, the need for an adjustment seems to be coming to the surface at this time.

Before considering this question, let me stress the urgency of keeping open minds on all aspects of the U.S.-Japanese relationship if the open doors of essential cooperation are not to close. We must face change if changes are indicated in any and every aspect of the relationship. We must be prepared to face changes before change is forced upon us by events.

The Okinawan problem, you will recall, arises from the fact that certain clauses were left dangling, so to speak, in the Peace Treaty of 1951. Those clauses involve not only the status of the Ryukyus but also of the Bonins and Volcanos. As I understand the problem, there is no question that these territories are Japanese within the meaning of the Peace Treaty. A question arises, however, as to the date—the timing—of the transfer of full authority from the United States to Japan. A question also arises as to the possibility of interim adjustments in administration before the final return of the islands.

With regard to the Bonins and the Volcanos, let me say that I am not aware of any circumstances so compelling as to require an indefinite postponement of the liquidation of the Treaty commitment. There are no major U.S. military installations there and strategic considerations do not appear to be involved in any significant way. In sum, there would appear to be no major blocks—at least I know of none—to the restoration of the Bonins and the Volcanos to Japan as required by the Peace Treaty. It would appear moreover, that this piece of unfinished business of the Treaty could be closed out not only without difficulties but also without delay.

I wish that the same might be said for Okinawa and the Ryukyus. Since there is a problem in this connection, it seems to me that a full consideration of the situation is in order. The absence of frank exchange of views, in the open, on Okinawa has given rise to rumors and innuendos. These hints seem to me to distort the motives of the United States and certainly do not contribute to the cordiality of U.S.-Japanese relations.

It has been said, for example, that the United States clings to the Ryukyus because of the war in Viet Nam. Of course, Okinawa is of importance to the United States in this connection. We have over half-a-million men involved in Southeast Asia. Our military installations in Okinawa serve as one source of supply for these forces, and we are determined that these men shall not lack supplies. That is not to say that there are no alternative ways by which their needs may be met. In my judgment, therefore, it is quite inaccurate to ascribe the problem of Okinawa to Viet Nam.

It has also been suggested that the United States desires to use the Ryukyus as some sort of bargaining chit in the extension of the Japanese-U.S. Defense Treaty. I do not know whether the Defense Treaty will be modified a few years hence and, if so, in what way.

It should be obvious, however, that the American government would not be so crass as to use the well-being of the people of the Ryukyus for some vague bargaining purposes in connection with the review of the Treaty. What could be sought and obtained by that course which would be of significant value to the United States? The assertion that the U.S. will seek to bend the Japanese viewpoint in treaty revision with the lever of Okinawa is as uninformed as it is unfounded. Even the thought that such could be the case is out of harmony with the entire character of Japanese-U.S. relations during the past few years.

To be sure, there are difficulties with regard to the return of the Ryukyus. They involve, however, not transitory considerations or base motives but very fundamental questions. These questions have to do with the uncertainty of the general security needs in the Western Pacific in the years ahead. They have to do with Japan's safety no less than that of the United States and other Asian-Pacific nations. They have to do with the relevance, today, of the defense concepts which prevailed at the time of the signing of the Japanese-U.S. Defense Treaty a decade and a half ago. They have to do with the nature of the American role in the Western Pacific in the decade or decades ahead—with what is expected of us by Japan and others as a defense contribution in this region.

Let me say bluntly in this connection that it would be only in an inertia of intellect, that we would fail to grasp the significant

differences in the Western Pacific today as compared with 15 years ago or even ten or five. Consider for a moment the change in the very positioning of American military power. Fifteen years ago, as I have already noted, U.S. strength was concentrated largely in Japan and it had converged with a great force of men and equipment on the peninsula of Korea. Where is it now? To be sure, there are still points of power north of Okinawa. But the focus of the U.S. military role in the Western Pacific has shifted south to Viet Nam at the other end of the Asian littoral.

Consider, too, the extraordinary change in the character of relations between China and the Soviet Union. You will recall that these two nations signed a Defense Treaty in 1950 on the basis of unbreakable Communist solidarity and an implacable hostility towards the United States and Japan. Today, the fury of Peking comes down—as the rain—impartially upon the Soviet Union and the United States. Today, the monolith of Sino-Soviet relations which stood until Stalin's death lies shattered by border quarrels and by ideological and other clashes between the two great mainland powers. Yet only a few years ago, it was commonly believed that, through communism, Russia had fastened a permanent yoke on the Chinese people. The fact is that there is not even a common ideology within China, much less one which binds the Chinese forever in subservience to the Russians.

I cite the disintegrative characteristics of the Chinese situation and the Sino-Soviet relationship only as a factor; I am not at all sure what consequences will flow from them in the end. Rather I make reference to them because they are profound elements in the changing situation in the Western Pacific. In a similar vein, I would note certain constructive adjustments which are taking place in this region. There is, for example, the more balanced view of Japan which has developed in Moscow and appeared to be developing in Peking at least until the outbreak of the current inner difficulties in China. There is the complementary effort of Japan to build bridges to its mainland neighbors. Together the two adjustments have produced an impressive increase in contact between China and Japan and between the Soviet Union and Japan, particularly in the realm of commerce.

If I am not mistaken, China now ranks fourth in the world in Japan's foreign trade with a current total volume of about $600 million. With respect to the Soviet Union, it is my understanding that not only is there a very substantial and growing Japanese trade but the general tone of the relationship has so improved that it has become feasible even to contemplate a joint Soviet-Japanese development of the natural resources of Sakhalin and Siberia.

These new trends have emerged from what was, just a few years ago, a sea of fear between Japan and the Northeast Asian mainland. They would appear to herald the return of more normal relationships in this region. Normal, in the sense in which it is used would involve the return of Japan, China and the Soviet Union to the center of the stage, so to speak, in the affairs of the Western Pacific. In view of the history of this region, it should not be surprising if this inner triangular relationship should be reasserted.

Indeed, it would be my hope that the changes which are appearing in this connection will permit the role of the United States in this region also to be scaled to more normal dimensions. The United States did not seek the massive role in which we have found ourselves in the Western Pacific for so many years. Rather it was the exigencies of World War II and its aftermath which thrust us deeply into this region. A restoration of a more stable situation as between China and Japan and Japan and the Soviet Union would appear to me to be helpful to the United States in the adjustment of its own position.

At this point, however, we still do not know whether the developments which I have been discussing foreshadow a more stable situation in the Western Pacific. We still do not know whether they foreshadow a situation in which the demands on U.S. military power in this region can be reduced.

There are, in any event, no certain responses to such questions. There can only be sound judgments. It seems to me that Japan and the United States should come together to try to make joint calculations respecting these developments. It seems to me that the two nations should do so without undue delay, on behalf of their common security and the peace of the Western Pacific.

Such calculations would also have relevance to the problem of the Ryukyus. That is not to say that security calculations are especially pertinent to the non-military aspects of this question. I cannot see, for example, that it is necessary to clarify the ambiguities of the Sino-Soviet dispute, in order to give consideration to the possibilities of a restoration of Japanese jurisdiction over islands in the Ryukyus, other than Okinawa. Nor do I see that we have to be assured that the fragile new bridges which stretch between Japan and the Soviet Union and between Japan and China will stand for all times in order to give consideration to Japanese participation in the administration of the civilian affairs of Okinawa, *provided* we bear in mind the great necessity for safeguarding the effectiveness of the military installations which are located there.

As I have suggested, however, the ultimate disposition of the Okinawa question does involve a sober and joint estimate of the significance of major developments and changes in the Western Pacific. An estimate of that kind, in turn, requires a better understanding of Soviet intentions in the Northeast Pacific. It requires a better understanding of the upheavals within China and their relevance not only for the Sino-Soviet Defense Treaty of 1950 but also for the Japanese-U.S. Defense Treaty. It requires, finally, a better understanding of nuclear development in China and the prospects for curbing by agreement the grave risks which are posed by nuclear weapons to the Western Pacific and the world.

One would expect that our joint understanding of these matters would be improved in connection with review of the Japanese-U.S. Defense Treaty a few years hence. However, it is not necessary to sit on our hands until that time. It occurs to me that the problem of Okinawa itself provides a sufficient basis for beginning now a joint consideration of the security questions of the Western Pacific. It occurs to me, too, that consideration might also be given to inviting the Soviet Union to join with the United States and Japan in joint examination of these questions. Would not tripartite discussions of this kind be of value in clarifying them? Indeed, I should think even that quadripartite meetings, to include China, would be useful, except for the turmoil which exists at this time on the Chinese mainland.

The illumination which would be provided by tripartite discussions of Japan, the Soviet Union, and the United States might help to provide a more rapid conclusion of the Ryukyus question. One would hope that it might also hasten a final resolution of the question of Etorofu and Kunashiri and of Shikotan and the Habomais. In sum, a tripartite meeting might speed the liquidation of all vestiges of the unfinished business of World War II and give more durable form to the peace of the Pacific. And may I add, two decades after, that it is about time.

I make the suggestion to an American-Japanese discussion group that there might well be three-way discussions of problems of the Western Pacific which would include the Soviet Union because I am confident that the Japanese and the Americans here share a hope for the peace of the Pacific. I am confident, too, that we share a realization of our obligation, as human beings, to work together through our respective nations and with all other nations for that peace and for world peace, to the end that there shall be no end to the civilized experience on this planet.

SOUTH VIETNAM—CHIEU HOI PROGRAM

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, I am happy to be able to report that the latest figures on the Chieu Hoi program in South Vietnam indicate mounting success in the effort to bring Vietcong guerrillas back to the side of the National Government. As of the week ending September 8, 1967, the total number of returnees in 1967 is 22,494. This compares with 20,242 during the entire 12-month period of 1966.

In my report, submitted to the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services after my trip to Vietnam earlier this year, I stated:

> For many reasons, primarily military pressure, the morale of the Viet Cong shows signs of deterioration. In this respect, I was impressed with AID's program of "Open Arms" or Chieu Hoi.
>
> This program actively solicits defections from the Viet Cong through the use of various propaganda techniques. These returnees furnish a mass of intelligence; 20 percent of them join the Army of South Vietnam.
>
> The success of this program affords a barometer on Viet Cong morale.

The Chieu Hoi program began as early as 1963 when President Diem announced an amnesty for those members of the Vietcong who would return to the side of the Government. Well received initially, the number of returnees fluctuated according to the political conditions in South Vietnam and with the success of the Vietcong military operations. However, the failure of the Communists to win a quick victory, along with the arrival of large numbers of combat troops from the United States and the establishment of a more stable government in Saigon gave impetus to the program. In 1965 more than 11,000 Vietcong defected. As I mentioned earlier, the number almost doubled in 1966.

To attract returnees from the Vietcong ranks, the Government conducts an extensive information campaign. Leaflets, radio broadcasts, loudspeaker announcements, drama teams, and folk singers are a few of the means used to spread the Chieu Hoi message. During the truce for the Lunar New Year, Tet, the Government enlarged the campaign at a time when the Vietcong were considered to be most receptive to the appeals. Many of them returned to their homes during the holiday. The Government propaganda teams visited the home of each suspected Vietcong before the holiday and left an envelope containing the New Year's greeting of the Government, a description of the Chieu Hoi program, a safe-conduct pass, and instructions on how

to defect, including a map showing the route to the nearest reception center. This extra effort is reflected in the larger number of defectors during the period between the end of February and the first week in April.

Reception centers have been set up in each of the 44 mainland provinces, in three autonomous cities, in four regional locations, and in one national center in Saigon. The 52 centers have a yearly capacity of 45,000 returnees based on six 2-month cycles.

When the returnee arrives at a reception center, he is carefully interviewed to determine his sincerity in coming over to the Government and to develop information about Vietcong operations in the area. He is given food, clothing, housing, medical care if needed, and a cash allowance for incidental expenses. If he has brought along weapons or significant documents, he is given a cash reward.

After a period of rehabilitation and indoctrination, most of the returnees go back to their home villages and resume their old occupations, generally farming. The Government assists them with food and farming supplies and a resettlement allowance. If he has no home, or if it is in a Vietcong territory, he may settle in a Chieu Hoi village. Here he receives a house, some land, and subsistence for 6 months for himself and his family.

Few of the defectors go back to the Vietcong, although enemy propaganda continuously invites them back.

There would seem to be a significant corollary to the effectiveness of the Chieu Hoi program in the diminishing rate of North Vietnam recruiting of South Vietnamese into the Vietcong. This was reported in the Joseph Alsop column, datelined Saigon, in the Washington Post of September 22, 1967. While the Hanoi government was recruiting South Vietnamese at the rate of 7,000 men a month in the early part of 1966, the number has now dropped, according to Alsop, to only 2,000 a month.

Mr. President, this program merits the full support of our Government. Its obvious success is contributing to the war effort. I ask unanimous consent that the latest figures on the Chieu Hoi program and the Alsop column of September 22, be included in the RECORD.

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

The Chieu Hoi program—Returnees during 1967

January 1 to 7	437
January 8 to 14	420
January 15 to 21	592
January 22 to 28	823
Total	2,272
January 29 to February 4	581
February 5 to 11	612
February 12 to 18	616
February 19 to 25	1,108
Total	2,917
February 26 to March 4	1,168
March 5 to 11	1,198
March 12 to 18	1,004

The Chieu Hoi program—Returnees during 1967—Continued

March 19 to 25	1,187
March 26 to 31	1,000
Total	5,557
April 1 to 7	1,005
April 8 to 14	693
April 16 to 22	642
April 23 to 29	465
Total	2,805
April 30 to May 6	492
May 7 to 13	591
May 14 to 20	538
May 21 to 27	528
Total	2,149
May 28 to June 3	475
June 4 to 10	485
June 11 to 17	474
June 18 to 24	528
June 25 to 30	483
Total	2,445
July 1 to 7	419
July 8 to 14	423
July 15 to 21	518
July 22 to 28	504
Total	1,864
July 29 to August 4	389
August 5 to 11	418
August 12 to 18	519
August 19 to 25	472
August 26 to September 1	333
September 2 to 8	355
Total to date	22,494

The Chieu Hoi program—Returnees during 1966

January 1 to 7	315
January 8 to 14	289
January 15 to 21	252
January 22 to 28	247
Total	1,103
January 29 to February 4	351
February 5 to 11	368
February 12 to 18	441
February 19 to 25	922
Total	2,082
February 26 to March 4	660
March 5 to 11	431
March 12 to 18	422
March 19 to 25	324
March 26 to April 1	499
Total	2,336
April 2 to 8	646
April 9 to 15	314
April 16 to 22	285
April 23 to 29	265
Total	1,510
April 30 to May 6	291
May 7 to 13	364
May 14 to 20	335
May 21 to 27	247
May 28 to June 3	257
Total	1,494
June 4 to 10	354
June 11 to 17	373
June 18 to 24	274
June 25 to July 1	313
Total	1,314

The Chieu Hoi program—Returnees during 1966—Continued

July 2 to 8	339
July 9 to 15	256
July 16 to 22	322
July 23 to 29	261
Total	1,178
July 30 to August 5	295
August 6 to 12	254
August 13 to 19	280
August 20 to 26	262
August 27 to 31	166
Total	1,257
September 1 to 7	204
September 8 to 14	189
September 15 to 21	266
September 22 to 28	226
Total	885
September 29 to October 5	315
October 6 to 12	377
October 13 to 19	477
October 20 to 26	392
October 27 to November 2	501
Total	2,062
November 3 to 9	566
November 10 to 16	611
November 17 to 23	556
November 24 to 30	772
Total	2,505
December 1 to 7	464
December 8 to 14	448
December 15 to 21	585
December 22 to 28	602
December 29 to 31	417
Total	2,516
Annual total	20,242

HANOI'S LOSSES IN MANPOWER ARE HEADING TO CRUCIAL STAGE

(By Joseph Alsop)

SAIGON.—Are the intransigent noises currecently being made in Hanoi a kind of whistling in the graveyard, in the most horribly literal sense of that phrase?

The question arises for two quite different reasons. In Israel, to begin with, Moshe Dayan was explaining the almost inconceivably detailed and far-sighted preparations the Israeli General Staff had made before their confrontation with the Arabs. This reporter thoughtlessly remarked that all this forethought no doubt explained the trifling figure of Israeli losses.

"Trifling!" said Dayan with some sharpness. "You do not seem to have figured out that for our small Israel to lose 800 men in a week is like your giant United States losing more than 60,000 in a week."

Obviously Dayan was right, as he has a habit of being, to use the population-loss ratio as the correct gauge of a war's cost. Obviously, too, this is the right way to gauge the cost of the war here to North Vietnam, which has a population of approximately 16 million.

It must be said at once that this matter of the war's cost to Hanoi has already produced grave errors of judgment, including grave errors by this reporter. In particular, far too little weight was given to the cardinal fact that at the time of the serious American intervention in the summer of 1965, we were beginning a war of attrition from what amounted to a standing start.

At that time, in other words, the war was costing North Vietnam almost nothing. The military hardware came from China, in the main. The cost of delivery in South Vietnam

was then minimal. Hanoi's main investment then amounted in fact to the two North Vietnamese divisions, about 25,000 men, that were then in the South, plus the cadres needed to maintain Hanoi's entire direction and control of the southern War.

The Southerners—the true Vietcong—were then paying all the rest of the bill. And throughout 1965 and early 1966, the largest part of the burden continued to be borne by Hanoi's puppets in the South, for in this period Vietcong recruitment rates were still maintained at a high level.

By the spring of 1966, however, replacing losses by recruiting in the South began to become more and more difficult. Careful analysis of captured documents has shown that the Southern recruiting rate was then 7000 men a month; and this was not enough to prevent an increasing requirement for troops from the North.

By the spring of this year, further careful analysis of the continuing flood of captured documents revealed that the Southern recruiting had dropped to about 3500 men a month. Another round of analysis is now in progress, with results not as yet exactly predictable. But it is a good horseback guess that the new rate of Southern recruitment will not be much above 2000 men a month.

The Southern recruiting rate must in turn be set against enemy losses in battle, in prisoners of war, and in deserters that reached just under 10,000 men in January, soared to 16,000 in March, again passed 15,000 in April and dropped to the level of a bit more than 12,500 in July. Adding the very substantial losses along the Ho Chi Minh Trail (often as high as 10 per cent of an outfit in transit) plus the serious toll taken by malaria and other diseases, and you get a total enemy loss for July that cannot have been much below 15,000 men and may have reached 18,000.

Let us take the median figure of 16,000 a month, which is probably very conservative. Nearly half this total were soldiers who fell in the particularly heavy fighting along the DMZ and elsewhere in the First Corps Area. Here the enemy troops engaged are mainly North Vietnamese.

In the Second and Third Corps Areas, too, almost all the big units have by now become predominantly North Vietnamese, even when they have a VC label. These units have also been fairly heavily engaged. Thus it is a fair estimate that about 7000 North Vietnamese were lost in the month of July alone.

Furthermore, the Hanoi war planners have reached the crucial stage where they must choose between replacing very large VC losses with still more North Vietnamese, or quite radically changing their own plans. If Southern recruitment is only 2000 to 3000 per month, and the overall enemy loss rate is something like 16,000 per month, then the North must meet a monthly replacement bill of at least 13,000 per month.

Using Dayan's ratio, the North Vietnamese losses in July are equivalent to American losses of about 80,000 men in a single month. Again using Dayans' ratio, furthermore the monthly replacement requirement the Hanoi war planners now appear to have to meet is equivalent to a requirement for about 170,000 Americans per month. It also exceeds the maximum manpower drain the Pentagon experts long ago decided Hanoi could withstand for any period.

The Hanoi war planners of course have the option of changing the wars pattern—by relinquishing their designs on the First Corps Area, particularly. But that means the beginning of acceptance of defeat. And if they do not change the pattern, the question then arises, how long they can possibly continue at such cost?

Not forever is the obvious though lamentably imprecise answer.

RIOTS AND CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, a very fine article, written by David Lawrence, appeared in the Washington Evening Star on September 15, 1967. It is entitled "Riots and the U.S. Government." I want to read it to the Senate.

This is what Mr. Lawrence had to say:

President Johnson has apparently decided that he will not allow any blame for riots of the last two years to be imposed upon him in the political arena in 1968. But the speech he made in Kansas City yesterday to the International Association of Police Chiefs, stating that the responsibility for keeping the peace is "squarely on the shoulders of local authorities" and that the federal government cannot "prevent a riot in a great metropolis," by no means closes the debate.

Strictly speaking, the President is right in saying that the local police must bear the burden of law enforcement. But this is not the basic issue. The causes of riots are far more pertinent than what is done to squelch them once they have begun. Indeed, the federal government is today primarily responsible for the climax that has been reached in the conflict between the races arising from the problems of segregation and desegregation.

Under the civil-rights acts which have been passed in the last few years, the federal government has assumed a responsibility for racial relations such as has never been undertaken by the states in the North or the South. Congress has enacted laws giving the federal government the right to intervene in questions involving racial "discrimination" in almost any form.

The federal government, moreover, wields its vast powers over the disbursement of public funds as a club over the heads of state and local authorities in order to speed up "integration" not only in schools but in public accommodations, housing and employment.

What Johnson conveniently overlooks is that in many cities in the North—like Milwaukee, for example—the issue of "open housing" would never have developed into the bitter controversy that has been the cause of recent rioting if it had not been for the federal government's intrusion into the whole housing problem.

Thus, while it may be literally true that the federal government itself cannot prevent a riot by sending policemen into a community, the federal courts and a majority of the congress, together with the President, joined to impose upon the states rules and regulations in the handling of racial "discrimination" which are at the heart of the whole problem of rioting and discontent.

The Department of Justice goes into court promptly to take action against schools or other institutions in the South which allegedly are engaging in "discriminatory" practices, but is slow to do so in other areas of the country. Federal troops were sent into Mississippi and Alabama to quell disturbances without any request on the part of the governors of those states, but President Johnson hesitated to order troops to Detroit until he had a written request from the governor of Michigan. A controversy is still going on as to who was responsible for the delay, during which the casualty list grew.

The President himself in his Kansas City speech declared that a new threat to local law enforcement has been raised in the "violence this summer," which has "spawned a group of men whose interest lay in provoking others to destruction while they fled its consequences." He condemned "these poisonous propagandists." But weren't these very persons moving in interstate commerce and thus subject to federal power?

Johnson has heretofore made a few abstract statements about the breakdown of law and order, but he has not until now denounced the irresponsible individuals who have provoked violence by arousing the passions of both whites and Negroes in various parts of the country. There are authentic reports, too, about nationwide organizations with Communists in their midst.

It is largely because there has been no denunciation from the White House that large numbers of "civil rights" demonstrators have felt that they had the support of the administration in their quest for more and more benefits and that "the end justifies the means."

When the 1968 campaign begins, it may be expected that, just as has happened in the past, the voters may tend to blame the incumbent administration for the unrest and lawless conditions prevailing throughout the country.

Mr. President, this article goes to the heart of a great deal of the trouble, and I hope that Senators will study the contents of it very carefully.

At the same time, as Mr. Lawrence stated, when President Johnson tries to wash his hands of this situation in this country, he is pursuing a course which cannot be justified.

He told the chiefs of police in Kansas City that keeping the peace was "squarely on the shoulders of local authorities." That may be true as for combating riots after they have begun is concerned, but what are the basic causes of riots? What can the President do there? What can Congress do? What can the Supreme Court do?

There is no question in my mind that there are things that should be done.

The President of the United States, in my judgment, should recommend that the appellate power of the Supreme Court be limited. He should recommend that Congress pass legislation to do that. He should recommend that technicalities not be allowed to intervene and defeat the ends of justice.

In my opinion, the recent decisions of the Supreme Court have done more than any other single thing to contribute to a general atmosphere to cause crime to increase in this country. When criminals know that they can commit crimes and may not be apprehended, but if apprehended stand a good chance of being allowed to get off on a mere technicality, it only encourages more crime.

The decision of the Supreme Court, holding that a lawyer must be present if a confession is made, is an unnecessary decision and is greatly handicapping law enforcement. If a confession is truly voluntary, obtained without coercion, force, or compulsion, it should be admitted into evidence.

When the Supreme Court held that a defendant was held a little too long, for his confession to be admitted in evidence in his trial, although he was guilty and had admitted that he was guilty, in my judgment, the Supreme Court did this country and the cause of law and order a great injustice.

I think that the President of the United States has a duty, to crusade, if necessary and certainly to recommend to Congress that it take steps to offset those Supreme Court decisions which have done such great harm to this country.

Then, too, I am convinced that the President has a duty in connection with the subject of civil disobedience.

There are preachers and teachers in colleges today, and other leaders in this country, who are saying that if the law offends the conscience of a person he should not have to obey that law. There are teachers in colleges telling their students that if a law does not agree with their conscience, they do not have to obey it.

That is completely unreasonable. I think that the President has a duty to tell the people that. He also has a duty to tell the college teachers that, as well as our misled preachers, if we are going to continue to have a civilized society based on law and order.

I remember, in World War II, when we went into France, Germany, and other countries, the very first thing our military authorities did was to restore law and order.

You cannot have a civilized society without law and order. We will not maintain a civilized society in America without law and order. Law and order is the very heart of a civilized society.

Then, too, in my judgment, the President ought to expose some of these leaders. I think he ought to take the record of Martin Luther King and tell the American people who he is, where he is geting his money, and whom he represents. I think he ought to take the record of Rap Brown and expose it to the American people. He ought to expose these other leaders who are going from State to State, agitating, creating disturbances, making inflammatory speeches, and causing riots to erupt and demonstrations to occur, as if they were all spontaneous.

I think the President has the responsibility to lead in this matter. I have not heard him say one word that I felt was important in this law-and-order question. He now says the burden is on the local police. Of course it is on the local police, and the law enforcement people, to enforce the law; but the President has the responsibility and must shoulder the blame when he does not help to prevent the causes of these riots, demonstrations, and violations of law and order.

I have not heard the President criticize when people have come down to this Capitol and have done things here to, in effect, virtually coerce or threaten Members of Congress. Why does he not speak out on that? He is the Chief Executive of this country.

I want to see Congress take a stand on this question, too. I want to see the appellate power of the Supreme Court limited. I want to see some of those decisions set aside.

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

Mr. THURMOND. I ask unanimous consent to have 3 more minutes.

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

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, there is another thing, too, that I think the President of the United States has the responsibility to do. That is to tell the American people they cannot get something for nothing. I think that enters into this question. We might call it false compassion, leading the people to believe they can get something for nothing, leading them to believe that the Government will support them whether they work or not.

What inducement is it to people when they can stay on relief for 38 weeks in the District of Columbia, 9½ months, and then get off it for only a short period of time and then get back on unemployment relief?

It seems to me it is the responsibility on the part of the executive to recommend legislation to remedy this. There is a responsibility on the part of the Congress to pass that legislation. I think there is a responsibility here for leadership to be shown in these matters.

In my judgment, if a man is disabled, physically or mentally, somebody has got to take care of him. If the local community does not do it, the State ought to do it. If the State does not do it, the Federal Government ought to do it. If he cannot get a job, the same thing applies. I think the local community or the State or the Federal Government ought to provide jobs if necessary, because people have to work to make a living. But so far as a handout goes, I do not think anybody ought to have a handout given to him if he is physically or mentally able to work.

I say, let the President come out with a program to let the Government give people jobs if they cannot get jobs. It is not a difficult thing to get jobs in most places in this country. In South Carolina we want workers. We cannot get people in South Carolina to fill the jobs there. Our personnel people are crying for workers. They are crying for skilled workers. They are crying for semiskilled and even unskilled workers. We need people in South Carolina. I understand that in most places today people can get jobs if they want them. A lot of the people do not want to work. They are parasites. They want to live on the public. I do not think the Government ought to support them. I think every man ought to support himself and his own family unless he is physically or mentally incapable of doing so.

Another point enters into this question, and that is that some of these people in this country, as I mentioned a few moments ago, are subversively inclined. Some of these people, if they do not start or direct these demonstrations, have infiltrated them and participated in them. I think the President of the United States has an obligation to investigate communism in the crimes, in the demonstrations, in the riots, in the violations of law and order. It is there. If he does not think it is there, let him talk to the FBI. The FBI will tell him. I think he knows where it is, but he is afraid he will offend certain blocs of voters and he will not tell the American people about it. He will not take the necessary steps to expose the undercurrents working behind the scenes. He will not recommend to Congress that it do something about it. He does not do anything about it himself because he does not want to lose the votes of certain groups.

In my judgment, this is a very serious question, and I think the time has come when something must be done. I hope the President will change his position and show some leadership in this field. I further hope Congress will take the necessary steps, whether the President does or not.

ECONOMISTS AGREE GOVERNMENT WASTING BILLIONS IN PUBLIC WORKS SPENDING

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on Wednesday, September 20, three economic experts testified before the Economy in Government Subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee on the wasteful way this Congress is pouring out billions of dollars in a gross misallocation of our resources.

This is not because Members of Congress like to throw money away, not because there is venality or corruption in the Congress. It is because we have no way of establishing priorities. We make no effective effort to determine whether the Federal Government can better invest funds in our economy or whether it is wiser to leave that investment to the private economy. We have no sensible way of determining whether we are going to get back in benefits the cost of the billions of dollars which this Government invests every year.

For most of our spending the Congress applies no benefit-cost system at all. We can and should apply such a system throughout most of the spectrum of Federal spending, and this may be beginning. If we follow through, our allocation of resources could be based on a system of priorities that would first only permit the investment of a dollar when we know that the benefits received for that dollar would exceed its cost.

Second, we would be in a position to invest first in those projects which promised the best return.

It is true that this benefit-cost system is applied for some public works projects. Indeed, no public works project which shows a benefit-cost ratio of less than one—that is, that its costs exceeds its benefits—will pass the Congress.

The trouble, however, is that the Congress insists on stacking the deck, rigging the calculations in favor of the public works project.

I say this on the basis of the testimony of three of the outstanding economists in this field before our committee on Wednesday. And, further, these experts testified that there is not an economist in the country with any knowledge or competence in this field who does not agree with their position.

This stacking of the deck to persuade the Congress to appropriate billions which should never be spent is achieved by a congressional directive that works this way:

The benefits of each project, of course, are to be received in the future, so each dollar of benefits must be discounted since a future dollar is of less value than a present dollar. This principle is acknowledged by the Congress. But the cards are stacked by discounting this future benefit at an unconscionably low, wholly unjustifiable rate of interest.

This greatly overstates—exaggerates—the value of the future benefit.

What should the discount factor be?

The Congress has decided to use the long-term cost of money to the Federal Treasury and this has been calculated at 3⅛ percent.

But the expert economists agree that the discount factor would be no less than the current cost to the Treasury, which would now be about 4¾ percent.

They so testified, and there is not a competent economist who does not agree with that position.

Mr. President, if we accept this 4¾-percent discount factor, this alone would immediately convert billions of dollars of our projects to a less than unit cost benefit ratio. In doing so it would prevent the appropriation of billions of dollars.

But most economists including all of the top experts who testified before our committee on September 20 testified that the fair and proper discount rate should be the effective return in the private sector of the American economy, before corporate taxes. This has been calculated as being between 10 percent and 15 percent, possibly as high as 20 percent.

This so-called opportunity cost is calculated as the return on private investment before taxes.

Mr. President, if we should take the most conservative of these figures—10 percent—I doubt very much if we would fund any of the major public works projects that have been before us. We would drastically reduce public works.

But why should we not put public spending on the same opportunity cost basis as private spending? Are we not wasting our resources—literally wasting them—by following a system that persuades the Government to take from the taxpayer part of his resources and invest that part at a far lower return for our economy than we could get from the private sector?

Mr. President, this issue is so important to public policy and to the decisions made by this Congress that I intend to call the matter to the attention of the Senate repeatedly over a period of several weeks.

Today, I call the attention of the Senate to remarkably able statements of Dr. Jacob Stockfisch, senior associate of the Institute for Defense Analysis. Dr. Stockfisch, in my judgment, states the case for stopping this Government waste and establishing our spending on a rational, ordered objective system of priorities. I ask unanimous consent that his statements be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

THE INTEREST RATE APPLICABLE TO GOVERNMENT INVESTMENT PROJECTS

(By J. A. Stockfisch)

This paper holds that decision makers apply to Government investment projects an interest rate that equals the opportunity return on investment in the private sector of the economy. Moreover, it should be the rate of return that prevails *before* corporate taxes. This position may be termed the application of an "equalization principle." Presently this rate is between 10 and 15 percent.

Most resource using activities permit substitution between different kinds of resources. Often, it is possible to substitute larger initial investment outlays for smaller annual or periodic outlays, or vice versa, to achieve the given objective. For example, a large investment in spare parts can reduce the periodic maintenance and transportation costs necessary to support a weapon system during its life span. Or a law enforcement agency may acquire electronic data processing equipment in order to dispense with file clerks and thus reduce annual operating expenses. Possibilities such as these require that some interest rate be explicitly employed to make rational decisions.

There is a class of Government resource-using activities which serve private ends by providing individuals instrumental services or products. For these activities it is often possible to identify the individuals or groups who benefit from the Government operation. Government enterprises such as the Post Office Department, reclamation, conservation, and power projects are examples of such activities. It is also often possible for the Government to employ prices to ration the service and to finance the operation. To determine the appropriate price, it is necessary to employ a cost of capital. The Government may or may not use the price mechanism to ration the benefits or services the activity provides. To the extent that it does not price the service to cover the *full cost* of the project, including an appropriate interest cost, it provides private users a "subsidy in kind." Whether a subsidy should be provided is not a point at issue in a discussion of what the interest rate should be. An appropriate interest rate should nevertheless be applied to the project if only to determine the magnitude of the subsidy itself.

Not to employ the same appropriate discount rate in the public sector that is encountered in the private sector can lead to many anomalies. A low discount rate "justifies" or signals the use of "capital intensive" production methods. As such, it would mean, for example, that a fork lift truck in a government warehouse or machine tools in a government arsenal would be more expensive and durable than are used in identical private operations. Government office buildings would be longer-lived than those in the private sector. More expensive automobiles, which would afford lower annual operation cost, would be called for. There appears to be no rational justification to promulgate such behavior.

The level of the interest rate applicable to government operations has nothing to do with whether the total amount of government goods and services, or the magnitude of government activity as applied to meeting purely government ends, be large or small relative to the private sector of the economy. It does not imply one way or the other whether we should have more "public goods" such as education, national parks, space probes and ballistic missiles and fewer consumer goods, or vice versa. This issue is still to be determined by essentially political processes, to be hammered out by the liberal and conservative spenders. To follow the equalization principle is simply a means of maximizing the combined amount of both private and collective goods over whatever foreseeable future for which the appropriate rate of return will hold.

It is held by some students, however, that the rate of return on private investment in the private sector is "too high" because private investors and savers invest too little. The private sector thus makes inadequate provision for future generations. Since the government has a responsibility for the unborn there is no necessary reason why it should use the private rate of return for its investment decision making. It is therefore argued that a "social time preference" rate be employed to evaluate government investments. Such a line of argument is another way of saying that a larger capital stock is better than a smaller capital stock. The issue therefore becomes one of determining the rate of economic growth and net capital formation which assures that future generations will enjoy some policy-determined level of income.

Even if we grant that the over-all rate of growth of the economy and the rate of investment spending should be higher than what it would otherwise be, it does not follow that the government should employ, for evaluating its projects, an interest rate that is lower than the rate of return prevailing in the private sector of the economy. To the extent that a more rapid rate of capital accumulation promotes a higher rate of economic growth, it is simply sufficient that investment *per se* be increased, whether it be in the private sector of the economy or in government projects. In order to achieve a given growth objective most efficiently, we should still adhere to the equalization principle. By means of tax and subsidy devices, monetary policy, and possibly through other techniques, the opportunity return on all investment could be forced down from 15 percent to 10 percent, or even 3 percent. Whatever the rate of return might be, the same rate should also be employed for evaluating government projects. If the rates in the two sectors are not equalized, the policy of employing a lower rate for evaluating government projects will be an inefficient way of attaining the growth objective. It will also change the composition of output available to future generations. Moreover, it changes the product mix in an extremely inefficient manner. Let us demonstrate these points in connection with reclamation projects.

Let us assume that the going rate of return (before taxes) in the private sector of the economy is 15 percent. A proposed reclamation project that will provide water to irrigate land that can grow tomatoes is subjected to a cost benefit study. The study reveals that the internal rate of return on the tomato land reclamation project is 5 percent. In the cause of offsetting the "myopia" of the private sector of the economy, government policy-makers employ a 4 percent "social time preference" rate in their cost benefit analysis. On this basis the tomato-land reclamation project is undertaken. What are its consequences, and how dose it benefit future generations?

Let us assume that the tomato-land reclamation project costs $100,000,000. In the cause of enhancing the welfare of future generations, steps are taken to insure that the resources diverted to the reclamation project come only out of private consumption. In this case future generations would enjoy a higher gross national product of $4,000,000 annually—the increment consisting solely of tomatoes. Should, however, $26.7 million of the resources required for the reclamation project be displaced from private investment, the future gross national product would be at the same level it would be if there had been no government project, although future generations would have more tomatoes but less consumer durables, entertainment, and other items normally produced in the private sector. Any larger displacement of resources from private investment into the tomato-land project would reduce the gross national product. For example, should the $100,000,000 project displace $40 million from private investment the future GNP will be $2 million less. Each year future generations would have $4 million more a year of tomatoes, but $6 million a year less of other goods. Thus the growth objective is defeated. For this happy outcome the present generation in addition sacrifices $60 million of consumption.

Rates of return on investment in physical assets in the American economy vary, depending on the sector and the type of investment. Table 1 summarizes rates of re-

turn, before corporate taxes, in a number of major industries. With the exception of the railroad industry, the rate of return in the regulated sector is around 10 percent. In manufacturing, the major non-regulated sector, the rate of return exceeds 15 percent.

Table 2 shows the allocation of investment spending for plant and equipment in the private sector over the past five years. Roughly, about 70 percent was allocated to the non-regulated sector; 30 percent, in the regulated sector. If one assumes that the 15 percent rate of return revealed in manufacturing is experienced overall in the non-regulated sector, one could weight the 15 and 10 percent rates of the return at the ratios of 70 and 30 percent respectively. The overall rate of return is thus 13.5 percent.

TABLE 1.—SUMMARY OF RATE OF RETURN BEHAVIOR FOR SELECTED MAJOR SECTORS

Sector	Total earning assets, 1965 (billions)	Period	Annual average rate of return (percent)	Annual average rate of return, 1961–65 (percent)
Manufacturing	$274,574	1949–65	17.7	15.4
Electric utilities	53,534	1949–65	8.9	9.3
Gas pipelines	8,782	1955–65	8.5	8.6
Telephone	31,429	1949–65	10.6	11.9
Railroads	25,203	1956–65	4.8	4.1
Motor carriers	1,293	1958–64	13.0	[1] 14.7
Oil pipelines	2,793	1956–65	14.4	15.6
Airlines	4,384	1959–65	6.1	8.2

[1] Average of 1961–64 only.

TABLE 2.—ALLOCATION OF BUSINESS INVESTMENT SPENDING ON PLANT AND EQUIPMENT 1960–65

[Dollar amounts in billions]

	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965	5-year total	Percent
All industries	$34.37	$37.31	$39.22	$44.90	$51.96	$207.76	100
Manufacturing	13.68	14.68	15.69	18.58	22.45	85.08	41
Mining	.98	1.08	1.04	1.19	1.30	5.59	3
Commercial and other	8.46	9.52	10.03	10.83	11.79	50.63	24
Public utilities	5.25	5.48	5.65	6.22	6.94	29.54	14
Communications	3.22	3.63	3.79	4.30	4.94	19.88	10
Railroads	.67	.85	1.10	1.40	1.73	5.75	3
Transportation, other than railroads	1.85	2.07	1.92	2.38	2.81	11.03	5

Source: Survey of Current Business, April 1964, p. S–2, and January 1967, p. S–2.

THE INTEREST RATE APPLICABLE TO GOVERNMENT INVESTMENT PROJECTS

(By J. A. Stockfisch)

(NOTE.—The author is a Senior Research Associate in the Institute for Defense Analyses. This paper had its origin in a study undertaken for Planning Research Corporation, Los Angeles, in the spring of 1960, on behalf of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, Department of the Navy, under contract No. NOnr–2713(00). The study received additional support through a research grant from the Division of Research of the UCLA Graduate School of Business Administration during the summer of 1960. Support from the Institute for Defense Analyses facilitated the final stage of gestation.)

(None of the above named institutions necessarily endorse or accept the views advanced in this paper.)

This paper seeks to demonstrate that decision makers should apply to Government investment projects an interest rate that equals the opportunity return on investment in the private sector of the economy. Moreover, it should be the rate of return that prevails *before* corporate taxes. Presently this rate is between 10 and 15 percent.

The use of a rate as high as 15 percent, as contrasted with one in the neighborhood of from 4 to 6 percent, is profound. Arnold Harberger, for example, stated that a majority of 53 Bureau of Reclamation and Corps of Engineers projects which he examined would have been rejected at a 10 percent rate.[1] Hirshleifer, DeHaven, and Milliman show that California's Feather River Project would be uneconomical at a 6 percent rate.[2] To employ a 15 percent rate would therefore radically change Government practices and operations. Current thinking in the Government suggests that the proposed Supersonic Transport Program will be regarded a financial success or economically viable if the Government can recover its outlay plus 6 percent. If a rate in the neighborhood of 15 percent is valid, it appears that present Government investment decision making is extremely inefficient.

This paper consists of two parts. Part I develops the principle of why the opportunity rate of return on investment in the private sector should be used as the measure of capital cost in the public sector. Part II and Appendix A presents a method to estimate that opportunity rate of return.

I. THE PRINCIPLE

A. The positive statement

Most resource using activities permit substitution between different kinds of resources. Often, it is possible to substitute larger initial investment outlays for smaller annual or periodic outlays, or vice versa, to achieve the given objective. For example, a large investment in spare parts can reduce the periodic maintenance and transportation costs necessary to support a weapon system during its life span. Or a law enforcement agency may acquire electronic data processing equipment in order to dispense with file clerks and thus reduce annual operating expenses. Possibilities such as these require that some interest rate be explicitly employed to make rational decisions.

There is a class of Government resource-using activities which serve private ends by providing individuals instrumental services or products. For these activities it is often possible to identify the individuals or groups who benefit from the Government operation. Government enterprises such as the Post Office Department, reclamation, conservation, and power projects are examples of such activities. It is also often possible for the Government to employ prices to ration the service and to finance the operation. To determine the appropriate price, it is necessary to employ a cost of capital. The Government may or may not use the price mechanism to ration the benefits or services the activity provides. To the extent that it does not price the service to cover the *full cost* of the project, including an appropriate interest cost, it provides private users a "subsidy in kind." Whether a subsidy should be provided is not a point at issue in a discussion of what the interest rate should be. An appropriate interest rate should nevertheless be applied to the project if only to determine the magnitude of the subsidy itself.

We may elaborate upon these points by an example which treats hypothetical alternative missile systems:

[In millions of dollars]

System	Initial investment cost	Annual operating cost
A	500	20
B	300	70

Note: System life, 5 years.

For simplification we can assume that both systems have the same "kill potential."

It is unnecessary to be concerned with the question of whether the "product" is "worth" the cost of either system: this judgment may be a political-military one, not an economic one.[3] We may assume that the Strategic Air Command requires either system. Given agreement on this point the procurement decision can be approached in the same fashion as businessmen would evaluate two machine tools.

In the example of missile systems "A" and "B", one evaluation approach would be as follows: System "A" requires an incremental investment, as compared with System "B", of $200 million. System A relative to System B saves $50 million a year for five years. System A therefore enables the Government to acquire a five-year annuity of $50 million a year. The internal rate return on the incremental $200 million investment is therefore 7.9%.

If the interest rate applicable to Government investment projects is 15 percent, the Government should not buy System A, since the incremental investment of $200 million in System A does not meet the 15 percent test, and System B is the preferred one. Stated another way, if the present costs of both systems were determined by applying a 15 percent discount rate, System B would be less costly: The present cost of System B is $534.6 million; System A's cost, $567 million.

Not to employ the same appropriate discount rate in the public sector that is encountered in the private sector can lead to many anomalies. A low discount rate "justifies" or signals the use of "capital intensive" production methods. As such, it would mean, for example, that a fork lift truck in a government warehouse or machine tools in a government arsenal would be more expensive and durable than are used in identical private operations. Government office buildings would be longer-lived than those in the private sector. More expensive automobiles, which would afford lower annual operation cost, would be called for. There appears to be no rational justification to promulgate such behavior.[4]

[1] Arnold C. Harberger, "The Interest Rate in Cost-Benefits Analysis," *Federal Expenditure Policy for Economic Growth and Stability*, U.S. Govt. Printing Office, 1957, p. 241.

[2] Jack Hirshleifer, James C. DeHaven, and W. M. Milliman, *Water Supply: Economics, Technology, and Policy*, Chicago: 1960. pp. 341–346.

[3] It is possible, however, to address by analytical methods the question of whether the capability provided by either system is worth the cost. But this point takes us into other aspects of cost-effectiveness analysis, particularly the problem of identifying and measuring benefits. These problems should not be intertwined or confused with those of cost, which is what the discount rate treats.

[4] However, the point discussed above can help one understand the behavior of government agency and bureau heads to the extent that they do advocate the more "capital intensive" methods. To employ a less capital intensive technique necessitates higher annual outlays to maintain a given level of operations. Annual outlays can be (and are) controlled through the annual budget cycle. A capital intensive method, therefore, provides the agency a larger measure of protection against possible future control by higher decision makers, including Congress.

It should be noted that the level of the interest rate applicable to government operations has nothing to do with whether the total amount of government goods and services, or the magnitude of government activity as applied to meeting purely government ends, be large or small relative to the private sector of the economy. As exemplified by our weapon system example, the use of a 15 percent rate does not affect the decision of whether the government should procure a large or small quantity of weapons. Nor does it imply one way or the other whether we should have more "public goods" such as education, national parks, space probes and ballistic missiles and fewer consumer goods, or vice versa. This issue is still to be determined by essentially political processes, to be hammered out by the liberal and conservative spenders. To follow the equalization principle is simply a means of maximizing the combined amount of both private and collective goods over whatever foreseeable future for which the appropriate rate of return will hold.

B. The Social Time Preference School of Thought

The "equalization principle" advocated here is not accepted by many students. Rather, they hold that the government employ some "social" rate of "time preference" for purposes of evaluating its investment projects. The main argument adopted by this group seems to run as follows: Investment decision-making in the private sector is governed by "time preference," which reflects the relative value that private individuals attach to present versus future consumption. The rate of return in the private sector reveals the "time preference" of private individuals who control resources. But there is no necessary reason, however, why the government should use the same rate. The private rate of time preference may be "too high" because private individuals are apt to be afflicted with "myopia," or possess a "defective telescopic facility," which causes them to save and invest less. The government should take a "longer view" since it has an obligation to promote the welfare of unborn generations. The appropriate social rate of time preference, therefore, should be lower than the "myopic" market rate.[5]

Such a line of argument is another way of saying that a larger capital stock is better than a smaller capital stock. The "optimum social rate of time preference" is therefore the opportunity return on the margin of investment that is consistent with some desired and larger total output goal. The assertion that the private rate of time preference is "too high" is therefore an assertion that the rate of capital formation will not be rapid enough, which is also an assertion that the national output at some future point in time should be higher than would result from spontaneous private investment and saving. The issue therefore becomes one of determining the rate of economic growth and net capital formation which assures that future generations will enjoy some policy-determined level of income.[6]

Even if we grant that the over-all rate of growth of the economy and the rate of investment spending should be higher than what it would otherwise be, it does not follow that the government should employ, for evaluating its projects, an interest rate that is lower than the rate of return prevailing to the private sector of the economy. To the extent that a more rapid rate of capital accumulation promotes a higher rate of economic growth, it is simply sufficient that investment per se be increased, whether it be in the private sector of the economy or in government projects. In order to achieve a given growth objective most efficiently, we should still adhere to the equalization principle. By means of tax and subsidy devices, monetary policy, and possibly through other techniques, the opportunity return on all investment could be forced down from 15 percent to 10 percent, or even 3 percent. Whatever the rate of return might be, the same rate should also be employed for evaluating government projects. If the rates in the two sectors are not equalized, the policy of employing a lower rate for evaluating government projects will be an inefficient way of attaining the growth objective. It will also change the composition of output available to future generations. Moreover, it changes the product mix in an extremely inefficient manner. Let us demonstrate these points in connection with reclamation projects.

Let us assume that the going rate of return (before taxes) in the private sector of the economy is 15 percent. A proposed reclamation project that will provide water to irrigate land that can grow tomatoes is subjected to a cost benefit study. The study reveals that internal rate of return on the tomato land reclamation project is 5 percent. In the cause of offsetting the "myopia" of the private sector of the economy, government policy-makers employ a 4 percent "social time preference" rate in their cost benefit analysis. On this basis the tomato-land reclamation project is undertaken. What are its consequences, and how does it benefit future generations?

Let's assume that the tomato land reclamation project costs $100,000,000. In the cause of enhancing the welfare of future generations, steps are taken to insure that the resources diverted to the reclamation project come only out of private consumption. In this case future generations would enjoy a higher gross national product of $4,000,000 annually—the increment consisting solely of tomatoes. Should, however, $26.7 million of the resources required for the reclamation project be displaced from private investment, the future gross national product would be at the same level it would be if there had been no government project, although future generations would have more tomatoes but less consumer durables, entertainment, and other items normally produced in the private sector. Any larger displacement of resources from private investment into the tomato-land project would reduce the gross national product. For example, should the $100,000,000 project displace $40 million from private investment the future GNP will be $2 million less. Each year future generations would have $4 million more a year of tomatoes, but $6 million a year less of other goods. Thus the growth objective is defeated. For this happy outcome the present generation in addition sacrifices $60 million of consumption.

The operation is also an expensive way of getting additional tomatoes. If increasing tomato output is an important public goal, a more efficient way to attain it would be to subsidize tomato growing in the private sector of the economy that would cause some capital resources, which on the margin are yielding 15 percent, to be reallocated to tomato production and diverted from the production of other privately produced commodities.

C. Summary on the equalization principle

When we recognize that the government can attain any desired product mix by the use of selected excise taxes and subsidies, the use of an interest rate on government projects that supply private goods that is lower than the opportunity return in the private sector is an inefficient way of changing the composition of output. The use of a lower rate also leads to irrational decision-making within the government sector itself. For example, with the use of a zero rate, a $3 billion freeway system for a large metropolitan area, would appear to have an annual opportunity cost of zero. At a 15 percent rate, the annual cost is $450 million. If we explicitly recognize the $450 million annual cost, the investment of say $1 billion in a rapid transit system with an annual operating subsidy of $100 million a year and only $2 billion in freeways might provide an overall more effective urban transportation system. The use of low interest rates, or a zero rate, for evaluating government investments therefore seems almost certain to insure that the public goods and services we do get are likely to be the wrong kind.

Critics of the equalization principle (who generally are "low" interest rate advocates) usually criticize the position on the ground that it assumes that the level and structure of rates revealed in the private sector of the economy are optimal. They then correctly assert that optimality has not been proven. Therefore, the equalization principle should be rejected. Rejection of the equalization principle for this reason is a palpable *non sequiter*.

To invest resources purposefully in activities where the return is lower than the highest attainable is simply wasteful and inefficient, whether the highest rate of return is "optimal" or not. If we wish to attain a given growth objective, resources should be invested where the return is highest. If we want to change the composition of private goods, whether produced by government or private firms, the most efficient investment channels should be directed to that end by means of excise taxes and subsidies. If we want a given amount of government goods that meet "collective" wants, the investment policy that provides the highest GNP is the best means to get it. Even those who decry our nation's alleged "imbalance" between public and private goods (to say nothing of those who fly bombers or man submarines, or who teach school or supervise the national parks) can be motivated by offering them command over productive power, which includes the services of privately-created investment goods. If there is more such productive power, as contrasted with less, the burden of taxation or the inflationary incidence of deficit spending is less. The government can therefore proceed to divert more resources from the private sector to attain collective goals than it could if it caused resources to be invested in less productive channels. Thus, the assumption that the private opportunity rate of return is "optimal," in terms of some desired rate of economic growth, is not necessary to support the

---

[5] See, e.g., Otto Eckstein, "A Survey of the Theory of Public Expenditure Criteria," *Public Finances: Needs, Sources and Utilization*, Prinecton, 1961, p. 10; Stephen A. Marglin, "The Social Rate of Discount and the Optimal Rate of Investment," *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, (February 1963), pp. 95–111. This line of thinking has its intellectual foundation in the work of A. C. Pigou. See his *The Economics of Welfare*, 4th Ed. (London, 1949), p. 24. It was first published in 1912.

[6] At this point we must recognize that the "optimum" interest rate could be zero or even negative. For example, a per capita personal income of $50,000 a year by the year 2000 might be attainable by utilizing all investment opportunities which at that time could offer any positive rate of return. Under such a condition the opportunity return would be zero. On the other hand, if we thought the per capita personal income should be $100,000 a year at that same point in time, an investment program that results in a negative opportunity return would have to be undertaken. Such a program, since all projects yielding positive returns would be exploited, would require that goods be stored for future generations. The cost of storing and deterioration would be responsible for the negative rate.

principle that the rates of return in the government and private sectors of investment be equalized.

II. ESTIMATING THE RATE OF RETURN

Ideally, we need a measure of the "marginal efficiency of investment." Moreover, it should be the rate of return before corporate and property taxes. Such a measure would enable us to address the following question: given an increment of new investment in the economy, what will be the resulting and permanent increase in the net national income and product? The reason we want the rate of return before taxes is because the government shares in the yield from private investment. This point is particularly germane with regard to treating government investment projects because the government experiences a loss of tax yields if it causes resources to be diverted from investment in the private sector. For example, an increment of private investment of, say, $100 million may increase the net national product by $15 million annually. With a 50 percent profit tax, the government is able to extract $7.5 million of that increment. The overall social benefit of the private investment is thus 15 percent, and this should be the rate of return used to evaluate government investment projects.[7]

Such a rate of return concept also implies an equilibrium in the sense that rates of return are equal in all lines of activity. Actually, no such equality exists. The lack of equality between rates available on different margins of investment may be due to the fact that at any given time the economy is not in equilibrium.[8] It may also be due to the fact that investors have "tastes" for the differences in risk encountered with various types of physical assets. One is therefore forced to employ some average of marginal rates of return in order to get an overall measure of the social benefits of private investment.

Table 1 shows the average rates of return attributed to physical assets in major sectors of the American economy for selected periods. Column 1 shows total "earning assets" in 1965, to provide the reader a feeling for the relative importance of these sectors. Columns 2 and 3 show the average annual rates of return for the periods stated in Column 2. Column 5 presents the average annual rates of return for the period 1961–65.

Before treating the behavior shown in Table 1, it is useful to describe the basis upon which the rates of return estimates were made.

"Earning assets" in these calculations include inventory, net plant and equipment, and accounts receivable. Excluded from the asset base were cash and other short term liquid assets, and securities and long term debt that a company may hold as an investment. These adjustments warrant explanation.

TABLE 1.—SUMMARY OF RATE OF RETURN BEHAVIOR FOR SELECTED MAJOR SECTORS[1]

Sector	Total earning assets, 1965 (billions)	Period	Annual average rate of return (percent)	Annual average rate of return, 1961–65 (percent)
Manufacturing	$274,574	1949–65	17.7	15.4
Electric utilities	53,534	1949–65	8.9	9.3
Gas pipelines	8,782	1955–65	8.5	8.6
Telephone	31,429	1949–65	10.6	11.9
Railroads	25,203	1956–65	4.8	4.1
Motor carriers	1,293	1958–64	13.0	[2] 14.7
Oil pipelines	2,793	1956–65	14.4	15.6
Airlines	4,384	1959–65	6.1	8.2

[1] Further detail, by year, is provided in appendix tables A–1 through A–8.
[2] Average of 1961–64 only.

Source: See appendix tables A–1 through A–8.

From a firm's point of view, cash is necessary to provide liquidity. But, from the point of view of the overall economy, cash is not a "productive" resource. It yields no service or product in the same sense that workers or physical equipment create products. It is only a paper of legal claim against the government or a bank. The marginal cost of cash to society is zero, since the supply of money can be increased or decreased by bookkeeping transactions and banking operations. As such, cash is not an asset the existence of which causes a displacement of real resources from the point of view of the economy as a whole, nor does cash create any real product in the economic system.

Other legal claims such as bonds and stocks are not physical, real resources; rather, they are claims against physical resources. Their creation, and their existence, therefore, do not involve the displacement of physical resources. Moreover, to the extent that a manufacturing or other operating enterprise owns them, that company is functioning as a portfolio investor, rather than a producer of economic goods and services. For these reasons such assets should not be considered part of the assets associated with the operations for which its physical investment is undertaken.[9]

The exclusion of these items from the estimate of a capital base, particularly the exclusion of cash and other short term financial assets, will cause the asset base to be smaller, and the derived rate of return to be higher, than those encountered in normal financial calculations.

TABLE 2.—ALLOCATION OF BUSINESS INVESTMENT SPENDING ON PLANT AND EQUIPMENT, 1960–65

[Dollar amounts in billions]

	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965	5-year total	Percent
All industries	$34.37	$37.31	$39.22	$44.90	$51.96	$207.76	100
Manufacturing	13.68	14.68	15.69	18.58	22.45	85.08	41
Mining	.98	1.08	1.04	1.19	1.30	5.59	3
Commercial and other	8.46	9.52	10.03	10.83	11.79	50.63	24
Public utilities	5.25	5.48	5.65	6.22	6.94	29.54	14
Communications	3.22	3.63	3.79	4.30	4.94	19.88	10
Railroads	.67	.85	1.10	1.40	1.73	5.75	3
Transportation, other than railroads	1.85	2.07	1.92	2.38	2.81	11.03	5

Source: Survey of Current Business, April 1964, p. S–2, and January 1967, p. S–2.

In line with the same asset base, asset earnings were calculated to derive earnings before payment of interest on debt a company owes, before corporate taxes, and to exclude income not derived from operations, such as dividends or interest received from stocks or debt that a company owns.[10]

Table 1 indicates that in manufacturing the rate of return is around 15 percent; in the preponderance of the regulated sector it is around 10 percent, with the notable exception of the railroads. Examination of Appendix Tables A–1 through A–8 indicates that in manufacturing the rate of return has held fairly constant at around 15 percent after a leveling off from the Korean War induced highs. In the regulated sector, from the early and middle 1950's, the rate of return has tended to rise, to level off at around 10 percent. Railroads, however, have consistently done poorly, which reflects basic structural changes in our transportation sector. Until the last few years, airlines also fared poorly. However, since 1962 they have picked up dramatically, both in terms of rate of return performance as well as the absolute and relative allocation of investment to that sector.[11] Thus, a rate of return of 10 percent in the regulated sector and 15 percent in manufacturing—attributable to earning assets as defined above—appears to be a reasonable estimate of the opportunity cost of private investment in those sectors.

One may go a step further to ascertain the relative importance to attach to these rates. Table 2 shows the allocation of business investment on plant and equipment, by year, during the five year period of 1961–65. According to these data, about 70 percent of the total flows into the unregulated sector of manufacturing, mining, and commercial;[12] the remaining predominately regulated sector absorbs 30 percent. If we assume that the revealed 15 percent rate of return in manufacturing would also apply to the mining and commercial sectors, on the ground that competition within the unregulated sector would tend to promote equality in the rates of return, one could weigh the 15 and 10 percent rates of return at the ratios of 70 and 30 percent, respectively. The overall rate of return is thus 13.5 percent.

[7] The overall impact of taxes on the earnings from all wealth—if one recognizes property, and corporate and personal income taxes—has been estimated by Arnold Harberger to be slightly under 50 percent, although the effective tax rates vary considerably as between sectors and activities. See Arnold Harberger, "Efficiency Effects of Taxes on Income From Capital," in *Effects of Corporation Income Tax*, ed. by Marian Krzyzaniak, (Detroit, 1966) p. 110. Harberger's estimate is based on 1953–59 behavior, which may be mitigated somewhat by the Revenue Acts of 1962 and 1964. On the other hand, increases since that period in state income taxes and local property taxes will have worked in the opposite direction.

[8] However, there is nevertheless a strong tendency toward an equilibrium. See George J. Stigler, *Capital and Rates of Return In Manufacturing Industries*, (Princeton, 1963), for a demonstration of this point.

[10] Further detail on the calculating methodology, including some discussion of the data sources, is presented in the Technical Notes in Appendix 1.

[11] The performance shown in Appendix Table A–8 for airlines has continued into 1966 when the rate of return was 12.5 percent, and the earning assets increased to $5.6 billion.

[9] Accounts receivable are also legal claims, rather than physical assets; and one might contend that they, too, should not be part of the physical asset base. However, they constitute part of the "stock in trade" necessary for the conduct of business operations. They reflect displaced physical resources. They may be viewed as a "lending" or "renting" of goods or services for some specified period of time, with the firm receiving its earnings on its investment in the form of higher prices to its customers.

[12] The "commercial and other" category shown in Table 2 absorbs a large portion (24 percent) of the total. It includes trade and services. The preponderance of unincorporated businesses will be found in this sector, although it also contains large corporate activities—e.g., hotels, retail trade. Because of the diversity of activities and the importance of non-corporate firms in this sector, good data on investment and asset earnings is not readily available. For a discussion of some of the analytical and measurement problems of treating unincorporated businesses, see Stigler, op. cit., pp. 114–118.

APPENDIX A

TABLE A-1.—MANUFACTURING EARNING ASSETS, EARNINGS AND RATE OF RETURN (BEFORE FEDERAL INCOME TAXES), 1949-65

[Earnings and assets in millions of dollars]

Year	Earning assets	Operating profit [1]	Interest [2]	Earnings [3]	Rate of return (percent)
1949	79,723	14,319	344	14,663	18.4
1950	84,061	22,651	340	22,992	27.4
1951	102,045	25,365	442	25,807	25.3
1952	122,780	22,456	624	23,080	18.8
1953	129,616	24,004	702	24,706	19.1
1954	132,092	20,541	663	21,204	16.1
1955	139,144	27,655	703	28,358	20.4
1956	159,043	28,742	932	29,674	18.7
1957	170,701	27,379	1,111	28,490	16.7
1958	175,341	21,926	1,173	23,099	13.2
1959	185,819	28,699	1,350	30,049	16.2
1960	198,713	26,486	1,538	28,024	14.1
1961	208,518	26,454	1,624	28,078	13.5
1962	222,624	30,819	1,822	32,641	14.7
1963	233,604	33,777	1,887	35,664	15.3
1964	248,896	38,416	2,143	40,559	16.3
1965	274,574	45,630	2,545	48,175	17.5

[1] Net operating profit as reported in source below.
[2] Estimated by method discussed below.
[3] Sum of operating profit and estimated interest costs.

Source: Quarterly Financial Report for Manufacturing Corporations, Federal Trade Commission, Securities Exchange Commission, 1949-66.

TABLE A-2.—RATE OF RETURN, TOTAL AND SELECTED ASSETS, PRIVATELY OWNED ELECTRIC UTILITIES IN THE UNITED STATES, 1949-65

[Assets and earnings in millions of dollars]

Year	Earning assets	Earnings	Rate of return on earning assets (percent)
1949	16,475	1,323	8.0
1950	18,150	1,519	8.4
1951	19,887	1,724	8.7
1952	21,954	1,985	9.0
1953	24,517	2,183	8.9
1954	26,716	2,371	8.9
1955	28,776	2,681	9.3
1956	31,127	2,888	9.3
1957	34,136	3,012	8.8
1958	37,012	3,212	8.7
1959	39,710	3,567	9.0
1960	42,241	3,828	9.1
1961	44,401	4,058	9.1
1962	46,403	4,372	9.4
1963	48,539	4,585	9.4
1964	50,770	4,753	9.4
1965	53,534	4,995	9.3

Source: "Statistics of Electric Utilities in the United States, Privately Owned," 1959 and 1965 volumes, Federal Power Commission.

TABLE A-3.—NATURAL GAS PIPELINE COMPANY EARNING ASSETS, EARNINGS (BEFORE FEDERAL INCOME TAXES) AND RATE OF RETURN, 1955-65

[Assets and earnings in millions of dollars]

Year	Earning assets	Earnings	Rate of return (percent)
1955	5,232	323	9.2
1956	5,789	359	9.0
1957	6,697	395	8.0
1958	7,270	427	8.0
1959	7,990	474	7.9
1960	8,718	549	8.6
1961	8,876	560	9.0
1962	9,356	605	8.6
1963	9,522	616	8.9
1964	9,397	586	8.3
1965	9,673	603	8.2

Source: Statistics for Interstate Natural Gas Pipeline Companies, 1965, Federal Power Commission.

TABLE A-4.—TELEPHONE COMMUNICATIONS EARNING ASSETS, INCOME, AND RATE OF RETURN (BEFORE FEDERAL INCOME TAXES), 1949-65

[Assets and earnings in millions of dollars]

Year	Earning assets	Earnings	Rate of return (percent)
1949	7,635	453	5.9
1950	8,239	709	8.6
1951	8,938	817	9.1
1952	9,801	915	9.3
1953	10,789	1,052	9.8
1954	11,729	1,184	10.0
1955	12,933	1,424	11.0
1956	14,685	1,572	10.7
1957	16,590	1,725	10.4
1958	18,015	2,085	11.6
1959	19,455	2,404	12.4
1960	21,108	2,601	12.3
1961	22,966	2,800	12.2
1962	24,861	3,030	12.2
1963	26,796	3,273	12.2
1964	28,964	3,377	11.7
1965	31,429	3,602	11.5

Source: Statistics of Communications Common Carriers Federal Communications Commission (annual reports).

TABLE A-5.—RAILROAD EARNING ASSETS, EARNINGS, AND RATE OF RETURN (BEFORE FEDERAL INCOME TAXES), 1956-65

[Assets and earnings in millions of dollars]

Year	Earning assets	Earnings	Rate of return (percent)
1956	23,756	1,713	7.2
1957	24,034	1,515	6.3
1958	24,479	1,305	5.3
1959	24,469	1,340	5.4
1960	24,613	787	3.2
1961	24,496	1,167	4.7
1962	24,538	885	3.6
1963	24,593	970	3.9
1964	24,240	956	3.9
1965	25,203	1,126	4.5

Source: Transport Statistics in the United States (annual reports), Pt. I, Railroads, Bureau of Accounts, Interstate Commerce Commission.

TABLE A-6.—OIL PIPELINES, EARNING ASSETS, INCOME AND RATE OF RETURN (BEFORE FEDERAL INCOME TAXES), 1956-65

[Assets and earnings in millions of dollars]

Year	Earning assets	Earnings	Rate of return (percent)
1956	1,990	328	16.5
1957	2,048	291	14.2
1958	2,094	246	11.7
1959	2,253	259	11.5
1960	2,267	269	11.9
1961	2,316	326	14.1
1962	2,316	342	14.8
1963	2,718	358	13.2
1964	2,739	476	17.4
1965	2,793	521	18.7

Source: "Transport Statistics in the United States" (annual reports) Pt. 6—Oil Pipe Lines. Bureau of Accounts, Interstate Commerce Commission.

TABLE A-7.—INTERCITY MOTOR CARRIER EARNING ASSETS, EARNINGS, AND RATE OF RETURN (BEFORE FEDERAL INCOME TAXES), 1958-64

[Assets and earnings in millions of dollars]

Year	Earning assets	Earnings	Rate of return (percent)
1958	844	95	11.2
1959	966	141	14.5
1960	991	66	6.7
1961	1,020	142	13.9
1962	1,104	164	14.9
1963	1,188	166	13.9
1964	1,293	208	16.1

Source: Transport Statistics in the United States (annual reports), Pt. 7., Motor Carriers. Bureau of Accounts, Interstate Commerce Commission.

TABLE A-8.—AIRLINES (CERTIFICATED AIR ROUTE CARRIERS) EARNING ASSETS, EARNINGS, AND RATE OF RETURN (BEFORE FEDERAL INCOME TAXES AND SUBSIDIES), 1959-65

[Earnings and assets in millions of dollars]

Year	Earning assets	Earnings	Rate of return (percent)
1959	2,114	75	3.5
1960	2,663	22	.8
1961	3,072	−58	----
1962	3,249	107	3.2
1963	3,236	197	6.0
1964	3,804	388	10.1
1965	4,384	593	13.5

Source: Civil Aeronautics Board, Air Carrier Financial Statistics. (So-called Yellow Book, issued quarterly.)

[Technical notes on tables A-1 through A-8]

I. DERIVATION OF EARNING ASSET ESTIMATES

A. Annual versus quarterly asset values

For all sectors, except manufacturing, asset values were end of year (December 31) magnitudes. For manufacturing, the average of end of quarter magnitudes was employed. To the extent that an industry is growing, this difference will tend to cause the asset base to be larger when the end of year value is used than when the average of the quarters is employed, with an opposite effect on the rate of return calculation. Thus the rates of return developed in this study on the regulated industries will be slightly understated relative to those shown for manufacturing.

B. Elements of the asset base

1. *Manufacturing*—The items in the *Quarterly Financial Report* (FTC-SEC) "Total Receivables," "Inventories" and "Total Property, Plant, and Equipment (net)," were summed.

2. *Electric Utilities*—The accounts labeled "net total utility plant," "notes and accounts receivable less accumulated provisions for uncollected accounts" and "materials and supplies" were summed.[1]

3. *Natural Gas Pipelines*—"Net gas utility plant," "gas stored underground—non-current" accounts were summed to derive long-term assets; "notes and accounts receivable, less accumulated provision for uncollected accounts," "materials and supplies" and "gas stored underground—current" constituted short term earning assets.

4. *Telephone Communications*—"Total communications plant—net," "materials and supplies" and "accounts receivable from customers, agents and others" were summed.

5. *Railroads*—"Total Properties less recorded depreciation and amortization," "materials and supplies," "net balance receivable from agents and conductors," "miscellaneous accounts receivable," and "accrued accounts receivable" were summed.

6. *Oil Pipelines*—Only selected balance sheet data are provided in ICC reports treating this industry. Earning assets were estimated as follows: "carrier property" less the sum of "accrued depreciation-property" and "accrued amortization-property" constituted estimate of physical plant. "Total current assets" less "cash" served as an estimate of receivables and inventory or supplies. This method undoubtedly overestimates "earning assets" as defined in this study, and will cause a slight underestimate of the rate of return.

7. *Motor Carriers*—"Net carrier operating property" plus 50 percent of "Current assets-total" were summed. The 50 percent factor was derived from examination of more detailed statistics for a subsample of the industry.

[1] See references cited in Tables for source documents.

8. *Airlines*—"Net value of operating equipment," "materials," "net value of spare parts" and "accounts receivable" were summed. For the years 1959 and 1960, the above short term asset accounts could not be clearly identified; hence, 50 percent of total short term assets was employed.

II. EARNINGS

A. For each of the regulated industries, annual operating income (before fixed charges, particularly interest) and major tax components (including federal income taxes) were readily identifiable. For airlines, federal subsidies (which mainly accrue to selected local route carriers) were *subtracted* from aggregate industry profits to derive before tax earnings. (In 1965, for example, the federal subsidy was $79 million.) It is possible that mail revenues may contain a subsidy element; however, we had no way of estimating this for a fact.

B. *Manufacturing*—The FTC-SEC definition of "Net profit from operations" *excludes* interest charges. That is, cost and expenses include interest on debt and bonds. Thus the "profit" figure (which compares with what corporate stockholders normally focus on) would understate asset earnings by the amount of interest payments. (The FTC-SEC reports, incidentally, follow the pattern employed in the Department of Commerce national income accounting methodology). Nor do the FTC-SEC Quarterly Reports provide a separate interest cost component. It was therefore necessary to estimate interest charges. (This estimate is shown by year in Table A-1.)

The estimating method for interest was as follows: The FTC-SEC reports do provide balance sheet data on "short term loans from banks" (maturity of one year or less), "installments, due in one year or less, on long term debt," and "long term debt due in more than one year." For each year the quarterly average of these items was determined; the short term item and the sum of the two long term items were multiplied by an appropriate interest rate. The sum of these products constitutes the estimated "interest" item shown in Table A-1.

The derivation of the interest rates was as follows: For long term debt, a 10 year moving average of Moody's composite yield on industrial bonds. For short term debt the arithmetic mean, for each year, of the rate on short term bank loans and the rate on 4 to 6 month prime paper. These rates are shown in Appendix Table A.

APPENDIX TABLE A.—INTEREST RATES EMPLOYED TO ESTIMATE INTEREST COMPONENT OF MANUFACTURING ASSET EARNINGS, 1949-65

Year	Short-term rates			Moody's composite yield on industrial bonds (10-year moving average)
	Short-term loans bank	Prime commercial paper (4 to 6 months)	Average	
1949	2.68	1.49	2.08	2.82
1950	2.69	1.45	2.07	2.78
1951	3.11	2.16	2.63	2.77
1952	3.49	2.33	2.91	2.77
1953	3.69	2.52	3.10	2.82
1954	3.61	1.58	2.59	2.85
1955	3.70	2.18	2.94	2.90
1956	4.20	3.31	3.75	2.99
1957	4.62	3.81	4.21	3.13
1958	4.34	2.46	3.40	3.25
1959	[1] 5.00	3.97	4.48	3.42
1960	5.16	3.85	4.50	3.62
1961	4.97	2.97	3.97	3.78
1962	5.00	3.26	4.13	3.93
1963	5.01	3.55	4.28	4.04
1964	4.99	3.97	4.48	4.18
1965	5.06	4.38	4.72	4.33

[1] Beginning 1959, series revised to exclude loans to nonbank financial institutions.

Source: Short-term rates: Economic Report of the President, January 1967, p. 272. Long-term rate: Moody's Industrial Manual, 1965, p. a21.

HURRICANE BEULAH DEVASTATES SOUTH TEXAS—DISASTER AREA DECLARATION NEEDED

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, my State has just suffered a devastating blow from nature. Hurricane Beulah has unleashed on the coast of Texas winds and waters of unprecedented force. Only now are the winds dying down and the waters receding to allow us to take stock of the damage—it is not a heartening picture. But Texans are hearty individuals by nature, and already we are busy at the task of recovery from this tragic disaster.

Yesterday on this floor I sought Senate approval of an amendment to the independent offices appropriation bill to make available an additional $10 million to the President's emergency disaster relief fund. With the cooperation and support of my distinguished colleagues from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] and Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] the amendment was approved, thus making available a total appropriation of $25,000,000 for disaster relief if the House concurs in my amendment.

Mr. President, under Public Law 81-875 and section 9 of Public Law 89-769, the Federal Government will provide assistance to State and local governments in the event of a declared major disaster by the President. By Executive Order 10427, responsibility for administration of this emergency relief program rests with the Office of Emergency Planning. I am told that some $11 million is presently available for disaster relief work performed under this authority. Approval by the House of my amendment of yesterday will bring this total to about $36 million. Once the President designates the area of Texas devastated by Hurricane Beulah a disaster area, this Federal financial assistance will be made available to the people of Texas who have suffered from this tragedy.

In addition to the Federal departmental efforts coordinated by the Office of Emergency Planning, other aid is available to our people. I have checked with Mr. Cowles, Director of the Office of Disaster Loans at the Small Business Administration and learned that some $150 million exists for loans to assist those small Texas business concerns that suffered the ravages of Beulah this week. He informs me that Hurricane Carla, which struck Texas in September of 1961, resulted in SBA loans and the Small Business Administration advises that it is capable of providing the necessary aid arising from this tragedy.

I also want to mention the emergency credit revolving fund of the Farmers Home Administration. This fund finances emergency loans in areas where agricultural credit is not readily available because of natural disasters. Hurricane Beulah struck one of this country's richest agricultural areas, and farmers and ranchers of the disaster area will be eligible for loans made at 3-percent interest. I am assured by the Farmers Home Administration that adequate moneys are available to cover whatever loans will be necessary as a result of Hurricane Beulah.

Early this morning I sent telegrams to President Lyndon Johnson and to Director Farris Bryant, Office of Emergency Planning, recommending that the heavily damaged areas of south Texas be declared a disaster area.

My telegram to President Johnson reads as follows:

Reports from Texas indicate vast, incalculable, and growing damage from Hurricane Beulah, with suceeding torrential rains of more than thirty inches in some areas of south Texas and the early estimates of five hundred million dollars of damage in south Texas growing hourly, with vast areas of land under water.

I recommend the immediate declaration of south Texas, southeast of San Antonio, including an area as far north as Victoria, as a major disaster area.

Mr. President, I sent an identical telegram to Farris Bryant, Director, Office of Emergency Planning. I ask unanimous consent that both telegrams be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

SEPTEMBER 22, 1967.

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.:

Reports from Texas indicate vast, incalculable, and growing damage from Hurricane Beulah, with succeeding torrential rains of more than thirty inches in some areas of south Texas and the early estimates of five hundred million dollars of damage in south Texas growing hourly, with vast areas of land under water.

I recommend the immediate declaration of south Texas, southeast of San Antonio, including an area as far north as Victoria, as a major disaster area.

RALPH W. YARBOROUGH,
U.S. Senator, Texas.

SEPTEMBER 22, 1967.

Hon. FARRIS BRYANT,
Director, Office of Emergency Planning,
Washington, D.C.:

Reports from Texas indicate vast, incalculable, and growing damage from Hurricane Beulah, with succeeding torrential rains of more than thirty inches in some areas of south Texas and the early estimates of five hundred million dollars of damage in south Texas growing hourly, with vast areas of land under water.

I recommend the immediate declaration of south Texas, southeast of San Antonio, including an area as far north as Victoria, as a major disaster area.

RALPH W. YARBOROUGH,
U.S. Senator, Texas.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE DR. GEORGE B. GALLOWAY, OFFICER AND AIDE TO CONGRESS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Congress has sustained a great loss in the death of Dr. George B. Galloway, whose highly effective and outstanding service has benefited the Members of the Senate and House of Representatives for more than two decades. As senior specialist in American government and public administration in the Legislative Reference Service, Dr. Galloway's record should stand as an inspiration to those who aspire to make a contribution to good government. He was one of the Nation's foremost experts on the legislative

process, and he was intensely interested in strengthening procedures which would lead to wise legislation. He understood the Congress as an institution as few people do and he had the respect and confidence of both the Democratic and Republican Members.

When his advice was sought, Dr. Galloway gave wise counsel based upon his thorough knowledge of American history. He could state a problem in clear terms, set forth alternative solutions, analyze the advantages and disadvantages of each proposed course of action, and estimate the probable consequences. He was dedicated to democracy in government and always had a healthy respect for differing viewpoints which might help to contribute to the solution of a legislative problem.

Having become an expert on the Congress, it was natural that Members of Parliament from all over the world came to his office to learn about the American government, to seek his advice, and to take back to their own legislative bodies the knowledge they had acquired about the United States. His biography has been in "Who's Who in America" for some 30 years.

Dr. Galloway's outstanding reputation both at home and abroad made him a natural choice for executive secretary of the U.S. group of the Interparliamentary Union. It was in this connection that I shall always cherish the memory of the briefings he gave the U.S. delegations prior to the Interparliamentary Union conferences, to the private counsel which he gave me in preparing for these meetings where the Congress actually plays a role in the conduct of foreign relations. His wishes and ideals for a stronger Interparliamentary Union were guidelines for those of us who were fortunate enough to be appointed as members of the U.S. delegation.

One of the main objectives of the Interparliamentary Union, which has been in existence since 1889, is the promotion of personal meetings between Members of Parliaments of all nations, in the belief that they will find mutual interests leading to common courses of legislative action. This is a method which can strengthen democratic institutions and peaceful international relations. There are now some 67 active national groups which are members of the IPU. standing study groups have been organized in recent years into, first, the committee on political questions, international security and disarmament; second, the parliamentary and juridical committee; third, the economic and social committee; fourth, the cultural committee; and fifth, the committee on non-self-governing territories and ethnic questions. These committees require considerable staff work in preparation for their spring meetings.

Dr. Galloway instituted the plan of briefing workbooks, often assembled other professional experts on specific subjects when they were needed and arranged for briefings of the delegation prior to conferences. The legislative branch of the Government needs its own staff experts, scholars who understand practical problems of the Congress in enacting laws, investigating various situations, and learning about complicated problems in the shortest time possible.

Every year a plenary session of the Interparliamentary Union is scheduled in the capital city of a different nation, the conferences always using the Parliament building of the host country. As a U.S. delegate to the Interparliamentary Union meetings at Brasília, Brazil, in 1962, Dublin, Ireland, in spring of 1965, Canberra, Australia, spring of 1966, Tehran, Iran, the fall of 1966, and in Mallorca, Spain, in spring of 1967, I found the advice and counsel of Dr. Galloway, and his vast knowledge of governments and peoples of incalculable aid to me. I miss his wise counsel in such matters.

Some of the Members of Parliaments with whom the U.S. delegation has worked during a conference find it possible to visit Washington. Many others always came with a letter of introduction to Dr. Galloway, who entertained visiting legislative representatives from all over the world. Typical of the many letters which Mrs. Galloway has received from abroad are the following.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that several letters of condolence to Mrs. Galloway be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

COMMONWEALTH PARLIAMENTARY ASSOCIATION, AUSTRALIA BRANCH,
Canberra, September 7, 1967.

Mrs. EILENE GALLOWAY,
Senior Specialist in International Relations, Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. GALLOWAY: Alan Turner has told me of your husband's sudden death. Please accept from myself and from the Australian Branch of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association our most sincere sympathy.

The many Members of Parliament who have visited Washington have grateful memories of the friendly help they always received from Dr. Galloway in his capacity as Secretary of the United States Associated Group of the Association.

He will be long remembered by his many friends.

Yours sincerely,

A. M. MCMULLIN,
President of the Senate: Chairman Australian Branch, C.P.A.

PARLIAMENT OF AUSTRALIA,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Canberra, September 7, 1967.

DEAR MRS. GALLOWAY: I was deeply shocked, as were my colleagues, to hear that George had died. My friendship with both of you has been something I have valued. I will not now be able to repay my considerable debt for his unfailing courtesy and help.

America has lost an outstanding citizen and an exceptional public servant. His contribution to Congress and Government has been appreciated in a wide field and I know that he will be sadly missed in the Library which he served so well so long. He will be missed too by his many friends in so many countries of the world.

Thank you for writing me. Ina joins in sincere sympathy and regards.

ALAN TURNER.

AUSTRALIAN SENATE,
Canberra, September 8, 1967.

Mrs. EILENE GALLOWAY,
Library of Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. GALLOWAY: I was very sorry to learn of the death of your distinguished husband, George Galloway. My colleagues in the Senate, a number of whom were fortunate to know George and to have enjoyed his hospitality in Washington, join with me in sending deepest sympathy.

As you know, George and I first met in Washington in 1955 and maintained a regular correspondence. I will always be grateful to him for his kindness and for the assistance he extended to me in understanding the American system of government. His profound learning was much respected in Australia.

My wife, Jean, joins me in expressing to you our most sincere sympathy.

Yours sincerely,

J. R. ODGERS,
Clerk of the Senate.

PARLIAMENT OF AUSTRALIA,
THE SENATE,
Canberra, September 8, 1967.

DEAR MRS. GALLOWAY: I have just heard from the Clerk of the Senate, Mr. Odgers, of the death of your husband, and I feel that I must write immediately to convey my sympathy.

I'm very sincere when I say that I have met very few men whom I have come to admire, love and respect like your late Doctor. His warm sincerity and gentle courteous manner endeared him to all his friends—and I felt deeply honoured that he should regard and accept me as one.

I shall always remember Dr. Galloway as a quietly spoken cultured gentleman in the very finest sense, and as a man who combined the rare qualities of calm personal serenity with a keenly intelligent and active interest in the welfare of his fellow men.

Would you please pass on my sympathy to your family. The night your husband invited me to dinner with you all at the Cosmos Club stands now very vividly in my mind.

Yours sincerely,

ROY BULLOCK.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, it is noteworthy that Dr. Galloway received from his alma mater, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn., the Distinguished Alumnus Award in recognition of outstanding achievement and service, with the following citation:

After graduation with honors in 1920, George Galloway obtained an M.A. from Washington University and a Ph. D. from Brookings Institution in 1926.

His keen interest, broad experience and study of the functioning of government qualify him as an expert on Congressional organization and procedure. As Staff Director of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, he did much of the research that led to the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. Since then he has been with the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress as Senior Specialist in American Government and Public Administration. His vast knowledge and experience in legislative matters is frequently sought by Congressional Committees and by individual members of Congress. He also briefs numerous officials from other countries, as well as student and civic groups, on the work of Congress.

As consultant, lecturer and author of numerous books and articles, George Galloway has contributed significantly to improved understanding and more efficient

functioning of the legislative branch of our government.

I believe that Dr. Galloway's record should be made known so that it can be emulated by those who come after him in dedicating their lives to the public service.

CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR JOINS BUILDING FORCES OF PEOPLE AGAINST ERADICATION OF WORLD'S WILDLIFE

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, recently I received an impressive and significant publication put out by the Christian Science Monitor, "The Call of the Vanishing Wild." This booklet, containing essays of such varied and distinguished authors as Cleveland Amory, newspaper reporter and Pulitzer Prize Winner Brooks Atkinson, and Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall, treats with the vital subject of conservation of our wildlife. The plight that these essays convey astonished me, even though I have been working for conservation, and against the forces of destruction, during 10 years in the Senate and for many years before that in Texas.

I was stymied by the figures cited by Dr. Lee M. Talbot, of the Smithsonian Institution, a scholar, ecologist, conservationist, and geographer. In his article, "The World's Most Endangered Species," Dr. Talbot points out that since the beginning of the Christian era, "the world has lost an estimated 110 kinds of mammals."

He noted:

> Furthermore, nearly 70 percent of the losses have occurred in the last century, and almost 40 percent within the past 50 years—one species a year since 1900.

This is a record of annihilation of which mankind must be ashamed, for it represents not only a loss to the biological collection which forms our world; it represents a loss to mankind now and in generations to come. Dr. Talbot cites examples of the early recognition of need to stop mankind's extermination of his fellow species, such as Plato's declamation against denuding of the hills of Attica, and "what this meant in terms of soil, water, timber, and crop losses." Especially he points out in this knowledgeable essay, the Indians in 250 B.C. recognized long ago the value of protecting wildlife, taking "a strong stand that it was not ethically or morally right for man to completely destroy another form of life."

It is time that we here in America, tens of centuries later, took this stand, and took up the fight against further decimation of our Nation's and our world's wildlife. It is for this reason that I have introduced Senate Concurrent Resolution 41, to provide for an International Conference on the Conservation of Wildlife. And it is for this reason that I have introduced S. 4, the Big Thicket National Park bill, to protect an area of Texas long visited by naturalists and biologists from all over the Nation, for its many, varied, and rare forms of animal and plant life. Now it is found to provide the last known habitat for the ivory-billed woodpecker, one of the species of American wildlife which has been thought altogether wiped out for the last 20 years. The Big Thicket is, moreover, one of those locales with the peculiarities of climate and soil which make a place of "critical speciation"—that is, a place of development and modification of forms of life. It is of value to man as more than an advocate of natural beauty—it is of value to him as a member of the community of living things.

I urge all of my colleagues to think seriously about the implications of the present slaughter going on throughout the world. In Africa and other habitats of rare and beautifully furred animals, the fashion industry is wiping out vital and well-known species by the demand created in New York, Dallas, and Paris. Superstitious symbols and artistic usage are contributing to the disappearance of horned species, such as the Sumatran rhino. And here at home, our very growth and development as a great industrial Nation threatens species after species with loss of a natural habitat and extinction.

As Dr. Talbot points out:

> Today, our greater awareness of man's role in changing the face of the earth, and our greater technological capabilities merely emphasize that we have the ability to protect or destroy a species, and therefore we—not an impersonal evolution—have the responsibility to make the decision.

I commend the Christian Science Monitor highly on this publication, which argues with eloquence characteristic of this journal for the action now to protect man's environment and the disappearing life forms of his world.

We have, indeed, the responsibility, and we have, too, the means, if we will use them. I urge action now on this important front.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Talbot's article in "The Call of the Vanishing Wild," being one chapter of the book, be printed at this point in the RECORD, for other Senators to review.

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

CHAPTER 10

(By Lee M. Talbot)

(NOTE.—Dr. Lee M. Talbot is the Smithsonian Institution's field representative for international affairs in ecology and conservation. A graduate of the University of California at Berkeley, he has traveled in more than 60 countries in connection with land use and wildlife researches and surveys. He is consultant to various African and Asian governments as well as to United States and international organizations. Dr. Talbot has written extensively as ecologist, conservationist, and geographer.

(Mankind has been exterminating mammals throughout the Christian era. But the rate of extinction has risen drastically in the past century. The following article explains the need for concern about the 1,000 forms threatened with extinction today.)

The world has lost an estimated 110 kinds of mammals since the beginning of the Christian era, and all of these departed animals owe their extinction to man's activities.

These same activities have brought another 1,000 forms to the point where they may be considered threatened with a similar fate today.

Roughly 100 extinctions spread over 2,000 years might not at first appear a particularly urgent matter. The urgency becomes clear, however, when one realizes that the rate of extermination—like the rate of the world's human population growth with which it is closely associated—has sharply accelerated in recent years.

Nearly 70 percent of the losses have occurred in the last century, and almost 40 percent within the past 50 years.

Stated another way, from the time of Jesus to A.D. 1800, one mammal was exterminated each 55 years.

During the next century the rate increased to one each year and a half. Since 1900, man has exterminated roughly one form each year!

HABITAT CHANGES

And this number refers only to mammals—mostly the large and conspicuous ones at that. No one has made a similar tally of reptiles, amphibians, fishes, or insects.

However, since 1689 when the last dodo is thought to have perished, about 162 species or subspecies of bird are believed to have been exterminated.

We exterminate animals in two ways: directly, through killing them; and indirectly, through changing their habitat. Less obvious than direct killing, but often far more threatening to the species' survival, is changing its habitat.

An animal does not exist by itself, isolated and independent. Instead, it might be considered as the center of a complex ecological web.

The radiating strands of this web are the animal's relations with and requirements for a variety of factors, including water, soil, plants, other animals, climate, and parasites.

These strands, in turn, are themselves interconnected, as with the circular strands of a spider web.

When any one strand of the web is altered it has some effect on most other strands. The strands, in sum, make up the animal's whole habitat. Survival of the animal usually depends on the habitat web's remaining relatively intact.

Some human activities, such as cultivation, flooding through dam construction, construction of cities, and some forms of lumbering virtually annihilate entire habitat webs. The results are easy to see.

Less easily recognized are the longer-term effects of those human activities that alter only a part of existing habitats.

These activities include grazing of domestic livestock, use of fire, diversion of surface or subsurface water, and introduction of parasites, diseases, and exotic species of plants and animals.

IMPACT ON MANKIND

Regardless of the form that such habitat changes take, they almost inevitably accompany human activities. It is difficult to find any significant area of the earth's surface that has not been altered in some fashion by man, and whose wildlife has not been affected accordingly.

Man set the stage for the extermination of animals when he became able to modify his own environment—when he became an ecological dominant.

This point in man's development was reached far back in prehistoric time. The prehistoric men were hunters and used fire extensively. Doubtless they exerted considerable influence on plant and animal populations of their times.

The implications of man's impact on his own environment were realized early in historic times. In the 4th century B.C., for example, Plato spoke eloquently of the then recently denuded hills of Attica, and of what this meant in terms of soil, water, timber, and crop losses.

An appreciation of man's impact on wild animals and plants came early also. In India

in the 3d century B.C. the need for complete protection of certain areas and animals was realized.

As the human population increased and more of the earth's surface was actually occupied or modified by man, increasing numbers of mammals were threatened.

The first species to go were those which competed with or threatened man. The earliest documented exterminations include 3 more cats (the Cape lion, Barbary lion, and Eastern cougar), 17 bears, and 5 wolves and foxes.

Over half of the species exterminated in Africa, Asia, Europe, the Antarctic, and North America have been largely predators.

LIONS DECIMATED

Many of the surviving forms of large predators are threatened species. Among these are such diverse creatures as the polar bear, maned wolf, the Spanish lynx, the Indian lion, and rarest of all with probably less than 10 left, the Javan tiger.

Now such animals can only survive in a protected area or a remote region where their activities do not conflict with those of man. The Indian lion is a dramatic example.

Two thousand years ago the Indian lions were so common that they were mentioned some 130 times in the Scriptures. They were found from the Eastern Mediterranean countries and the Arabian Peninsula eastward into India.

But they were gradually killed out of this vast area. Since 1884 the last real population of Indian lions has been limited to the remote Gir Forest in northwest India.

By the early 1900's hunters had so decimated the population, now variously estimated at between 12 to 100 animals, that the lion was declared protected in the forest and has remained so to the present. Thanks to this action, an estimated 200 to 300 lions still survive.

Another threatened carnivore is the black-footed ferret, a diminutive weasellike creature which is the only North American representative of a group of Old World weasels.

It is almost exclusively found in association with prairie dogs, living in their burrows and living on them. The near extermination of the prairie dog has had the same effect on this ferret.

UNGULATES HIT HARD

The other principal group of continental mammals to be exterminated was the large ungulates (hooved, herbivorous mammals) which required extensive feeding grounds, thereby competing with man and his domestic livestock; and which were hunted for food and other products.

The exterminated ungulates have included such diverse animals as the European wild horse, the aurochs, the Portuguese ibex, Caucasian bison, Eastern wapiti, Oregon bison, Badlands bighorn sheep, Algerian wild ass, Quagga, Syrian wild ass, and rufous gazelle.

About 40 percent of the mammal species exterminated in Asia, Europe, Africa, and North America were from this group, which also includes nearly half of the species presently threatened with extinction.

Among the more seriously threatened ungulates are the four mammals which probably were the basis for the legend of the unicorn.

Three of these are the Asian rhinos—the great Indian, Javan, and Sumatran. All formerly were found throughout much of South and Southeast Asia. All have been brought to the verge of extinction by habitat changes and intensive hunting.

SANCTUARIES SET SIDE

Because of the medicinal and magical properties credited to all parts of a rhinoceros by many Asian peoples, very high prices are paid for rhino products, especially the horn which is almost literally worth its weight in gold. As the rhino habitat and rhino numbers declined, the profit-hunting pressure on the survivors has increased.

The last several hundred Indian rhinos are protected in sanctuaries in northeast India and Nepal.

The remaining Sumatran rhinos, mostly heavily hunted single individuals, are widely scattered in Sumatra, Borneo (Kalimantan and Sabah), and in several countries on the mainland, and their total numbers are estimated at 100–200.

The last known Javan rhinos, 2 to 4 dozen animals, still survive in the magnificent Udjung Kulon Reserve on the western tip of Java, which is also the last habitat of the Javan tiger.

The other gravely threatened "unicorn" is the Arabian oryx, a fleet white desert antelope with long, straight horns which, when seen from the side, appear to be one—hence the unicorn.

Intensive hunting from cars and aircraft reduced the once widespread population to a few ever-more intensively hunted survivors, probably under 100, scattered around the southern fringes of the Empty Quarter desert in Arabia. Survival in their natural habitat at this time appeared unlikely, so in 1963 Operation Oryx was undertaken.

Sponsored by the Fauna Preservation Society and other organizations concerned with conservation, an expedition captured 3 oryx and secured 5 more from existing collections.

These animals were taken to Phoenix, Ariz., to start a survival center with.

OBJECTIVES SET UP

The first objective was to establish several breeding herds. The ultimate objective was to reintroduce the oryx back into its former range when there are sufficient animals in hand and conditions are favorable for their survival.

The captive herd has produced eight calves, justifying cautious optimism about the future of the oryx.

"All right," some people say, "many animals have become extinct and others are threatened; why worry? Thousands of animals have become extinct as the world developed. That's evolution. Nobody worried about the dinosaurs!"

True enough. Man was not on hand to worry about the passing of the dinosaurs—or to cause their extinction. But we are here today, and it is we who are doing the exterminating.

All the mammal species lost during recorded history owe their extinction to man's activities, and these same activities today have brought many others to the point where they are threatened with a similar fate.

FIRST ACTIONS TRACED

Further, the dinosaurs and other forms of prehistoric animal life that followed them evolved and became extinct over geological periods extending for many millions of years. Compared with these periods, the rate of modern, man-caused extermination is almost instantaneous.

Under Emperor Asoka of India in the 3d century B.C., some of the answers were provided to the question, "Why worry about threatened species?"

At the same time, the Indians took the first recorded actions to do something about the problem, through the establishment of reserves and game laws including complete protection for some species and closed seasons for others.

The Indians saw clearly, first, that man was the agent of extermination, and that therefore he must accept the responsibility for it or take action to prevent it.

Today, our greater awareness of man's role in changing the face of the earth, and our greater technological capabilities merely emphasize that we have the ability to protect or destroy a species, and therefore we—not an impersonal evolution—have the responsibility to make the decision.

Recognizing this responsibility, the ancient Indians took a strong stand that it was not ethically or morally right for man to completely destroy another form of life. They further recognized the importance of some forms of wildlife to their cultural background and possibly as a link with their historical past.

They also appreciated the recreational values involved, in terms of people's enjoyment of viewing animals. Today, these arguments are felt strongly by an increasingly large segment of the world's population.

ECONOMIC VALUES

The ancient Indians recognized an economic value in some animals, particularly those that provided food or other products, including medicines, and they furnished protection to maintain adequate stocks of those species.

Today we recognize a variety of economic values to man from threatened species, ranging from their very considerable value as tourist attractions in some cases, to the industries based on harvesting them or their products.

In parts of Russia and Africa, wild animals once considered threatened now are ranched commercially. They have proved capable of making more productive use of the habitats to produce meat and hides than the conventional domestic livestock.

The need to develop such resurces to make the most effective use of the land is becoming increasingly urgent.

We now recognize that the scientific values and potential benefits to man of threatened species are particularly great. With the ever-increasing interest in space exploration, we tend to lose sight of the fact that our knowledge of natural biological processes on on the earth is incomplete. And this lack is a major stumbling block in our efforts to increase the world's production of food and fiber.

A 5-YEAR PROGRAM

In recognition of this fact, the International Biological Program (IBP), a 5-year worldwide program of basic research into biological processes, will be initiated next year. Already over 60 nations have participated in the preparatory stages.

Threatened species, many of which provide real links with past conditions, can supply much needed information on the basic biological processes. They can also furnish materials for medicines and other needs of man, and some can serve as subjects for medical and other research of direct human application. These species also provide living "gene pools" from which information and products better able to provide for human requirements may be met. In other words, we may well need these animals—their extermination is our loss.

Some people believe that extermination of wild animals is necessary or unavoidable wherever there is a dense human population, especially in developing economies or highly industrialized civilizations.

This is simply not true. India, with one of the densest human populations in the world, until recently had not exterminated a single mammal. In the United States and a few other highly industrialized countries, wildlife is abundant and is managed as an important renewable natural resource.

RESEARCH URGED

The answer to immediate protection of most species can be found in provision of effective protection from overexploitation, habitat management, establishment of parks or reserves to protect the habitat as well as the animals, or in extreme cases (such as the oryx) the establishment of survival centers.

If we will only use them, we have the capabilities for effective action on these lines

now. And we should have—it was done in India in 250 B.C.!

However, research is still much needed: (1) to find out what species are indeed threatened; and (2) to provide the foundation for effective, long-term management and protection.

In the 22 centuries that have passed since Emperor Asoka's pioneering but effective worry about threatened species, the problem and the need for action has greatly increased, but so has our ability to do something about them.

It is increasingly realized that threatened species ultimately are an international concern rather than a purely local one.

Wild animals do not recognize political boundaries. When a species becomes extinct the irreparable loss is equally great to all those concerned whether they are in the country of extermination or on the other side of the world.

PANAMA CANAL JURIDICAL STRUCTURE—PART VI: SPOONER ACT OF 1902

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, in a series of statements to the Senate on the Panama Canal juridical structure on July 17, 18, 21, 24, and 25, I quoted, with appropriate comments, the full texts of the following treaties relating to the Panama Canal:

First, Hay-Pauncefote Treaty of 1901 with Great Britain; second, Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty of 1903 with Panama; third, Thomson-Urrutia Treaty of 1914–1922 with Colombia; fourth, Hull-Alfaro Treaty of 1936–39 with Panama; and fifth, Eisenhower-Remon Treaty of 1955 with Panama.

In addition to the indicated treaties, there are three important enactments by the Congress relating to the juridical structure of the Panama Canal. These three laws form the legislative framework for the canal, and should be of particular interest since they are within the domain of Congress.

First. The Spooner Act of 1902 under which the Canal Zone was acquired and governed and the Panama Canal constructed, 1904–14.

Second. The Panama Canal Act of 1912 for the permanent organization and operation of the canal, 1914–51.

Third. The Panama Canal Reorganization Act of 1950—Thompson Act—placing the canal on a self-sustaining basis, effective in 1951.

Today, I shall limit my comments to the Spooner Act, which is one of the great landmarks in modern Panama Canal history, prepared by one of the ablest men ever to serve in this body of Congress—Senator John C. Spooner, of Wisconsin. Passed by the Senate on June 19, 1902, by a vote of 67 to 6, the House on June 26 by a vote of 259 to 8, the enactment was approved by President Theodore Roosevelt on June 28, 1902, thus becoming the basic Panama Canal law.

In brief, the Spooner Act authorized the President of the United States to do the following:

First. Acquire the French holdings on the isthmus, including the Panama Railroad, at a cost not exceeding $40 million, which amount was actually paid in 1904.

Second. Acquire from Colombia the perpetual control of a strip of land between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans at Panama for the construction of the Panama Canal and its perpetual operation, and of the Panama Railroad.

Third. Obtain such additional necessary rights from Colombia required to facilitate the general purpose of the law.

Fourth. Construct the Panama Canal when satisfactory title to the French holdings was acquired.

Fifth. In event of inability to secure a title or to negotiate an adequate treaty with Colombia, the President was authorized to obtain perpetual control of the necessary territory for a Nicaraguan Canal.

Sixth. Create an Isthmus Canal Commission to be nominated and appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Mr. President, I first made reference to the Spooner Act when I pointed out that it was the legislative foundation for the negotiation of the Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty of 1903. However, for the convenience of those who are studying these documents in logical order, and who wish to compare the text with my analysis of its general legislative intent and function, I ask unanimous consent that it now be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

THE SPOONER ACT [1]

(Approved June 28, 1902)

An Act to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States is hereby authorized to acquire, for and on behalf of the United States, at a cost not exceeding forty millions of dollars, the rights, privileges, franchises, concessions, grants of land, right of way, unfinished work, plants, and other property, real, personal, and mixed, of every name and nature, owned by the New Panama Canal Company, of France, on the Isthmus of Panama, and all its maps, plans, drawings, records on the Isthmus of Panama and in Paris, including all the capital stock, not less, however, than sixty-eight thousand eight hundred and sixty-three shares of the Panama Railroad Company, owned by or held for the use of said canal company, provided a satisfactory title to all of said property can be obtained.

SEC. 2. That the President is hereby authorized to acquire from the Republic of Colombia, for and on behalf of the United States, upon such terms as he may deem reasonable, perpetual control of a strip of land, the territory of the Republic of Colombia, not less than six miles in width, extending from the Caribbean Sea to the Pacific Ocean, and the right to use and dispose of the waters thereon, and to excavate, construct, and to perpetually maintain, operate, and protect thereon a canal, of such depth and capacity as will afford convenient passage of ships of the greatest tonnage and draft now in use, from the Caribbean Sea to the Pacific Ocean, which control shall include the right to perpetually maintain and operate the Panama Railroad, if the ownership thereof, or a controlling interest therein, shall have been acquired by the United States, and also jurisdiction over said strip and the ports at the ends thereof to make such police and sanitary rules and regulations as shall be necessary to preserve order and preserve the public health thereon, and to establish such judicial tribunals as may be agreed upon thereon as may be necessary to enforce such rules and regulations.

The President may acquire such additional territory and rights from Colombia as in his judgment will facilitate the general purpose hereof.

SEC. 3. That when the President shall have arranged to secure a satisfactory title to the property of the New Panama Canal Company, as provided in section one hereof, and shall have obtained by treaty control of the necessary territory from the Republic of Colombia, as provided in section two hereof, he is authorized to pay for the property of the New Panama Canal Company forty millions of dollars and to the Republic of Colombia such sum as shall have been agreed upon, and a sum sufficient for both said purposes is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be paid on warrant or warrants drawn by the President.

The President shall then through the Isthmian Canal Commission hereinafter authorized cause to be excavated, constructed, and completed, utilizing to that end as far as practicable the work heretofore done by the New Panama Canal Company, of France, and its predecessor company, a ship canal from the Caribbean Sea to the Pacific Ocean. Such canal shall be of sufficient capacity and depth as shall afford convenient passage for vessels of the largest tonnage and greatest draft now in use, and such as may be reasonably anticipated, and shall be supplied with all necessary locks and other appliances to meet the necessities of vessels passing through the same from ocean to ocean; and he shall also cause to be constructed such safe and commodious harbors at the termini of said canal, and make such provisions for defense as may be necessary for the safety and protection of said canal and harbors. That the President is authorized for the purposes aforesaid to employ such persons as he may deem necessary, and to fix their compensation.

SEC. 4. That should the President be unable to obtain for the United States a satisfactory title to the property of the New Panama Canal Company and the control of the necessary territory of the Republic of Colombia and the rights mentioned in sections one and two of this Act, within a reasonable time and upon reasonable terms, then the President, having first obtained for the United States perpetual control by treaty of the necessary territory from Costa Rica and Nicaragua, upon terms which he may consider reasonable, for the construction, perpetual maintenance, operation, and protection of a canal connecting the Caribbean Sea with the Pacific Ocean by what is commonly known as the Nicaragua route, shall through the said Isthmian Canal Commission cause to be excavated and constructed a ship canal and waterway from a point on the shore of the Caribbean Sea near Greytown, by way of Lake Nicaragua, to a point near Brito on the Pacific Ocean. Said canal shall be of sufficient capacity and depth to afford convenient passage for vessels of the largest tonnage and greatest draft now in use, and such as may be reasonably anticipated, and shall be supplied with all necessary locks and other appliances to meet the necessities of vessels passing through the same from ocean to ocean; and he shall also construct such safe and commodious harbors at the termini of said canal as shall be necessary for the safe and convenient use thereof, and shall make such provisions for defense as may be necessary for the safety and pro-

[1] *Statutes at Large* (57th Cong., 1st Sess.), Vol. 32, Part 1, pp. 481–84; Public—No. 183. Also, *Isthmian Canal Commission, Annual Report, 1911,* pp. 549–52; I. E. Bennett, *History of the Panama Canal, Its Construction and Builders,* pp. 507–9.

tection of said harbors and canal; and such sum or sums of money as may be agreed upon by such treaty as compensation to be paid to Nicaragua and Costa Rica for the concessions and rights hereunder provided to be acquired by the United States, are hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be paid on warrant or warrants drawn by the President.

The President shall cause the said Isthmian Canal Commission to make such surveys as may be necessary for said canal and harbors to be made, and in making such surveys and in the construction of said canal may employ such persons as he may deem necessary, and may fix their compensation.

In the excavation and construction of said Canal the San Juan River and Lake Nicaragua, or such parts of each as may be made available, shall be used.

SEC. 5. That the sum of ten million dollars is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated toward the project herein contemplated by either route so selected.

And the President is hereby authorized to cause to be entered into such contract or contracts as may be deemed necessary for the proper excavation, construction, completion, and defense of said canal, harbors, and defenses, by the route finally determined upon under the provisions of this Act. Appropriations therefor shall from time to time be hereafter made, not to exceed in the aggregate the additional sum of one hundred and thirty-five millions of dollars should the Panama route be adopted, or one hundred and eighty millions of dollars should the Nicaragua be adopted.

SEC. 6. That in any agreement with the Republic of Colombia, or with the States of Nicaragua and Costa Rica, the President is authorized to guarantee to said Republic or to said States the use of said canal and harbors, upon such terms as may be agreed upon, for all vessels owned by said States or by citizens thereof.

SEC. 7. That to enable the President to construct the canal and works appurtenant thereto as provided in this Act, there is hereby created the Isthmian Canal Commission, the same to be composed of seven members, who shall be nominated and appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall serve until the completion of said canal unless sooner removed by the President, and one of whom shall be named as the chairman of said Commission. Of the seven members of said Commission at least four of them shall be persons learned and skilled in the science of engineering and of the four at least one shall be an officer of the United States Army, and at least one other shall be an officer of the United States Navy, the said officers respectively being either upon the active or the retired list of the Army or of the Navy. Said commissioners shall each receive such compensation as the President shall prescribe until the same shall have been otherwise fixed by the Congress. In addition to the members of said Isthmian Canal Commission, the President is hereby authorized through said Commission to employ in said service any of the engineers of the United States Army at his discretion, and likewise to employ any engineers in civil life, at his discretion, and any other persons necessary for the proper and expeditious prosecution of said work. The compensation of all such engineers and other persons employed under this Act shall be fixed by said Commission, subject to the approval of the President. The official salary of any officer appointed or employed under this Act shall be deducted from the amount of salary or compensation provided by or which shall be fixed under the terms of this Act. Said Commission shall in all matters be subject to the direction and control of the President, and shall make to the President annually and at such other periods as may be required, either by law or by the order of the President, full and complete reports of all their actings and doings and of all moneys received and expended in the construction of said work and in the performance of their duties in connection therewith, which said reports shall be by the President transmitted to Congress. And the said Commission shall furthermore give to Congress, or either House of Congress, such information as may at any time be required either by Act of Congress or by the order of either House of Congress. The President shall cause to be provided and assigned for the use of the Commission such officers as may, with the suitable equipment of the same, be necessary and proper, in his discretion, for the proper discharge of the duties thereof.

SEC. 8. That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to borrow on the credit of the United States from time to time, as the proceeds may be required to defray expenditures authorized by this Act (such proceeds when received to be used only for the purpose of meeting such expenditures), the sum of one hundred and thirty million dollars, or so much thereof as may be necessary, and to prepare and issue therefor coupon or registered bonds of the United States in such form as he may prescribe, and in denominations of twenty dollars or some multiple of that sum, redeemable in gold coin at the pleasure of the United States after ten years from the date of their issue, and payable thirty years from such date, and bearing interest payable quarterly in gold coin at the rate of two per centum per annum; and the bonds herein authorized shall be exempt from all taxes or duties of the United States, as well as from taxation in any form by or under State, municipal, or local authority: *Provided*, That said bonds may be disposed of by the Secretary of the Treasury at not less than par, under such regulations as he may prescribe, giving to all citizens of the United States an equal opportunity to subscribe therefor, but no commissions shall be allowed or paid thereon; and a sum not exceeding one-tenth of one per centum of the amount of the bonds herein authorized is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to pay the expense of preparing, advertising, and issuing the same.

Approved, June 28, 1902.

IN DEFENSE OF THE PRESIDENT

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, on my way to the Capitol Thursday I turned on my car radio to NBC and heard Commentator Chet Huntley deliver an excellent report on what he called "A Startling Evening." Mr. Huntley spoke of a dinner party at which the conversation turned to indictment and criticism of President Johnson that continued until a young attorney announced that he could think of no more attractive case than to defend the President of the United States against his detractors in front of any reputable judge or any fair jury.

Mr. President, Chet Huntley's presentation on the NBC Emphasis series was very brief and needs to have no analysis applied to it. For those who missed it, however, I should like to make the thoughts available, and pass on this young unnamed attorney's challenge that we name any other contemporary American whom we would have preferred in the White House at this time and who could have solved the problems and spared us some of our current anxiety.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Huntley's commentary be printed in the RECORD.

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

A STARTLING EVENING

Chet Huntley, Emphasis, Plain Talk.

It happened one evening this week at a dinner party. The conversation began with the customary barrage of indictments of President Lyndon Johnson—the credibility gap, the Vietnam War, the state of our cities, the presence of poverty, the riots of American Negroes, the state of our alliance with Europe, and so on.

Finally, a bright young New York attorney spoke up. He came on with a rush of words and there were startling little evidences of deep concern and deep feeling in the pitch of his voice. He began by saying that as a lawyer he could think of no more attractive case than to defend the President of the United States against his detractors in front of any reputable judge or any fair jury.

The attorney then said that his defense would rest on the solid premise that it is not Lyndon B. Johnson who has created or exacerbated the problems and dilemmas which bother us. Rather, he said, the problems and the dilemmas were there, and that this President has had the misfortune to be in office at a time when they have become most painful. The attorney declared that far from ducking problems or doing nothing about them, this President has had the daring to call problems to national attention. Poverty was an example. The attorney said that in his opinion this country might have gone on paying little attention to poverty for a few more years, but it was Lyndon B. Johnson who called the attention of the nation to it and tried to do something about it.

As for the credibility gap, the attorney lashed into that issue and called it a hackneyed cliche employed by a section of the population which is too soft to endure dilemmas and to face the unknown. Having no immediate solutions to some of our current dilemmas, he said, we turn to the lame excuse that our President has not told us all and therefore we are confused.

Our attorney friend reached his peroration with a challenge that we name any other contemporary American whom we would have preferred in the White House at this time and who could have solved the problems and spared us some of our current anxiety. He finally ended with the statement that he was not really a Democrat and he was certainly not a Lyndon B. Johnson Democrat but he was getting tired of the abuse being heaped upon the President.

It was a memorable evening. It had been a long time since any of us had heard a defense of the President. I think it had a sharp effect. Some of us went away with a queasy and uneasy feeling that there might be considerable justice in the proposition that all of this unrest and angry talk and complaint is not a case of the man . . . but rather it is a case of the times and the state of things.

THE GOLDEN VOICE OF SENATOR DIRKSEN

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, on September 12, 1967, Jack Mabley wrote a column about the distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN]. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

THE OLD MASTER HAS VOICE BOX FULL OF GOLD

(By Jack Mabley)

The cheering subsided, and Sen. Everett McKinley Dirksen leaned across the speaker's

stand, grasped the microphone, and in his dramatic booming bass voice asked undramatically:

"Can everyone hear me? I always try to find out before I proceed whether you are hearing me well." The audience was quiet. Sen. Dirksen, still grasping the microphone, continued:

"I want to thank you for that warm reception. You know, there was a farmer up in South Dakota who went out to milk his cows in 40 below zero—and it does get to 40 below, I can assure you—and when his warm hands touched those conduits that deliver the milk that old cow turned and said, 'Boss, thanks for the warm hand.' And I thank you for the warm hand."

Each vowel was lovingly caressed. Dirksen doesn't just talk—he plays a mighty vocal organ. He rarely uses three words if it can be said in 10. A cow's udder becomes "those conduits that deliver the milk."

"God created man" is translated by Sen. Dirksen as: "Then came the only creature that was created with intelligence, a soul, a personality, the prospect of divinity. There he was, this lonely creature. He had a beautiful home, if a garden can be called a home. God made it without the aid of the Housing administration. They were not even around then."

Sen. Dirksen was in Calumet City Sunday dedicating a handsome junior high school named for him. I studied him during his half-hour speech to try to analyze what makes Dirksen one of the great orators of the generation.

First of all, he looks like a Senator ought to look. His greatest physical blessing, tho, is a magnificent set of pipes.

"Can you imagine [legato] the army of fresh faced eager-eyed youngsters who will become the tillers of the soil tomorrow or the technicians of tomorrow or the generals?"

"I have tried [molto appassionato] to restore voluntary prayer in the schools of the United States. [Fortissimo] And if the Lord is willing and my spirit don't fail [crescendo] I'll get it done in spite of the Supreme Court!"

The audience roared to its feet in appreciation.

Dirksen has no trouble establishing rapport with his listeners because he talks with them, not at them. He loves being where he is. He is not condescending, and he has a rare ability to be self deprecating without for a moment sacrificing his sense of dignity or importance.

He talked steadily at the school dedication without a note, in a virtual stream-of-consciousness delivery.

Usually names of public persons are bestowed on airports or dams, he said, and even cigars [Ralph Waldo Emerson]. It's nicer to have a school named after you. Teachers should find high joy and rich satisfaction in teaching. A nursing home in Springfield was named the Everett McKinley Nursing Home, but a school is better, for in a school life begins. Some senators say cotton is the greatest national crop, others say it is corn, and some say the peanut. Just think of the peanuts sold in ballparks and the joy they give. But the greatest crop is children.

At the end of 30 minutes he climaxed his speech with a clenched fist, shouting, "There'll always be an America" and the thousands jammed in the big school gym cheered.

Dirksen had come out in favor of schools, children, prayer, soybeans, and America, and against draft card burners and low pay for teachers. There wasn't a person in the room who felt his time was not well spent.

We'll be seeing more of Sen. Dirksen than usual in the next 13 months because no matter how powerful a United States Senator becomes, every 6 years he has to go back home and ask the voters to return him to office.

If you get a chance to hear him, I recommend you do, because you'll be seeing a master, maybe the last of the oratorical masters because of what television is doing to politics.

MRS. LYNDON JOHNSON LEADS A TIMELY CRUSADE TO PRESERVE THE VALUES OF RURAL AMERICA

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, Minnesota was honored this week by a visit from our charming First Lady who is on a Midwestern tour to remind Americans of the virtues of rural living.

Mrs. Johnson was accompanied by three distinguished Minnesotans—Mrs. Muriel Humphrey and secretary, and Mrs. Orville Freeman—along with three other distinguished Americans—Secretary Robert Weaver, Mr. Roger Stevens, the President's special assistant on the arts, and Mrs. Stevens.

I commend Mrs. Johnson for making this trip. Smalltown America contributes tremendously to the vitality of our national life. The values, the attitudes, the way of life shaped by the rural experience has been for countless generations synonymous with the American way of life.

As our cities continue to grow, rural America will remain as a vital influence for shaping the American character. We cannot turn our backs on rural America without endangering one of the most valuable ingredients in our society: America's greatness has always been the diversity of its people, its culture, its community life.

And as Mrs. Johnson said yesterday in Montevideo, Americans must continue to have a choice between rural and city living.

Our First Lady is performing a valuable service by reminding Americans of the quality of their heritage—as both a rural and urban people dependent upon one another not only for food and jobs, but for the exchange of ideas and values that contribute to the full richness of American life.

I ask unanimous consent that Mrs. Johnson's thoughtful address on the values of rural America be printed in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS OF MRS. LYNDON B. JOHNSON AT THE DOWNTOWN URBAN RENEWAL AREA OF MONTEVIDEO, MINN.

Mr. Mayor, Mr. Aaker, Mr. Secretary—friends:

There are 17,000 towns across the country with less than 6,000 people—but I am especially glad to come to this one, because Montevideo has taken action which makes it an example to the others.

I have enjoyed this morning thoroughly, and I know my traveling companions have, too—especially Secretary Robert Weaver who deals with the problems of cities. He is so pleased to see one town where you can find a place to park!

Our group arose this morning at dawn in Washington, flew by jet across 1225 miles and eight states; boarded a bus and drove 60 miles across two states to get here. So you know we really wanted to come to Montevideo!

Your own Orville and Jane Freeman had told us that what we would see would be well worth the effort. And it certainly is!

I am beginning to see evidences of this kind of new zest as I travel. What is happening here is beginning to happen other places. You have a head start.

About 71 million Americans live in towns of 10,000 persons or less. In many of these towns, the streets are coming alive with commerce and industry, old problems are being solved in new ways and the arts are flourishing.

The Census Bureau estimates that in the past 20 years, 200 of these towns have disappeared from the map, and across the land, hundreds of others have settled into a coma. Opportunity went to the city, and the people went after it.

These ghost towns of the 60's have been created not by industries that died such as gold rush towns or coal mining communities, but by populations that simply moved to payrolls and excitement in the city. These towns have literally been dying on the map.

There are no tombstones for them. But if there were, the tombstone might read:

"Here lies fresh air, a place to play, friendly neighbors. It was great while it lasted."

There is no chance of that decline in Montevideo—and I want to congratulate you for setting the pace for other towns.

There is no secret in this land that many of our cities are beset with problems that breed crime: bad housing, rats, pollution, congested traffic, streetside boredom—perhaps the most dangerous of all.

The re-energized small towns across this country may offer one of the important answers to that rising problem. That is why I am glad that our government has joined in with localities like Montevideo for action such as we find here today.

Now the speed of modern transportation, which once drained off the small town to the city, may be the very artery which pumps life back into the small town with new industries, new residents.

Over the past few years, the fact of American life has been that the traffic was all one way: into the city.

One thing my husband has been striving for—is to give Americans a choice. Once, they had to go to the city for jobs, amenities—and entertainment. If these things are available in small towns, might not some of the traffic of people be reversed?

And so I salute you for making your own place on the map secure—and happily—for refusing to give up, and for rolling out such a gay fiesta carpet that says for all who come this way: "Welcome to Montevideo, a good place to live."

DR. EDWARD K. STIMPSON, BELLINGHAM, WASH., HONORED

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, St. Luke's General Hospital in Bellingham, Wash., recently honored a longtime physician of the community. The hospital announced that it would identify its new addition as the Edward K. Stimpson wing. The hospital board took this action by unanimous vote.

Dr. Stimpson is a brilliant medical practitioner who has devoted his life to serving the health needs of a community of some 35,000 people in the northwest corner of the United States. His medical career in Whatcom County has now ended because of his own ill health. His friends and admirers in the community have taken quick action in naming the new "extended-care" structure in his honor.

Dr. Stimpson has been a member of the medical staff of the hospital more

than 30 years and was chief of staff in 1947 and 1948. He was chairman of the medical section on financing for the construction of the present hospital.

His father, Dr. E. W. Stimpson, also was a member of the staff for many years. One son, Edward W. Stimpson, is Assistant Administrator for Congressional Liaison of the Federal Aviation Agency here in Washington, D.C. Another son, Jon, a Sehome High School senior in Bellingham, has worked in my office as an intern the past two summers.

Dr. Stimpson has reason to be proud of his fine family, just as he has reason to feel pride for his many contributions to the community he has served so many years. He represents the best in the medical profession.

The people of Bellingham and Whatcom County sincerely appreciate his efforts, as noted in an editorial in the Bellingham Herald and an article in the same newspaper.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial and article be printed in the RECORD so that all Senators may be aware of this honor given an outstanding physician.

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

NEW ST. LUKE'S WING NAMED FOR DR. STIMPSON

The new wing of St. Luke's General Hospital will be named the Edward K. Stimpson Wing in honor of the Bellingham physician whom the hospital board of trustees "recognizes as a great humanitarian, an outstanding citizen of Whatcom County and a physician who represents the highest ideals of the medical profession."

The name of the new wing received unanimous approval from the board, and dedication has been tentatively set for mid-December.

Dr. Stimpson has been a member of the medical staff of the hospital since 1934, was its chief of staff in 1947 and 1948, served on the advisory board to the board of trustees for a number of years, beginning in 1941, and was chairman of the medical section on financing for the construction of the present hospital.

His father, Dr. E. W. Stimpson, also was a member of the staff for many years.

CHANGE PLANNED

The new wing, due for completion near the end of the year, was designed as a convalescent or extended care unit, but because of the impact of the Medicare program on the hospital's census, the board decided that the opening of the 31 bed unit will provide the opportunity to reorganize the services and facilities of the hospital's North Wing.

The Stimpson Wing will therefore be used for acute patients for the time necessary to modernize the older portion of the hospital constructed in 1924. It currently has 29 beds.

AN EARNED TRIBUTE

Admirers of Dr. Edward K. Stimpson—and that includes just about everybody who knows him—are pleased that his name will identify the new wing of St. Luke's General Hospital.

The structure, an "extended care" unit, was designed as an intermediate facility between hospital and nursing home care and will play an important role in the community's health picture for many years to come. It is to be completed late this year.

In honoring a dedicated local doctor whose longtime practice must close because of ill health, St. Luke's trustees have recognized "a great humanitarian, an outstanding citizen of Whatcom County and a physician who represents the highest ideals of the medical profession." So true!

KIMBERLY-CLARK LEADS THE WAY

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, we in Wisconsin are proud of our industrial achievements. We rank our State as No. 1 in the Nation in the paper industry.

Kimberly-Clark Corp., of Neenah, Wis., has helped to lead the way for the entire industry. It has taken great strides in the field of paper and allied products. It is rated as one of the top companies in the United States.

The far-sighted management of President John R. Kimberly and others of the executive staff is well documented in the company's 1967 annual report.

Kimberly-Clark reported a 10.4-percent increase in net sales during its last business year, a net increase in earnings of 11 percent and an attractive 4.8-percent increase in new jobs created. Over 1,000 new employees now enjoy the benefits of a well-run company.

I have had occasion to scan many annual reports, but Kimberly-Clark's is an exceptionally fine one. It combines excellent photography and an interesting format with a straightforward presentation of the facts. I would commend it for review by my Senators, and I would be happy to supply complete copies to any Senator who would care to contact me.

REPUBLIC OF MALI NATIONAL HOLIDAY

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I wish to extend my compliments and best wishes to the Government and people of the Republic of Mali, who today celebrate their national holiday. This year marks the seventh anniversary of the proclamation of the Republic.

Self-determination and self-fulfillment are the hallmarks of this nation's goals, and the people of Mali are to be commended for their efforts in meeting the stimulating and frustrating challenges of social and economic advancement.

In international affairs, Mali has actively engaged in regional African affairs but has avoided any binding commitment to the major political-ideological blocs. We Americans, who after the Revolutionary War sought to secure our independence through avoiding so-called "entangling alliances," can appreciate and respect Mali's basic policy of nonalinement.

It is my wish, which I am sure is shared by many Americans, that our two nations may enjoy friendly and fruitful relations based upon mutual respect. It is appropriate that we in the Senate take note today of this nation's special achievements and salute its government and people as they celebrate the anniversary of their Republic.

U.S. POLICY IN VIETNAM—ADDRESS BY SENATOR TOWER

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the distinguished junior Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER], a member of the Committee on Armed Services, delivered a major speech on our Nation's Vietnam policy last night.

Because Senator TOWER was prevented by the flooding of Hurricane Beulah from getting from south Texas to Dallas, where he was scheduled to make these remarks to the Dallas Council on World Affairs, he spoke to the group by telephone on what I understand was a rather tenuous hook-up.

In order that the entire text of the Senator's remarks may be available, and because I believe other Members of the Senate will wish to give attention to it, I ask unanimous consent that Senator TOWER's complete speech, entitled "Vietnam: Victory or Gradualism?" be printed in the RECORD.

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

VIETNAM: VICTORY OR GRADUALISM?

(Remarks of Senator JOHN TOWER)

As 1968 approaches we are being beseiged by rhetoric—some logical, most not—designed to persuade this nation of the futility of winning the war in Vietnam.

But, there are good reasons why we must persevere and achieve victory.

First: There are selfish reasons why we must win.

A rebuke for the communist conviction that wars of insurgency are, indeed, the wave of the future could buy 30 years of peace for ourselves and our friends in Asia.

And, there are reasons of honor:

The U.S. pledge to honor its military obligations in defense of our beliefs, wherever we may have such commitments, will not long claim respect if we discard it when confronted by a difficult test.

There are reasons of justice:

The most severe critics of the war have failed to explain why a pacific, innocent Vietnamese people should be abandoned to the atrocity and terror of a communist regime that is determined to impose its ideology upon them.

There are reasons of morality why we must win in Vietnam.

The entire Free World ascribes to the conviction that the United States as the Free World's leader has a moral obligation to provide leadership and assistance throughout the world. We cannot turn back the clock of history and plunge America into a period of "new isolationism", hoping that the rest of the world will just go away and leave us alone. Neither our common sense nor our conscience permits that.

The facts are that if we will quit pulling our punches against the enemy in Vietnam, then victory is within sight.

Not the "unconditional surrender" military victory which Americans came to expect after World War II, but the kind of military-political victory we obtained in Korea when an exhausted enemy finally decided that he could no longer afford to impose his will where he was not wanted. The fact is that there are signs our enemy in Vietnam is reaching exhaustion.

Now, we should not expect an actual surrender or truce; we probably will not even recognize the end when it comes, but only see in retrospect that during a particular month of the combat the enemy began to fall back. Indeed, that moment may already have been reached. It is important to note that every report currently coming out of Hanoi proves beyond any doubt that the enemy knows he cannot defeat us. He can only hope that we will despair and pull out leaving the field to him.

But none of the reasons for winning the

war which I have cited thus far are as vital to this nation, and to its future, as this last reason:

It is not in its successes that a civilization, or a great nation, endures, but rather in its response to adversity. For it is in the response to challenge, rather than in easy affluence, that national sinews of strength, survivability, and growth are forged.

America faces a number of crucial challenges at this juncture in our brief history. Our commitment in Vietnam is one of those crucial challenges.

If we were to turn our backs on that challenge, we would not only close our eyes to the important reasons for winning the war, but we would also level a self-inflicted blow at the very foundations of our national strength. We would weaken ourselves for the challenges and adversities of the future.

Nevertheless, some spokesmen of our so-called "Peace" movements will continue to rationalize America out of the Vietnam war because they find it neither honorable, nor just, nor moral, nor important to future U.S. and free world security and stability.

In succumbing to such a rationalization, these spokesmen duck the real issue—the Red hope that Vietnam-type wars may be too much of a challenge for American society. Mao Tse-tung in Peking and Ho Chi Minh in Hanoi have placed their bets—have publicly staked their policy—on the firm conviction that America will not stand up to this challenge.

I, for one, do not believe that the Vietnam war is too much of a challenge for this great nation!

I have from the very beginning supported what the President has stated as his goals for Southeast Asia. I have supported his announced intention to arrest the spread of communist aggression. I have supported and applauded his stated goal of insuring the freedom and territorial integrity of South Vietnam.

But, along with my support of the long-range goals, I have made suggestions to the President and his Defense Secretary about ways in which our Vietnam effort might be improved. The Administration, however, has remained tied to a single, inflexible policy.

As a result, I must clearly state that I cannot be satisfied with the Administration's present conduct of the war. The Administration has committed us to an open-ended, no-win, long-war policy of gradualism, frittering away the early advantages our massive power afforded us.

We simply must have a new policy to shorten the war.

Military force is successful only when massively applied. Gradual, halting spurts of pressure only enable the enemy to gradually increase his ability to withstand that pressure.

We must begin immediately to apply unrelenting military pressure on the enemy, bombing all targets of military significance and closing the supply port of Haiphong. (A port closed for the duration of World War II by two airplanes laying mines.)

I believe it is important that we confront and defeat communist aggression in Vietnam and promote creation of a series of Asian buffer states around Red China which can help peacefully to contain her just as we have peacefully contained Russia in Europe, but I cannot justify nor support further committing of U.S. lives and resources to a no-win policy.

We need not, nor should we use nuclear weapons in Vietnam, but quite aside from that power we have sufficient conventional air and sea power to shorten the war. We must adopt policies that will end this war before Red China deploys a nuclear missile capability, and that gives us only about two years leeway.

We must act decisively for victory.

As you know, I have been to Vietnam three times in the last two years, and I hope to go again this fall. After each of my investigation trips for the Senate Armed Services Committee, I have frankly reported my assessment of the Vietnam War situation and my suggestions on steps that could speed an end to the fighting.

Nearly two years ago, after my first trip to Vietnam, I advised Texans than an intensified air war against North Vietnam would cut U.S. casualties in the South. And, I stated that the closing of the North Vietnamese supply port of Haiphong was the single, most effective way to damage the communists' war effort.

Again in the spring of 1966, and in the subsequent spring of 1967, I returned from Vietnam with identical observations. Closure of the Haiphong port is still the thing that most needs to be done against North Vietnam. It is entirely possible that had the Administration acted decisively to close Haiphong 24 months ago, the war would be nearly over today.

Throughout the two years that I have been recommending this step toward victory, much of the *evidence* which led me to make that recommendation has been *obscured* by Defense Department *secrecy* restrictions.

Now, within the last month, the *Senate Armed Services Preparedness Subcommittee* has taken evidence from our top defense officials, and released to the public for the first time many of the *previously classified* reasons why the air war in the North has so long concerned not only me, but also other members of Congress.

The facts are that the Administration has so restricted and hamstrung our airmen that the U.S. air effort against North Vietnam has not been *allowed* to achieve the *pressure for victory* which it *could* and *should* achieve. The Senate subcommittee reports that U.S. air power has been *purposely prevented* from waging the air campaign in a way best calculated to achieve results—prevented by overly restrictive controls, strict limitations, and the general Administration doctrine of "gradualism."

It should be nothing less than astounding to Americans that throughout all of 1966 our airmen were allowed to strike less than one percent of the militarily significant targets in the North. Only in very recent weeks have some of the restrictions on our air effort been lifted, but there still remain about *50 key targets recommended for attack* by the Joint Chiefs of Staff *but placed off-limits* by Administration civilians.

The Senate subcommittee states that in its view "the long delay in approving targets in North Vietnam has almost certainly contributed to our aircraft and pilot *losses* since it has given the North Vietnamese the time to build up formidable air defenses."

Moreover, the subcommittee feels the long delay enabled the enemy to prepare for and to alleviate anticipated loss of key supplies and installations by giving the Reds lots of time to relocate and conceal such things as *oil storage*.

Another key point made by the subcommittee report is that, even in cases in which some major targets have been approved for attack, *second attacks* on those same targets *after they have been repaired by the enemy* have been *denied*, particularly in the areas around Haiphong and Hanoi. And, despite target-attack improvements in recent days, there still remain *absolute sanctuary* areas in North Vietnam into which the enemy may move his supplies and operations and know with certainty that he *never* will be subject to air attack. These sanctuaries have enabled the North to concentrate its war-making materiel where it is safe and secure and then dash it south under cover of darkness and bad weather.

The Senate subcommittee also points out again that the port of Haiphong is the *top priority target* still unstruck in the North. Through that port comes the great bulk of North Vietnam's imports—as much as *58-hundred tons* each day.

Every one of the top military experts who testified told the subcommittee that closure, neutralization, or isolation of Haiphong is the *single-most-important military action* that can be taken to speed an *end to the war* and to *save* American and allied lives in the South.

The Administration's conduct of the war is now fully open for public review. It amounts to a policy of restricted gradualism. A policy which discounts the professional judgment of our top military men and substitutes civilian judgment for the smallest details of target selection and timing.

Obviously this strategy of restraint and restrictions has *not* brought the war to an end. We have *not lost*, but we have *not* achieved our objectives *and the war goes on*. The price we have extracted from North Vietnam for its continued aggression is a price North Vietnam is still willing to pay.

Neither the Senate subcommittee, nor I, can support continuation of a *no-win* policy that ignores military judgment. If we are to continue to fight on the ground in the South, then we must press the *air war* in the *North* in a *much more effective way*.

We have been heavily involved in this war for almost two and a half years, since the regular bombing of North Vietnam began in February 1965. By next March, we will have been fighting in Vietnam longer than in the Korean war, and if the war goes into 1969, only our Revolutionary War will have lasted longer.

And there seems to be general agreement that this war will drag on into 1969 and beyond if only our current level of effort is maintained.

Already, the lives of too many American boys have been needlessly sacrificed because civilian officials have refused to follow policies designed to achieve prompt military victory.

The Administration is pulling our punches in Vietnam.

It's not pulling them because our *top military experts* advise that they be pulled. Quite to the contrary, the Joint Chiefs of Staff testifying to the Senate Armed Services Committee have made it clear they favor action against all significant military targets in North Vietnam and unrelenting military, political and economic pressure on the enemy.

The Administration is not pulling our punches either because it really fears intervention by Red China. Both the facts and the Administration's own words refute that contention. In the first place Red China is adequately occupied by internal unrest and disorder and appears in no position to make the massive effort necessary to intrude ground troops across very difficult terrain into Vietnam. In the second place, the President has just belatedly approved U.S. bombing attacks within 10 miles of China proving that he does not think such attacks will provoke China.

If such attacks near China will not bring her into the war, it seems perfectly clear that the removal of restrictions on other significant targets are even less likely to arouse Red China.

Why, then, does the Administration allow this war to drag on?

Either the Administration simply does not understand how to apply American power or it has been unnecessarily stalled by a very small, vocal group in the Congress and around the country and is concerned about the domestic effects of its policy on an already discredited "Great Society".

But the President has only to check the polls to see that the vast majority of Americans will support a strong U.S. policy in Vietnam and that they feel that we *should* apply the means at our disposal to bring this ugly

war to an end. The surveys show, moreover, that more than half of the American people are *not* satisfied with the way the war is being conducted now.

Where has the policy of gradualism brought us? We have methodically built up our forces in Vietnam, from about 25,000 in February 1965 to more than 460,000 today. It is true that the enemy hasn't won a major battle on the ground in over two years, but we have not defeated the enemy forces. The Viet Cong had forces of about 100,000 at the beginning of 1965, but our gradualism policy has allowed the Viet Cong time to also build up its forces to a present total of more than 300,000.

American forces in Vietnam have lost more than 15,000 dead (including nearly 13,000 in combat) and nearly 80,000 wounded.

We will needlessly lose thousands more if present policies continue.

Let's remember that our national interest makes it imperative that Communist aggression be *defeated* in Vietnam.

A check of the record shows that both Republican and Democratic administrations have argued that a policy of containing Asian communism is vital to U.S. interests.

President Eisenhower stated in 1957 that without U.S. assistance, "Strategic Vietnam and Southeast Asia would probably be lost today to the Free World." He said that if Indochina was lost, then Burma would be unable to remain non-communist, the Malayan peninsula would be indefensible and "all India would be outflanked."

President Kennedy is 1963 stated that any significant reduction of American help to South Vietnam and other countries in the area would eventually lead to communist control of all of Southeast Asia "with the inevitable effect this would have on the security of India and, perhaps all the way toward the Middle East."

We are *not* satisfying our national interest in allowing this war to drag on. But, the communists are quite happy to see it drag on. Documents captured in South Vietnam indicate that Hanoi expects the war to last another four or five years and that Peking is urging the North Vietnamese to hold out even longer. Hanoi believes the communists can outlast us. Peking not only believes this, but has publicly stated that U.S. involvement in the Vietnam war will keep America bogged down, and unable to respond to communist moves in other parts of the world.

Some argue that the Soviet Union wants to get this war over. This does not square with the fact that the Soviet Union is the major supplier of military supplies to North Vietnam. The Vietnam war clearly has been a boon to the Soviet Union in its campaign to become a major force in Asia, in its campaign to up-stage communist China in the international communist movement, and as a means of proving to other revolutionary elements in the world that Moscow still is the center of revolutionary communism.

A long, drawn-out Vietnamese war can only be a victory for communists, whether they be of the Moscow, Peking or Hanoi brand.

I submit to you that the communist attitude toward the war will not change unless pressure—heavy military pressure—is applied. The Korean war dragged on for three years and only ended because President Eisenhower made it clear in May 1953 that the war would be broadened unless the shooting stopped. Secretary of State Dulles, in a 1956 interview, indicated that China was told targets would have been attacked in China to win in Korea. The Korean war ended in July 1953, two months after America took a firm stand.

Never in the military history of mankind has a war of indecision produced a victory. Americans who have studied the world's military history know that. Many of them have articulated the principle clearly over the years.

General Douglas MacArthur has stated that: "Once war is forced upon us, there is no other alternative than to apply every available means to bring it to a swift end. War's very object is victory—not prolonged indecision. In war, indeed, there can be no substitute for victory. . . . History teaches us with unmistakable emphasis that appeasement begets but new and bloodier war".

"The surest way to insure World War III," General MacArthur said, "is to allow the Korean War to continue indecisively and indefinitely."

Today, it appears equally obvious that the surest way to insure World War III is to allow the Vietnam War to continue indecisively and indefinitely.

Here is what General Eisenhower said on August 15: "If you are going to fight a war I believe in winning it. You should get everything you can, and use it just as fast as you can and get over with . . . because war is a nasty thing."

Our present military commander in the Pacific, Admiral U. S. Grant Sharp, stated last month to the Armed Services Committee that we must keep the pressure on the communists. He confirmed that there were many good targets left to be hit in North Vietnam. Admiral Sharp said that from a military standpoint, anything that could be done to stop the flow of material into Haiphong would be a fine move, whether by bombing, blockade or mining. And he pointed out that mines from two U.S. planes and one submarine in 1943 closed the port of Haiphong for the rest of World War II.

We simply must not continue to fight the enemy on his terms, but must hit him where it hurts with the least cost to ourselves. Our Air Force and Navy have clear superiority in the air over North Vietnam and in coastal areas, and they have the necessary weapons to force the communists to immediately reconsider their current plan to let this war drag on. All restrictions on our bombing and sea attack must be removed.

It would be the greatest act of folly to limit further our pressure on North Vietnam, and any concession to the Communists on bombing would be the quickest way I know to ensure that this war drags on indefinitely. The communists were hurt badly in Korea in the spring of 1951 and shortly thereafter they agreed to negotiate. Then, when the pressure was off, after negotiations began, the war dragged on for an additional two years. It was only when additional pressure was threatened that the communists agreed to stop fighting. During those two years of negotiations, the United States lost some 20,000 of its total of 54,000 dead suffered in the Korean War.

General Mark Clark, who negotiated with the communists in Korea in 1953, has stated this year that if we agree to stop bombing North Vietnam, then we are going to be whipped at the conference table. General Clark added that he was sure the communists would use peace talks in Vietnam as a cover, to build up their military position, to infiltrate forces into the South and to confront us sooner or later during negotiations with a position of supreme strength that we would not have. General Clark said that military commanders should be allowed to hit every remunerative military target in North Vietnam, "Then you'd find the enemy running to the conference table."

All indications are that the communists hope to put us through the same wringer in Vietnam that they put us through in Korea and which they used to force the withdrawal of France from Vietnam. If we agree to their present conditions, they may well agree to some kind of negotiations. But these conditions would take the pressure off North Vietnam, would eliminate use of our best weapons and force us to fight on communist terms.

The available evidence does not indicate that the communists would agree to a cease-fire in conjunction with a current opening of talks, nor does it indicate that the communists have backed off from their proclaimed goal of a unified Vietnam under communist rule.

Captured enemy documents include a report by Le Duan, number two man in Hanoi, which indicates that if "tactical negotiations" take place, *fighting would continue.* The deputy chief of staff of the North Vietnamese army stated that *fighting would continue* during negotiations, without any restrictions, as a means of influencing the talks under way. These captured documents show that the communist aim is *victory,* not a negotiated settlement. To achieve victory, the communists believe the "key requirement" is to destroy a major portion of U.S., South Vietnamese and other allied forces. We should be wary and not fall into the trap of agreeing to a conference in which we are bound to lose.

The only way to win the war and the peace in Vietnam is to increase the pressure on the enemy, rapidly: to force the communists to give up their attempt at aggression in Vietnam.

I don't believe the American people will accept or should accept a 10- or 20-year war. I don't think they're prepared to tolerate a war of attrition that goes on year after year. Our problems would be simpler, and the war would be shorter, if the Administration would give greater heed to professional military advice. We have the highest caliber of professional military men in our history. They are men who fully understand the political implications of military acts.

If we use the military muscle available to us to punish the enemy—to convince him that war is too costly an instrument of national policy to employ—we will not only win this war but we will also discourage future brush-fire wars.

It is important for us to remember what circumstances have led the Administration to its mistaken Vietnam policy. What we are seeing in Vietnam is the ultimate perversion of the so-called "escalation theory" which was popularized in about 1949 when the Soviets left us in a state of shock by suddenly achieving a nuclear capability.

Stated in lay terms the "escalation theory" goes like this: Nuclear disaster impends in the world; the only way to avoid a nuclear confrontation between the U.S. and the USSR is for the U.S. to make no sudden moves that might upset the enemy or be misinterpreted by the enemy; therefore, the U.S. will publicly announce that it has adopted a policy of "gradualism" and will move to meet enemy pressures only in tiny power-increments—each of which the Communist enemy will be advised about.

This "escalation theory" was all very well when it was implemented by policies of *determination.* In the Cuban Missile Crisis President Kennedy took a series of increasingly severe steps which were fully understood by the Soviet Union. Taken in a controlled but quick and determined fashion, these steps enabled President Kennedy to achieve his policy objectives in short order.

But in Vietnam "escalation with determination" has been replaced by "escalation with gradualism." Not only has it failed, it is actually inhibiting us from moving soon enough and decisively enough to achieve American objectives.

Our enemies in Vietnam know the Administration is committed to gradualism. They know with certainty that no matter how they move against us the Administration will *not* deliver any quick and major response but will respond only bit by bit.

This gives the enemy ample time to absorb our bits of pressure, readjust his operations and keep on fighting.

Worse than that, viewed in a strategic sense, gradualism actually gives the enemy

an *incentive* to challenge us, because he knows we will not act decisively to counter him.

It is analogous to a poker game. Our opponent knows that even if he holds a strategically weak hand he can continue a bluff and we will not drive him from the game with a decisive raise. Instead, he can prolong his game, meeting and surviving our small, indecisive raises until at length *we* have in the pot far more than we had ever intended to commit—so much more that we are tempted to abandon the effort. Our gradualism has thus increased, not decreased, our risks.

So long as this Administration gives the Communists in Vietnam and over the world the *incentive* of guaranteed, gradualistic response, the Reds can and will profitably foment disorder and drain U.S. manpower and resources.

The theory of *gradualized* escalation—which perverts the theory of *determined* escalation by which Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy maintained peace—has been shown a costly fraud in Vietnam. We must face up to the facts of that failure and discard the disproved policy, exercising instead controlled but decisive action.

American power for peace can be decisive only when decisively applied.

A policy of gradualism is too much obsessed with short-term risks and too blind to long-term risks. The gradualist worries too much about the risks he sees in steps needed to shorten the war; but he fails to give proper weight to the far more dangerous risks of letting the war drag on and on while Red China moves nearer and nearer to an inevitable nuclear missile capability.

Gradualism is the greatest risk of all.

Instead of gradualism we need guts.

Instead of procrastination we need pressure.

Instead of vacillation we must have victory.

ADDRESS BY HON. THOMAS R. BYRNE, MAYOR OF ST. PAUL, MINN.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the National Institute of Public Affairs is sponsoring a series of urban forums to acquaint local urban officials with problems in other cities across the Nation, and with potential solutions to these problems. Last night the Honorable Thomas R. Byrne, mayor of the city of St. Paul, gave the major address at the sixth urban forum.

I am particularly pleased to be able to bring this speech to the attention of Congress, because Mayor Byrne exemplifies the young and creative urban leadership we all know is essential for the rejuvenation of our cities.

In the speech, Mayor Byrne has presented an excellent analysis of the problems cities face and what they can do to solve them. He correctly notes that an entire new attitude on the part of city dwellers is needed—the willingness of each individual to examine the problems of all city neighborhoods and not just his own. Mayor Byrne states:

We must become convinced that adequate municipal services in sanitation, health, housing code enforcement, demolition of abandoned and hazardous buildings, protection to the innocent against violence to person or property, must be provided in our poorer neighborhoods with the same solicitude as they are provided in those which are wealthier.

But even more significant, in my opinion, is Mayor Byrne's recognition that the Federal role in solving the urban crisis must be one of partnership with the cities, and not domination of the cities. He states:

In spite of Washington's absolutely vital role as leader, financier, and shaper of urban programs, I do not feel that this Administration or this nation actively desires to see its great cities placed in receivership to the Department of Housing and Urban Affairs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mayor Byrne's speech be printed in the RECORD.

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

CITIES AT THE CROSSROADS

(Remarks of Mayor Thomas R. Byrne to the Sixth Urban Affairs Conference of the National Institute of Public Affairs, Washington, D.C., September 21, 1967)

The National Institute of Public Affairs and the Ford Foundation are to be commended for conducting this series of seminars. The dimensions of our "urban situation" are so vast as to require the concerted attention of America's entire leadership, and only through events like this, which help vitally to broaden the base of concern throughout the business community as well as government, will we ever be able to see the matter through.

Modern history is the history of the city. The great *20th Century* movements and advances in art and literature, in finance and commerce, in politics and government, have stemmed almost entirely from men living in the urban situation. Since the beginning of the modern era, the urban mass has chosen and deposed rulers, determined the course of history, and, on the dark side, been the advance guard of coming upheaval.

In many countries other than our own, great cities grew up around the capitals of various rulers, and thus enjoyed rather more than their share of government attention and of what we would today call "beautification". In view of the power of the urban mob to dethrone kings and princes, the attention flowed more from a healthy respect for survival than from any exaggerated sense of concern for the quality of urban life. To this day the chief of police of Paris is an appointee of the Prime Minister of the country.

In America, by contrast, our traditions and the scope of our vast land led most of our cities to "jest grow", without planning, and, more to the point, with a minimum of concern whether their ultimate form would contribute to the general well-being and happiness of those who would dwell there.

As men become increasingly aware that the *quality* of urban life is not only a matter of grave concern but also is being seriously endangered by present trends, an urban debate of considerable and growing dimensions has begun to spread throughout our land.

It seems to me strange that as a basis for this debate we have not seized upon the elemental and overwhelming fact about urban existence, from which flows most of the corollary problems we face, and that is that the basic *cause* of an urban center, its basic reason for existing and growing, is economic necessity. *In spite of* the romantic talk about the bright lights of the city, about cultural enrichment, and all the rest, the vast majority of people who live in urban centers do so because to do otherwise would be to starve or to live an existence so poor as to be intolerable. People live in the city because they *have* to, *not* because—or *just* because—they like to.

Having decided to live in the city to keep bread in their mouths or to escape oppression, most people find enough there to make life tolerable, if not enjoyable.

But while the urban debate goes on, and the country gradually wakes up to the ramifications of the fact that within the near future more than three-quarters of our people will live in cities and suburbs, it has become apparent—brutally apparent—that our cities have become places where millions of people live lives of not-too-quiet desperation. The racial circumstances of these events have made it difficult for the country to accept Daniel Moynihan's observation that *class*, not *race*, produces these urban upheavals, but I do not feel the observation is any less true.

These outbreaks of street violence have produced a sudden shift of emphasis in this continuing national debate. Until recently the "in" topics for discussion were such middle-class matters as proliferation of governmental units, the growth of various kinds of "megalopolis", mass transit, waste disposal, and the like. We knew Gunnar Myrdal had said "there is an ugly smell rising from the basement of the stately American mansion". We had read Michael Harrington's description of "the other America". Some of us even recalled Dr. Conant's brutally prophetic statement that the high school dropout is "social dynamite", but I think we all uneasily hoped that Sargent Shriver would somehow take care of the whole problem and then we buckled down to *really* important problems such as how to get the new sewage plant built.

Now of course it has been brought home to us in a compelling way that all is not well, that all is in fact going badly, and that significant numbers of our urban residents in this Age of Space are so unutterably frustrated as to be willing to burn the town down to get someone's attention.

We do not "give in to rioters" if we admit that our attention has in fact been got. One of the great relief valves provided by a democratic system is its ability to provide a medium for changing intolerable situations without revolution.

We who form a part of the "political establishment" in this difficult time (and who must ask the people to respect and to support the forces of law and orderly change) must demonstrate by action, not words, that the democratic process can and will provide solutions to legitimate grievances. We have not done so, and time is not on our side.

I am disturbed by much of the public response to our street violence. While it goes without saying that riot training, additional police, and similar measures are necessary—and for a lot of reasons other than repressing urban riots—mere repression did not work for the Czars and it will not work for us. This past summer saw an event whose sad and symbolic value was overlooked in the greater shock. In America, and in 1967, it became necessary for troops of the *central government* to be used to put down a revolt by its own citizens, an action so disturbing to the Framers of our Constitution that it was specifically prohibited except upon application of the Legislature or the Governor of a state. In other countries of the world such an action has always been viewed as a sign of serious civil discord, if not of impending revolution.

As disturbing as the attitude of those who preach repression has been that of those who point the accusing finger of scorn at the Federal government. The defeat of the rat bill on the eve of rioting has become a national "in" joke for cartoonists. While no one can defend the callous jokes made on the House floor by some whose whimsy outweighed for the moment their sense of humanity, one similarly cannot defend the opinion which places the major share of the blame for our urban crisis upon the shoulders of Uncle Sam.

For all the legitimacy of complaints that Federal programs are involved in vast

amounts of red tape, for all the truth to the comments that officials 1500 miles away cannot possibly make judgments on all local situations, the Federal government has for a generation been the leader and the shaper of much of the real progress which has been made in the public sector of urban life. Public housing, urban renewal, public health, welfare reforms, stiffer housing code enforcement, land use planning and recreation, community renewal, and a host of other programs would be weak or nonexistent without enlightened Federal participation and leadership.

The truth of the matter seems to be that the responsibility for urban crisis might be said to result from local governments doing the same things in the same old way, state governments doing nothing at all, and the Federal government doing those things it should have been doing, but not enough of them, while occasionally getting into areas where it did not belong because nobody else *would*. Those who criticize Uncle Sam for not getting into rat control should ask why the States did not do it twenty years ago, or ask the cities why the rats are there in the first place. They certainly were not put there from Washington.

The rather widespread assumption that local leadership—and by that I mean everyone comprehended within the inaccurate term "power structure"—is incompetent to contribute to solving our urban mess, that everything depends upon Federal action, is not only untrue, but more to the point may cause trouble. It may very well force the Federal government, as the level of government historically most responsive to urban problems, into areas in which it simply cannot do as good a job as local government could have done if it had the will, the public support, and the money.

What this nation must have, it seems to me, is a radical change in the "set" of the uneasy coalition of downtown business interests, taxpayers' associations, labor union central bodies, pressure groups, and local politicians who actually form and determine major decisions in every large American city. This isn't really a "power structure", in the sense that its members feel an identity or even agree among themselves, but is rather a "power mix", each of whose components is strong enough to *prevent* actions which are deeply unfavorable, or to *promote* actions which it sees as desirable to its own interests. It determines in fact the level of city expenditures, the priority of various claims on the city's funds and attention, and the vigor with which city policies are established and pursued. The mix determines, for instance, if we will have a downtown shopping mall before we will have a new school in the ghetto, or if we will have a new convention center before we will have public housing, and so on and on. It determines how vigorously the housing code will be enforced as it determines whether or not we will use our limited funds to hire more police, to improve welfare and health services, to clean streets or pick up garbage.

The mix has not really *interested* itself in many of the "gut" problems which cause our current urban tumult. Which of you public officials can recall a telephone call from the local Chamber of Commerce or Labor Assembly demanding more frequent trash collections in the slum area? Demanding stricter health code enforcement in rental dwelling property?

Unless this basic change in local attitudes and practices takes place, the Federal government will not be able to assist in solving our urban crisis without an exercise of national brute force which will permanently affect the course of our tradition of strong local government. And in spite of Washington's absolutely vital role as leader, financier, and shaper of urban programs, I do not feel that this Administration or this nation actively desires to see its great cities placed in receivership to the Department of Housing and Urban Development. I am one liberal Democrat who believes that enlightened, locally elected Democrats with a proper approach can do a better job of solving problems which are really local than the same Democrats appointed by a Federal agency.

Now—which changes must we have before we can approach the millenium?

Most important, as I mentioned above, is the radical change in attitude necessary to bring about *any* significant changes in the policies of local government.

Then we must buckle down to the most immediate problems which face our particular local competences. Vice-President Humphrey put it well in his address to the National League of Cities on July 31, 1967:

"We do not need riots to tell us what is wrong in our urban slums. We all know that in the slums, garbage pickup is at best infrequent if it occurs at all, the snow is plowed away last, the incidence of crime is highest and law enforcement worst, housing is more decrepit, public transportation is most inadequate; . . . the people themselves tell us what is needed".

We must—and I am referring to the entire public and private leadership of the city—we *must* become convinced that adequate municipal services in sanitation, health, housing code enforcement, demolition of abandoned and hazardous building, protection of the innocent against violence to person or property, must be provided in our poorer neighborhoods with the same solicitude as they are provided in those which are wealthier. The common City Hall practice of sending the services where the most taxes come from must come to an end.

The private sector must become as interested in creating and lobbying for improvements to, and expansion of, programs to strengthen family life, guide and correct delinquents, provide job training and opportunities to all, improve welfare programs and services, and the like, as it now is in the construction of convention centers and the building of freeways to reach downtown.

As part of this approach, the business community is going to have to look at local government programs in terms not only of their *cost* but of their *effectiveness*. It does no good for the National Chamber of Commerce, in testifying against Federal programs, to emphasize the role of the private sector and of local government while many of its local affiliates seem to feel their chief role in local government is to keep taxes down. In your business, you don't ask just what a program costs—you ask will it be *worth* the cost. We have simply got to realize that solving our local ills will take money, and that the position of local government as low man on the tax totem pole cannot be forced to continue except at the cost of turning more and more of our problems over to Uncle Sam.

The Federal role in the urban situation, it seems to me, is to provide its vast financial resources to local governments to solve their own problems, while at the same time using its very useful remoteness and position as financier to force upon local governments and power structures decisions and programs which are acknowledged to be right, but which the politics of localities prevent from being adopted.

There must be a strong federal role in urban reform. Central cities, especially, are strapped enough competing for tax bases with suburban communities which can offer attractive locations at convenient distances from the problems of minorities and lower income groups without being forced to bear all the costs of serving as society's melting pot on their own. But you as businessmen and we as public officials are going to have to recognize that really adequate municipal services in declining areas with major social problems will cost more than the present level of service, and that the bill will have to be paid. After all, gentlemen, you might very well ask yourself the long-term value of low property taxes on a burnt-out building.

Another necessary change in attitude is best illustrated by a story. My campaign was based upon having a block worker on every residential block in the city, pledged to go door-to-door with literature, baby-sit on election day, and so forth. More than 1200 volunteers signed up, including a wonderful elderly woman with whom I am personally acquainted.

After the election, she came up to me and said she had a confession to make. "Mr. Byrne," she said, "I signed up as a block worker, and I got all my kit and literature, but I didn't do my job, and finally I didn't even vote for you."

I was a bit stunned, but I managed to ask her why she didn't vote for me.

Very earnestly, and a little sadly, she said, "Because you're just too *nice* to get mixed up with all those people at City Hall."

Humorous? Yes. But also tragic, because it reflects all too accurately an attitude which, however well earned in the past, hampers city government today in dealing with any problems. I feel honest. I think politics, while a tough way to make a living, is pretty respectable. Its so-called "seamy side" is not a bit worse than what I know to be the rough side of any private business. The sense of honor and duty among my co-workers in Saint Paul City Hall is strong and visible.

I can only suggest to all you gentlemen that a community's leaders set the tone for its government. If you don't like what's going on, run for office or support those whose convictions agree with yours. If you do like what's going on, say so. But for the good of all that's holy, the custom of casual remarks which *make* it appear as if everyone in City Hall has two left feet and an outstretched hand is as damaging to the hope that local government can ultimately do what it must do in this nation as *any other* single factor I have named. Companies spend millions of dollars a year to protect and improve their "images". The image of government is in the hands of anyone with a gripe and a tongue. Don't make it any worse than it has to be.

With these changes in attitude, local government itself is due for an overhaul. If anyone tried to run a business the way antiquated city charters, suspicious state legislatures, and the oppressive power of custom requires us to run City Hall you couldn't meet your second payroll. In St. Paul it takes nineteen separate steps, seven signatures, two publications in the legal newspapers, and a performance bond to let a contract to fix a street. It costs us $600 in cash outlay and $1,000 in man-hours of paperwork to tear down an abandoned house. The examples go on and on. After a year of hard work we are submitting a new, modern Charter to our voters December 5; and if it is adopted we will spend the following year, at least, reorganizing our whole government from top to bottom along functional, rather than sentimental or traditional, lines. There probably isn't a major city in the country whose power to act isn't seriously hampered by obsolete charter restrictions on acting *and* taxing, which date back to the first Henry Ford and are the philosophical results of Boss Tweed. If time has proved anything, it has proved that tight restrictions on city powers do not protect the people from the crooks who could twist any system to their own ends; restrictions end up by frustrating the very objectives for which the people organize a government.

If the millenium arrives and the entire local leadership of our own country really buckles down to solving our urban problem, it *will* be solved. While there are encouraging signs that things are moving in this direction, all too much of the talk today reminds me of the lines of Carl Sandburg. "We asked

the cyclone to go around our barn, but it didn't hear us".

Until the late 1800s this nation had a frontier. The poor, the frustrated, the unhappy of the nation and the world had *always* an escape to the west, where land was cheap and restrictions were few.

When the frontier closed, the frontier for vast numbers of immigrants became our great cities.

The frontier is still in the city streets. As I said at the beginning of these remarks, people have always lived in cities because they had to do so to survive. In this country's last, great migration, the Mississippi sharecropper, the Appalachian miner, the back country farmer, white and Negro alike, have come to our great cities seeking the Good Life. They are coming because they have to. They are not finding what they expected, but they are not going back either.

I am confident that given a real recognition by the whole leadership structure of this country that we have in our city streets a revolution of rising expectations different in degree but not in nature from those going on throughout the world, we can solve these problems within the framework of democracy with the same practical success that we have had on every other occasion, except one, when our nation was faced with a great social issue. Nevertheless, the outcome is by no means certain, nor is it at all clear what our nation will look like when the smoke of battle drifts away.

The social choice we face is real. We had enough information at hand to know it was coming, and the question now, the very real question, is will the opinion-making groups of this nation recognize and seize the challenge to do what needs doing? . . . or will we permit hysteria and self-righteousness, the twin cloaks of selfishness, to lead this country into the path of blind reaction and repression which has been the fruitless answer in so many of the nations of this world, old and new?

We must bring to our city courage and conviction; may God give us the strength.

CREDIT UNIONS HELP IN ECUADOR

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, Credit Union magazine is an interesting and informative publication published by the CUNA International, Inc., of Madison, Wis.

This month's issue contains an excellent article describing the impact a credit program is having on the economy of Ecuador.

Prime beneficiaries of these credit programs have been small farmers who, without this assistance, would be forced to go out of business.

Working in cooperation with the AID program, the credit unions are making an important contribution to the welfare of the people of Ecuador.

I am happy that the United States, through the remarkable Credit Unions of North America, based in Wisconsin, is performing such noteworthy work in Latin America.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

TEACHING GRASSROOTS ECONOMICS IN ECUADOR

"I've never been out of debt, so what have I to lose by trying this new scheme?" the *campesino* thought to himself. Since the answer was "Nothing!" he gave it a try.

After a few weeks of study and discussion he had the seed of an idea that would alter his life. He saw a way to own something free and clear for the first time since he began working his small farm. It would take at least a year, but it could be done.

Basically, the plan worked this way: He buys a top-breed sow for $50 with a one-year loan from his village credit union. The sow has two litters during the year. At the end of the year, he sells the sow for what it cost—or maybe even more—and repays his credit union loan. He then has the two litters free and clear—minus the cost of sheltering and feeding the sow during the year.

For years Ecuador's small farmers have been on the fringe of the economy, constantly in debt to usurious moneylenders and barely scraping out an existence from their tiny farms.

What good would it do to tell a poor farmer he needs better seed, fertilizer, insecticides, pesticides, fungicides, and vaccines if there is no way for him to purchase these things? By the same token, what good would a source of low-cost credit be to him if he didn't know how to use it wisely?

The solution came through a special CUNA/AID program which combined credit union services with the technical training necessary to farm profitably. The pilot project began high in the Andes Mountains near the Colombian border in the village of Julio Andrade, and has since spread to 16 other areas of Ecuador.

The dozen and a half credit unions operate a little differently from most of those in North America. Members attend classes to learn about the credit union, how it's organized, and their role in it. As for loans, the stress is on the productive type; loans which will produce income so they can be repaid. Loans are granted only after the member has shown exactly how he plans to use the money and follows the advice of the agricultural extensionist.

In the village of Yaruqui, about 35 miles and more than an hour's drive east-southeast of Quito, the community credit union serves 250 of the 400 families in the area. One of its members, farmer Alfonso Hidalgo, was skeptical of the value of all this involvement. So with his credit union loan he planted some potatoes the old way and some in the manner recommended by the agricultural extensionist.

The new method of planting was much more expensive because of the use of chemicals, but the return was bigger, too. Because of a superior crop, potatoes harvested from the experimental plot sold for more per hundredweight than the other crop. And because he kept accurate records of all expenses and income, Hidalgo made a startling discovery:

He lost 38c (U.S.) on each hundredweight of seed planted the old way but made a net profit of $26.25 on each hundredweight of seed planted the new scientific way.

Even before harvest, Hidalgo and his neighbors could see the difference in the two methods of planting. The new method of planting was producing a more abundant and healthier crop.

"During the year few members took into consideration the advice and technical assistance the credit union was trying to provide," said Nicolas Paillacho Lovat, manager of the Yaruqui Credit Union. "But the few who did had tremendous crop production, so today others want fertilizer, insecticides, and fungicides."

Combining credit with technical advice "was the biggest thing ever to hit Yaruqui," said credit union director Rafael Molineros. "Before we learned how to use fertilizer and fungicides we would plant potatoes at a certain time of the year to avoid the blight season. Now we can plant anytime and harvest 500 hundredweight per hectare (2.471 acres) as compared with a maximum of 200 hundredweight per hectare before."

It also means that the farmers can harvest a crop every seven months (the normal growing season) instead of just once a year.

Another practice recommended in the program is diversification. At Julio Andrade, Luis Filiberto Yar-Maya borrowed from the credit union to plant wheat. An unexpected frost wiped out his crop. He was able to repay his credit union loan, however, because he was also raising hogs and made money on them.

This year Luis is fattening steers. He borrowed 9,500 *sucres* ($475) from the credit union to cover the cost of buying six steers, renting pasture land, hiring a watchman, salt, veterinarian expenses, and the 10 per cent of the loan which must go into credit union shares.

It takes two and a half to three months to fatten the cattle. In the first three lots Luis fattened and sold his net profit came to $60 per lot—a total of $180 in less than nine months. This is an amazing figure in a country with one of the lowest annual per capita incomes in the world.

"I am a farmer's son—a small farmer—and I know the problems of the small farmer: no credit and no place to get technical advice," said Manuel Benitez, managing director of the Ecuador Credit Union League. "This agricultural production credit program is the answer to the small farmer's problem."

Benitez also sees some far-reaching effects from the program. "Farm people have been moving to the cities and creating new social problems such as housing shortages, disease, poverty, and unemployment. So the stress is on solving the cities' problems. But if the concentration were in rural areas, and farm conditions were improved, this would encourage people to stay on the farms and many of the urban problems would disappear."

The production credit program which is so drastically changing the lives of Ecuador's *campesinos* is a tribute to the simplicity and adaptability of the credit union idea.

When Henry Cruz, formerly of St. Joseph's credit union in Saginaw, Michigan, went to Ecuador in August of 1962 under the CUNA/AID contract to get the first credit union program underway, he saw the need for a strong rural program. At his recommendation, CUNA sent Jim Jukes, now managing director of the Kansas League, to Ecuador for three months at the end of 1963 to determine the needs of the *campesino*.

Jukes found the small farmer was still planting potatoes by the full moon, using sticks to dig holes, intermingling his crops, never using fertilizers or other chemicals, and selling his crop in advance to moneylenders for money to buy seed.

By visiting various farmers, Jukes was able to establish the costs of properly planting and caring for the different crops. He also knew what changes would be necessary in the mechanics of the credit union. Jukes recommended the training of members, coordinating the program with the agricultural extension agent, and using Peace Corps volunteers. Loans were to be only for productive purposes, short term credit for a maximum of one year to coincide with the harvest. He also recommended a production credit specialist to implement the activity.

As a result of his last recommendation Percy Avram, formerly of Saskatchewan and CUNA's world extension department, went to Ecuador in October of 1964 to put the program into effect.

Avram set up his pilot project at Julio Andrade, a 55-square-mile farming area with about 1,000 families. The credit union had been in existence for about a year but was not very active.

The new program called for each borrower to receive six hours of instruction. Since the program started, members have received 3,624 man-hours of training. Subjects include the operation of the credit union, the importance of saving and borrowing, the need to repay promptly, the annual meeting, functions of the board and committees, and production credit.

Through the program members learned the proper fertilizer formula based on Julio Andrade's soil conditions, how to mix rations and vaccinate chickens, and new and better hog and chicken breeds were introduced into the community.

In addition to putting the *chulco*, or loan shark, out of business and helping farmers increase production anywhere from 100 to 500 per cent, the credit union has also created a sense of social consciousness in the area.

"The philosophy of the credit union has accomplished much," said Padre Gerardo Onofre, whose church provides the credit union with an office at no cost. "The people have learned mutual respect and mutual help. Before, the political aspects were sharp. Now members of both political parties work together."

The credit union has loaned more than $95,000 without any write-offs. Of the $37,667 in loans outstanding only five are delinquent and these amount to a mere $141. There is indeed a social consciousness in the village as well as a sense of obligation to the credit union.

As other credit unions enter the program, the league helps them prepare promotional campaigns to build up savings, provides information and training on loan procedures and credit regulations, and assists in orienting the members to using productive credit.

They also get strong encouragement to hire fulltime managers if they are to grow, said Mark D. Moriarty, credit union program director under the CUNA/AID contract. "The problem is that they look upon a manager as an expense instead of an investment." So far 10 of the 17 credit unions in the program have fulltime managers.

Most of the participating credit unions are purely agricultural, but a few are in the semirural class. As a result, their loan portfolios also contain loans for productive purposes to artesans, small businessmen, and small industry. The 17 credit unions in the program have more than 6,000 members with nearly $4,000,000 in savings and more than $500,000 in loans outstanding.

Filling the gap between the savings of the members and their loan needs is the Bank for Cooperatives of Ecuador.

The three-year-old co-op bank has nearly $600,000 out in loans to 93 credit unions and eight cooperatives. The bank lends in proportion to what the credit union's loans are for: For each *sucre* a credit union has out in productive loans the bank will lend three; for each *sucre* in consumer loans the bank will lend one.

At Julio Andrade, for example, the members have $15,500 in savings but $37,667 out in loans, possible because of a $23,250 loan from the co-op bank.

In less than three years of operation, the bank made 101 loans for $730,000 at 7 per cent (which includes a government tax of 1 per cent). Commercial loans are about 14 per cent.

Because the investment of credit unions and co-ops in the bank is small, its working capital comes from a $1.2 million line of credit from AID and a 20-year loan from the Ecuadorian government.

Before a loan is granted, the credit union must declare for what purpose the funds will be used, productive or consumer loans. Loans up to 400,000 *sucres* ($20,000) are approved by the credit committee consisting of the general manager and two members of the board of directors. Loans above that amount must be approved by the board.

Only 10 of the 17 credit unions in the production credit program have borrowed so far from the bank. But as the others grow and new credit unions enter the program, loan demands are sure to soar.

Although present plans call for 10 new credit unions to enter the program each year, there are hopes of doubling this figure. But as the program grows new problems are certain to develop.

For example, the small farmers will soon become bigger producers earning bigger incomes, which in turn will make them bigger spenders and bigger consumers. In the near future they'll need marketing co-ops to handle their increased production; farm supply co-ops to get the seed, chemicals and equipment they'll be using in quantity; and consumer co-ops to meet the needs of these new consumers.

Some of this is already taking place on a small scale. "A substantial improvement does not yet exist nationally," explained Carlos Flores of the Ecuador League, "because we only have one and a half years in the program. But the income per member participating in this program is increasing considerably."

One of the more significant aspects of this program is the stress put on training local leaders so that they can carry on without the help and supervision of people like Avram.

One credit union member told THE CREDIT UNION MAGAZINE how his credit union was organized by a priest. "When he had to leave everyone thought the credit union would fail. Another priest came along and he worked with the credit union. The people thought if we are to have a credit union it must be run by the priest. But as we grew and the (production credit) program started we hired a manager, and the credit union grew and all have confidence in the credit union and its manager."

So it is with the program itself. Now that Avram has left, the league is playing a bigger role in the production credit program.

Avram left Ecuador last month to join the staff in CUNA's Latin America regional office in Panama. Through this office CUNA is actively supporting credit union work in 14 Central and South American countries. Avram will now be setting up production credit programs in these other countries.

Continuing Avram's work in Ecuador is Carlos Flores, who has been with the league since November, 1963. Flores and three other Ecuadorians will work with credit unions in setting up production credit programs. These specialists work with a credit union for about six months. Once it reaches the point where the manager and board are trained and it has enough capital to get a loan from the co-op bank, the specialist steps out and regular league fieldman takes over.

"We're convinced that this is the exact program countries in the process of development need," said Flores. "It has changed the methods of farming for some, and enabled others to branch into new types of activities, such as the raising of pigs and chickens.

A strong educational process, naturally, is the keystone of any program. Education is available at three levels in Ecuador, through the league's director of education, the Rev. Ramiro Leon, S.J.

The basic level is aimed at the credit union members and stresses credit union operation, philosophy and history. The text is a league-prepared 8½ x 11-inch, 104-page booklet. Courses are taken right to the individual credit unions.

The second level consists of week-long regional seminars for credit union directors, covering much of the basic course but in more depth. Primarily workshop sessions, they involve participants in setting up and directing committees and threshing out problems actually encountered in their own credit unions.

The third level is a 15-day school held annually in Quito for credit union managers. The highly specialized courses deal with various phases of credit union operation.

"None of these courses are given free," explained Father Leon, a graduate of both the CUNA School and the Coady International Institute at Antigonish, Nova Scotia. The credit unions pay five *sucres* (20c) for each credit union member who takes the basic course; 50 *sucres* ($2.50) for the six-day regional seminars, which includes food and lodging; and 100 *sucres* ($5) for the two-week managers' course, again including food and lodging.

"We are educating our people that they shouldn't expect anything for nothing. They must learn that they have to pay the expenses of the league," explained Father Leon, a native Ecuadorian.

The instructors include personnel from the league and the co-op bank, Peace Corps volunteers, and—most important—local leaders. "We're insisting that credit union people from the local levels help us," says Father Leon. This has alleviated the fear of what would happen when the Peace Corps volunteers and CUNA people stop coming, as one day they must.

"We now have well-trained local leaders to take over," the priest said happily.

In its recent report on CUNA/AID activities, the Agency for International Development termed the "over-all progress" as being "very good."

ASIAN VIEW OF U.S. PARTICIPATION IN VIETNAM

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, Philippine President Ferdinand Marcos, in an interview with Scripps-Howard Newspapers' editor in chief, Walker Stone, this week laid out the Asian view of America's responsibility and presence in Vietnam and, in fact, in all of Asia. The Washington Daily News followed this interview with an editorial summing up—

If we are a global power—

Wrote the editors—

we are automatically a Pacific power. Geography, our national history, and compulsions of international politics since World War II make it so, and there is no point ducking the fact.

President Marcos made it clear that he would consider an American withdrawal from Vietnam a disaster because:

The central fact of life here in Asia is Red China. Whatever it does is of interest to all the leaders and peoples of Asia. Vietnam is merely the theater where the intention of Red China may be reflected. Right now it is supporting North Vietnam and is supporting what we call an exported war, something which all independent nations here in Asia fear most.

Mr. President, I commend these statements and others by President Marcos in this excellent interview to the attention of Senators and the Nation. I ask unanimous consent that Walker Stone's dispatch on this interview from Manila and the Daily News' editorial of September 21 be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Daily News, Sept. 19, 1967]

EXCLUSIVE INTERVIEW: PHILIPPINES FEAR A PULLOUT

(By Walker Stone)

MANILA, September 19.—President Ferdinand Marcos' sensitive antennae are attuned to the political debates in the United States on the conduct of the Vietnam war.

Because of the Philippines' long association with our country he perhaps understands better than other Asian leaders of the vagaries of American politics, and recognizes

that a political pendulum swing from internationalism to isolation has historical American precedent.

He hopes the swing will not go so far as to cause the United States to withdraw from Vietnam short of attaining a stabilizing peace settlement, and certainly not so far as to cause withdrawal from all Asia.

WRONG POLICY

He thinks this would be a "wrong policy," and foresees dire consequences.

With the British already abdicating as a Pacific power, says President Marcos, "if the United States pulls out of Asia, Asia will have to accommodate itself to the reality that Red China is the power that they (Asian nations) cannot prevent from exerting not only pressures but ultimately military control over the countries. Now you tell me where such a conclusion is mistaken."

The word "accommodation," said the president, is a more palatable term than "domination," but ultimately they mean the same.

"If that gap, the security gap or the development gap, is not filled up by an outside power, I can foresee that in the long run, Asia will be run by Red China," he said.

AFRAID?

Are the people afraid of that?

"Definitely so. Leaders realize it not only here in the Philippines but in other places. Ministers that have come here for periodic gatherings in Manila have indicated this growing fear that if America is tired of the war, if America is tired of the burdens of wars brought on them, we now have to think of the possibility that America will withdraw. You will close yourself up again and isolate yourself from all these confrontations. Of couse we feel strongly that would be a wrong policy."

The immediate consequence of an unsatisfactory resolution of the Vietnam conflict would be, said the president, that "almost every country in Southeast Asia would start compromising with Red China. Even Taipei would have to accommodate itself in this situation. And thereafter ultimately, the hegemony of Asia would be attained under the overlordship of Red China. Not that we will not oppose with the force necessary if they try to take over our country. We will."

Vietnam, said the president, "still agitates everybody. The Philippines is no exception. The central fact of life here in Asia is Red China. Whatever it does is of interest to all the leaders and peoples of Asia. Vietnam is merely the theater where the intention of Red China may be reflected. Right now it is supporting North Vietnam and is supporting what we call an exported war, something which all independent nations here in Asia fear most. It is a kind of subversion which may be effective depending on the circumstances. We have had our own experience with communism and subversion, as you will remember.

"I think our country is the only country that has succeeded in overcoming a nationwide communist-inspired rebellion with indigenous troops—tho it is true we had help of American arms and equipment. And you will member this moved (the late) President Quirino in declaring before the United States Senate that, even before the Korean war had erupted, Asia was endangered by communist intentions and activities."

These warnings of the Filipino president should not be interpreted to mean that his is only a gloomy outlook. He sees hope in the recent Vietnam elections, which he describes as "a fantastic success."

"I am surprised," he said, "that they could have such elections. We sent observers, three observers—one from the department of foreign affairs, one from the Senate and one from the House. The three were unanimous that there was free voting. There was an atmosphere of complete freedom although, of course, there were a lot of men in uniform, especially in the north in areas recently under Viet Cong attack."

He is proud of the work being done by the Filipino engineering construction battalion in Vietnam in rebuilding and rehabilitation work. He believes possibly more resources of Vietnam and her allies should be devoted to this "second front."

[From the Washington Daily News, Sept. 21, 1967]

AN ASIAN LEADER SPEAKS

Philippine President Ferdinand Marcos, in his interview this week with Scripps-Howard Newspapers' Editor-in-Chief Walker Stone, laid out an Asian leader's point of view on the Vietnam war, communist China and the American role in Asia. You might find it interesting to compare your views on those three controversial subjects with those of that friendly yet independent-minded man.

To him, the Vietnam war is an "exported war," a war of subversion sponsored by Hanoi with the support of Peking. It is the type of war all independent nations fear most, because China, with its great weight—its vast land mass, teeming population, long history and urge toward expansionism—is, in President Marcos' term "the central fact of life here in Asia."

In the absence of any other great power, Mr. Marcos believes the U.S. must stand up against the exported war in Vietnam, and stay there until there is a "stabilizing peace settlement." Even then, the Philippine President said, the U.S. cannot withdraw from Asia, for to do so would force the smaller nations in China's great shadow to make an "accommodation" with Peking, meaning to recognize China's "overlordship," at the minimum, her ultimate military control at the probable worst. That doesn't exempt Asian nations from doing all they can toward their own security and development. But it does say the U.S. must stick around as the first line of defense and as provider of assistance in the foreseeable future.

In our own mind, we have never been able to understand how some apparently isolationist-leaning Americans can acknowledge proudly their country as a "global power," yet somehow deny we have any business in Asia. If we are a global power we are automatically a Pacific power. Geography, our national history, and the compulsions of international politics since World War II make it so, and there is no point ducking the fact.

A generation ago America went to war in the Pacific to prevent an imperialistic Japan from clamping all Asia into its own "Greater Asian Co-Prosperity Sphere." If that war (tho thrust upon us) was worth it, how can we now fail to do what is necessary to contain a China bent on the same sort of mission, yet working from a much more advantageous base and with greater ability? The present challenge in Asia is another round in our effort to help the smaller nations of Asia stay free. Foolishly, the Japanese of 1941 put the issue squarely on the line by attacking Pearl Harbor. The Chinese of today are unlikely to make such a mistake. But we must recognize the challenge just the same.

THE 90TH BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF HEADMASTER-EMERITUS ARCHIBALD V. GALBRAITH, WILLISTON ACADEMY, EASTHAMPTON, MASS.

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, today marks the 90th birthday anniversary of one of New England's and Massachusetts' most distinguished and dedicated educators, Headmaster-Emeritus Archibald V. Galbraith, of Williston Academy, Easthampton, Mass.

In addition to being a trustee of Smith College and chairman of the board of trustees of the renowned Clark School for the Deaf, Dr. Galbraith served for almost a third of a century as headmaster of Williston Academy. Under his long administration, this fine school prospered and flourished, and it is no exaggeration to suggest that its present high scholastic standing in the academic community is largely attributable to the vision, leadership, and devoted service of Dr. Archibald Galbraith.

In a State which has produced many giants in the field of education, the name of Dr. Archibald Galbraith will always stand out as one of our really great teachers and brilliant administrators.

It is with special pride, therefore, that I take this opportunity of wishing Dr. Galbraith the very happiest of birthdays. If any man ever had a right to look back upon his life with the utmost satisfaction and with the knowledge that his contribution to the field of education has been a particularly rich and fruitful one, it is certainly the man who today celebrates his proverbial fourscore and 10 years amongst us. In wishing for Dr. Galbraith all of the best for today and always, I am privileged also to express my appreciation for all that he has done to bring the highest standards of excellence to the educational institutions which have been so remarkably enriched by his truly distinguished and devoted service.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION, 1968

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 555, H.R. 11722.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 11722) to authorize certain construction at military installations, 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 Armed Services, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

TITLE I

SEC. 101. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment for the following projects:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

UNITED STATES CONTINENTAL ARMY COMMAND

(*First Army*)

Fort Belvoir, Virginia: Operational and training facilities, and research, development, and test facilities, $3,210,000.

Fort Devens, Massachusetts: Maintenance facilities, and utilities, $1,304,000.

Fort Dix, New Jersey: Hospital facilities, $2,585,000.

Fort Eustis, Virginia: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, $976,000.

Fort Hamilton, New York: Operational facilities, $127,000.

A. P. Hill Military Reservation, Virginia: Training facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $4,893,000.

Fort Holabird, Maryland: Administrative facilities, $588,000.

Indiantown Gap Military Reservation, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $581,000.

Fort Knox, Kentucky: Training facilities, and utilities, $3,325,000.

Fort Lee, Virginia: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, medical facilities, and utilities, $2,139,000.

Fort George G. Meade, Maryland: Hospital facilities, and administrative facilities, $4,510,000.

Camp Pickett, Virginia: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, and ground improvements, $329,000.

(Third Army)

Fort Benning, Georgia: Troop housing and utilities, $3,759,000.

Fort Bragg, North Carolina; Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $15,019,000.

Fort Campbell, Kentucky: Hospital facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, $1,654,000.

Fort Gordon, Georgia: Training facilities, supply facilities, utilities, and real estate, $4,364,000.

Fort Jackson, South Carolina: Hospital facilities, $11,412,000.

Fort Rucker, Alabama: Training facilities and troop housing, $2,118,000.

(Fourth Army)

Fort Bliss, Texas: Training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $1,693,000.

Fort Hood, Texas: Maintenance facilities and utilities, $3,075,000.

Fort Polk, Louisiana: Supply facilities, $954,000.

Fort Sill, Oklahoma: Training facilities and community facilities, $3,636,000.

Fort Wolters, Texas: Utilities, $379,000.

(Fifth Army)

Fort Carson, Colorado: Operational and training facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, $15,152,000.

Fort Benjamin Harrison, Indiana: Operational facilities and utilities, $1,106,000.

Fort Leavenworth, Kansas: Administrative facilities, $392,000.

Fort Riley, Kansas: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, medical facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $21,962,00.

Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri: Training facilities, medical facilities, community facilities, and utilites, $2,575,000.

(Sixth Army)

Fort Irwin, California: Operational facilities and utilities, $439,000.

Fort Lewis, Washington: Maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, $4,615,000.

Fort Ord, California: Hospital facilities and troop housing, $27,329,000.

(Military District of Washington)

Fort Meyer, Virginia: Troop housing and utilities, $1,680,000.

(CONUS Various)

CONUS Various Locations: Community facilities, $1,053,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY MATERIEL COMMAND

Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland: Training facilities, research, development, and test facilities, and utilities, $7,228,000.

Aeronautical Maintenance Center, Texas: Utilities, $419,000.

Anniston Army Depot, Alabama: Maintenance facilities and utilities, $964,000.

Fort Detrick, Maryland: Research, development, and test facilities, $2,151,000.

Edgewood Arsenal, Maryland: Troop housing, $653,000.

Letterkenny Army Depot, Pennsylvania: Maintenance facilities and supply facilities, $552,000.

Lexington Blue Grass Army Depot, Kentucky: Maintenance facilities, $160,000.

Fort Monmouth, New Jersey: Utilities, $1,523,000.

New Cumberland Army Depot, Pennsylvania: Utilities, $330,000.

Pine Bluff Arsenal, Arkansas: Production facilities, $1,713,000.

Pueblo Army Depot, Colorado: Maintenance, and supply facilities, $855,000.

Red River Army Depot, Texas: Supply facilities, and administrative facilities, $376,000.

Redstone Arsenal, Alabama: Training facilities, research, development, and test facilities, and administrative facilities, $695,000.

Rock Island Arsenal, Illinois: Utilities, $320,000.

Sacramento Army Depot, California: Supply facilities, $93,000.

Savanna Army Depot, Illinois: Operational facilities, and utilities, $102,000.

Sharpe Army Depot, California: Supply facilities, $199,000.

Tobyhanna Army Depot, Pennsylvania: Maintenance facilities, $268,000.

Tooele Army Depot, Utah: Supply facilities, $680,000.

Watertown Arsenal, Massachusetts: Research, development, and test facilities, $3,471,000.

White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico: Research, development, and test facilities, and utilities, $4,781,000.

Fort Wingate Army Depot, New Mexico: Utilities, $166,000.

Yuma Proving Ground, Arizona: Research, development, and test facilities, $176,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY AIR DEFENSE COMMAND

Chicago Defense Area, Illinois: Operational facilities, $365,000.

Detroit Defense Area, Michigan: Operational facilities, $130,000.

New York Defense Area, New York: Troop housing, $327,000.

CONUS Various Locations: Operational facilities, and utilities, $64,846,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY SECURITY AGENCY

Two Rock Ranch Station, California: Supply facilities, $174,000.

Vint Hill Farms, Virginia: Operational facilities, and supply facilities, $433,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY STRATEGIC COMMUNICATIONS COMMAND

Fort Ritchie, Maryland: Utilities, $136,000.

UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

United States Military Academy, West Point, New York: Training facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $15,495,000.

ARMY MEDICAL SERVICE

Madigan General Hospital, Washington: Medical facilities, $185,000.

Walter Reed Army Medical Center, District of Columbia: Hospital facilities, and community facilities, $12,840,000.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Army Map Service, Maryland: Utilities, $156,000.

MILITARY TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT AND TERMINAL SERVICE

Bayonne Naval Supply Center, New Jersey: Operational facilities, $95,000.

Oakland Army Base, California: Utilities, $289,000.

Sunny Point, North Carolina: Utilities, $70,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY, ALASKA

Fort Greely, Alaska: Operational facilities, $852,000.

Fort Richardson, Alaska: Utilities, $1,800,000.

Fort Wainwright, Alaska: Utilities, $84,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY, HAWAII

Fort De Russy, Hawaii: Troop housing and utilities, $7,132,000.

Schofield Barracks, Hawaii: Training facilities, $286,000.

Fort Shafter, Hawaii: Utilities, $1,944,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

UNITED STATES ARMY, PACIFIC

Camp Zama, Japan: Supply facilities, $193,000.

Korea: Hospital facilities, $2,810,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY FORCES, SOUTHERN COMMAND

Fort Clayton, Canal Zone: Utilities, $7,985,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY MATERIEL COMMAND

Kwajalein Atoll: Research, development, and test facilities, housing and community facilities, $12,255,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY SECURITY AGENCY

Various locations: Operational facilities, housing and community facilities and utilities, $4,601,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY, EUROPE

Germany: Supply facilities, $2,000,000.

Various locations: Operational facilities and supply facilities, $6,815,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY STRATEGIC COMMUNICATIONS COMMAND

Various locations: Operational facilities and utilities, $3,821,000.

SEC. 102. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisitions, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the amount of $2,873,000.

SEC. 103. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop Army installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Army missions and responsibilities which have been occasioned by: (a) unforeseen security considerations, (b) new weapons developments, (c) new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or (d) improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $10,000,000: Provided, That the Secretary of the Army, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction in any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire as of September 30, 1968, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

SEC. 104. (a) Public Law 87-554, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 101, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "CONTINENTAL ARMY COMMAND (Third Army)" with respect to Fort McClellan, Alabama, strike out "$1,-

352,000" and insert in place thereof "$1,554,000;"

(b) Public Law 87–554, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 602 "$102,370,000" and "$150,879,000" and inserting in place thereof "$102,572,000" and "$151,081,000" respectively.

SEC. 105. (a) Public Law 88–174, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 101, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "ARMY COMPONENT COMMANDS (Pacific Command Area)" with respect to Schofield Barracks, Hawaii, strike out "$913,000" and insert in place thereof "$1,006,000".

(b) Public Law 88–174, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 602 "$155,826,000" and "$200,695,000" and inserting in place thereof "$155,919,000" and "$200,788,000", respectively.

SEC. 106, (a) Public Law 88–390, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 101, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "CONTINENTAL ARMY COMMAND (Second Army)" with respect to Fort Lee, Virginia, strike out "$2,900,000" and insert in place thereof "$4,000,000".

(2) Under the subheading "CONTINENTAL ARMY COMMAND (Military District of Washington, District of Columbia)" with respect to Fort Myer, Virginia, strike out "$4,052,000" and insert in place thereof "$4,330,000".

(3) Under the subheading "CONTINENTAL ARMY COMMAND (Fifth Army)" with respect to Fort Sheridan, Illinois, strike out "$5,544,000" and insert in place thereof "$6,350,000".

(4) Under the subheading "UNITED STATES ARMY MATERIEL COMMAND (United States Army Missile Command)" with respect to Redstone Arsenal, Alabama, strike out "$2,389,000" and insert in place thereof "$2,563,000".

(5) Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES (Signal Corps)" with respect to Army Pictorial Center, New York, strike out "$1,120,000" and insert in place thereof "$1,185,000".

(6) Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES (Medical Service)" with respect to Letterman General Hospital, California, strike out "$14,305,000" and insert in place thereof "$15,424,000".

(b) Public Law 88–390, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 602 "$252,994,000" and "$304,055,000" and inserting $256,536,000" and "$307,597,000", respectively.

SEC. 107. (a) Public Law 89–188, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 101, as follows:

(1) Under the heading "CONTINENTAL ARMY COMMAND (Second Army)" with respect to Fort Lee, Virginia, strike out "$700,000" and insert in place thereof "$925,000".

(2) Under the subheading "CONTINENTAL ARMY COMMAND, less Army Materiel Command (Fifth Army)" with respect to Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri, strike out $16,084,000" and insert in place thereof "$16,536,000".

(b) Public Law 89–188 is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 602 "$253,722,000" and "$310,583,000" and inserting "$254,399,000" and "$311,260,000", respectively.

SEC. 108. (a) Public Law 89–568 is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 101, as follows:

(1) Under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" and under the subheading "UNITED STATES CONTINENTAL ARMY COMMAND (First Army)" with respect to United States Military Academy, West Point, New York, strike out "$2,451,000" and insert in place thereof "$2,705,000".

(2) Under the heading "OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES" and under the subheading "UNITED STATES ARMY MATERIEL COMMAND" with respect to Kwajalien Atoll, strike out "$31,333,000" and insert in place thereof $36,907,000".

(b) Public Law 89–568 is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 602 "$57,219,000," "$36,141,000," and "$126,360,000" and inserting "$57,473,000," "$41,715,000" and "$132,188,000".

TITLE II

SEC. 201. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment for the following projects:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

FIRST NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Utilities, $575,000.

Naval Shipyard, Boston, Massachusetts: Utilities, $496,000.

Naval Construction Battalion Center, Davisville, Rhode Island: Troop housing, $2,613,000.

Naval Station, Newport, Rhode Island: Operational facilities, and troop housing, $3,747,000.

Naval Supply Depot, Newport, Rhode Island: Supply facilities, $82,000.

Naval Destroyer School, Newport, Rhode Island: Training facilities, $1,486,000.

Naval Schools Command, Newport, Rhode Island: Training facilities, $2,848,000.

Navy Public Works Center, Newport, Rhode Island: Operational facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $1,697,000.

Naval Air Station, Quonset Point, Rhode Island: Maintenance facilities, and utilities, $2,823,000.

THIRD NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $2,355,000.

Naval Submarine School, New London, Connecticut: Training facilities, $1,607,000.

Naval Submarine Medical Center, New London, Connecticut: Medical facilities, $1,590,000.

FOURTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Air Station, Lakehurst, New Jersey: Troop housing and utilities and ground improvements, $1,786,000.

Naval Air Test Facility, Lakehurst, New Jersey: Research, development, and test facilities, $148,000.

Naval Air Development Center, Johnsville, Pennsylvania: Research, development, and test facilities, $1,684,000.

Naval Shipyard, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Maintenance facilities, and administrative facilities, $1,526,000.

Naval Station, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Troop housing, and utilities and ground improvements, $1,859,000.

Navy Aviation Supply Office, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Administrative facilities, $80,000.

Naval Air Technical Services Facility, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Administrative facilities, $586,000.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Scientific and Technical Intelligence Center, District of Columbia: Administrative facilities, $1,374,000.

Naval Research Laboratory, District of Columbia: Operational facilities, and utilities, $874,000.

Naval Security Station, District of Columbia: Administrative facilities, $2,271,000.

Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland: Training facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $2,443,000.

Naval Hospital, Annapolis, Maryland: Hospital and medical facilities, $134,000.

Naval Radio Station, Annapolis, Maryland: Operational facilities, $5,000,000.

National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, Maryland: Utilities, $630,000.

Naval Communication Station, Cheltenham, Maryland: Troop housing and utilities, $925,000.

Naval Ordnance Station, Indian Head, Maryland: Utilities and ground improvements, $1,208,000.

Naval School, Explosive Ordnance Disposal, Indian Head, Maryland: Training facilities, $296,000.

Naval Air Test Center, Patuxent River, Maryland: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, research, development, and test facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $6,522,000.

FIFTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Hospital, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina: Troop housing, $267,000.

Naval Facility, Cape Hatteras, North Carolina: Troop housing, $92,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Carolina: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $5,349,000.

Marine Corps Air Facility, New River, North Carolina: Operational facilities, and troop housing, $2,866,000.

Fleet Anti-Air Warfare Training Center, Dam Neck, Virginia: Training facilities, and troop housing, $2,378,000.

Naval Radio Station, Driver, Virginia: Troop housing, $21,000.

Naval Amphibious Base, Little Creek, Virginia: Medical facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $6,072,000.

Naval Amphibious School, Little Creek, Virginia: Training facilities, $693,000.

Naval Shipyard, Norfolk, Virginia: Maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and troop housing, $4,723,000.

Headquarters, Commander in Chief, Atlantic Fleet, Norfolk, Virginia: Troop housing, $2,508,000.

Fleet Operations Control Center, Norfolk, Virginia: Utilities, $424,000.

Naval Station, Norfolk, Virginia: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $6,997,000.

Naval Air Station, Norfolk, Virginia: Maintenance facilities, and troop housing, $4,714,000.

Naval Degaussing Station, Norfolk, Virginia: Operational facilities, $364,000.

Naval Supply Center, Norfolk, Virginia: Operational facilities, and supply facilities, $153,000.

Armed Forces Staff College, Norfolk, Virginia: Troop housing, $808,000.

Fleet Training Center, Norfolk, Virginia: Training facilities, $65,000.

Nuclear Weapons Training Center, Atlantic, Norfolk, Virginia: Training facilities, $1,557,000.

Navy Preventive Medicine Unit, Norfolk, Virginia: Medical facilities, $339,000.

Naval Air Station, Oceana, Virginia: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $8,412,000.

Naval Hospital, Portsmouth, Virginia: Troop housing, $498,000.

Naval Weapons Station, Yorktown, Virginia: Maintenance facilities, research, development, and test facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $2,051,000.

SIXTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, Florida: Operational and training facilities, and troop housing, $3,590,000.

Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Florida: Maintenance facilities, $5,260,000.

Naval Hospital, Jacksonville, Florida: Troop housing, $302,000.

Naval Station, Mayport, Florida: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing, $6,558,000.

Naval Station, Key West, Florida: Operational facilities, $300,000.

Naval Air Station, Key West Florida: Supply facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and real estate, $1,511,000.

Naval Hospital, Key West, Florida: Troop housing, $243,000.

Naval Training Center, Orlando, Florida: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $13,425,000.

Navy Mine Defense Laboratory, Panama City, Florida: Troop housing, $441,000.

Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Florida: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities and ground improvements, $5,608,000.

Naval Aviation Medical Center, Pensacola, Florida: Troop housing, $338,000.

Naval Communications Training Center, Pensacola, Florida: Training facilities, and troop housing, $1,864,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Saufley Field, Florida: Operational facilities, and troop housing, $1,317,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Whiting Field, Florida: Troop housing, $1,020,000.

Naval Air Station, Albany, Georgia: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, $1,530,000.

Naval Air Station, Glynco, Georgia: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing, $3,143,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Beaufort, South Carolina: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and community facilities, $955,000.

Naval Shipyard, Charleston, South Carolina: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and administrative facilities, $3,063,000.

Naval Station, Charleston, South Carolina: Community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $4,048,000.

Naval Weapons Station, Charleston, South Carolina: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $16,186,000.

Naval Air Station, Memphis, Tennessee: Troop housing, and utilities and ground improvements, $5,246,000.

EIGHTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Chase Field, Texas: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, utilities and ground improvements, and real estate, $12,784,000.

Naval Air Station, Corpus Christi, Texas: Troop housing, and utilities and ground improvements, $3,603,000.

Naval Hospital, Corpus Christi, Texas: Troop housing, $344,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Kingsville, Texas: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing, $3,894,000.

NINTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois: Troop housing, $6,869,000.

Naval Hospital Corps School, Great Lakes, Illinois: Training facilities, $1,561,000.

Navy Public Works Center, Great Lakes, Illinois: Utilities, $306,000.

Naval Ammunition Depot, Crane, Indiana: Maintenance facilities, $225,000.

ELEVENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Observatory, Flagstaff, Arizona: Research, development, and test facilities, $704,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Yuma, Arizona: Operational facilities, medical facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $2,133,000.

Naval Ordnance Test Station, China Lake, California: Research, development, and test facilities, $2,486,000.

Naval Aerospace Recovery Facility, El Centro, California: Research, development, and test facilities, $460,000.

Naval Air Facility, El Centro, California: Troop housing, $427,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, California: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities and hospital and medical facilities, $4,918,000.

Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, California: Maintenance facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $489,000.

Naval Station, Long Beach, California: Community facilities, $800,000.

Fleet Anti-Submarine Warfare Training Facility, Long Beach, California: Training facilities, $434,000.

Naval Dental Clinic, Long Beach, California: Medical facilities, $821,000.

Pacific Missile Range, Point Mugu, California: Research, development, and test facilities, $509,000.

Naval Ship Missile Systems Engineering Station, Port Hueneme, California: Administrative facilities, $1,591,000.

Naval Construction Battalion Center, Port Hueneme, California: Troop housing, $2,638,000.

Marine Corps Air Facility, Santa Ana, California: Operational facilities, and troop housing, $1,145,000.

Marine Corps Auxiliary Landing Field, Camp Pendleton, California: Operational and training facilities, $381,000.

Naval Amphibious Base, Coronado, California: Administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $8,380,000.

Naval Air Station, Miramar, California: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, adminstratve facilites, and utilities, $5,836,000.

Naval Air Station, North Island, California: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilites and ground improvements, $7,692,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Ream Field, California: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $1,471,000.

Naval Submarine Support Facility, San Diego, California: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilites, and troop housing, $4,720,000.

Fleet Anti-Air Warfare Training Center, San Diego, California: Administrative facilities, $475,000.

Fleet Anti-Submarine Warfare School, San Diego, California: Training facilities, $286,000.

Naval Training Center, San Diego, California: Training facilities, and troop housing, $12,491,000.

Naval Hospital, San Diego, California: Troop housing, $986,000.

TWELFTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Air Station, Lemoore, California: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilites, $5,955,000.

Naval Air Station, Alameda, California: Maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $383,000.

Naval Weapons Station, Concord, California: Operational facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and real estate, $20,079,000.

Naval Radio Station, Dixon, California: Medical facilities, and troop housing, $172,000.

Naval Schools Command, Mare Island, California: Troop housing, $2,738,000.

Naval Air Station, Moffett Field, California: Utilities and ground improvements, $119,000.

Naval Hospital, Oakland, California: Troop housing, $1,436,000.

Naval Shipyard, San Francisco Bay, California: Troop housing at Hunters Point; and maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, community facilities, and utilities at Mare Island, $9,174,000.

Naval Station, Treasure Island, California: Utilities and ground improvements, $850,000.

Naval Schools Command, Treasure Island, California: Training facilities, and troop housing, $5,825,000.

Naval Ammunition Depot, Hawthorne, Nevada: Maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $598,000.

THIRTEENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Facility, Coos Head, Oregon: Utilities and ground improvements, $65,000.

Naval Shipyard, Bremerton, Washington: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, $6,923,000.

Naval Hospital, Bremerton, Washington: Troop housing, $83,000.

Naval Radio Station, Jim Creek, Oso, Washington: Community facilities, $130,000.

Naval Communication Station, Puget Sound, Washington: Operational facilities, $713,000.

Naval Supply Depot, Seattle, Washington: Utilities and ground improvements, $252,000.

Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island, Washington: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing, $2,626,000.

FOURTEENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Communication Station, Honolulu, Oahu, Hawaii: Troop housing, $370,000.

Naval Shipyard, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Hawaii: Maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, $2,237,000.

Naval Station, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Hawaii: Operational facilities, and troop housing, $1,395,000.

Naval Submarine Base, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Hawaii: Maintenance facilities, and troop housing, $4,102,000.

Naval Supply Center, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Hawaii: Operational facilities, $62,000.

Fleet Submarine Training Facility, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Hawaii: Training facilities, $944,000.

Navy Public Works Center, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Hawaii: Utilities and ground improvements, $7,636,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Kaneohe Bay, Oahu, Hawaii: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $2,554,000.

Fleet Operations Control Center, Kunia, Oahu, Hawaii: Troop housing, and utilities, $1,728,000.

Naval Ammunition Depot, Oahu, Hawaii: Maintenance facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $1,170,000.

Naval Air Station, Barbers Point, Oahu, Hawaii: Operational facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $494,000.

Naval Radio Station, Lualualei, Oahu, Hawaii: Operational facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $6,793,000.

Pacific Fleet Tactical Range, Barking Sands, Kauai, Hawaii: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and research, development, and test facilities, $2,264,000.

SEVENTEENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Station, Adak, Alaska: Maintenance facilities, hospital and medical facilities, and utilities, $4,587,000.

Naval Radio Station, Buskin Lake, Kodiak, Alaska: Operational facilities, $686,000.

VARIOUS LOCATIONS

Various Locations: Operational facilities, $55,000.

Various Naval Communication Activities: Utilities, $3,278,000.

MARINE CORPS GROUND FORCES FACILITIES

Marine Corps Schools, Quantico, Virginia: Maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities and ground improvements, $2,571,000.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina: Medical facilities, troop housing, and utilities and ground improvements, $12,507,000.

Marine Corps Supply Center, Albany, Georgia: Maintenance facilities, and utilities, $892,000.

Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Parris Island, South Carolina: Training facilities, medical facilities, and troop housing, $2,149,000.

Marine Corps Supply Center, Barstow, Cal-

ifornia: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing and community facilities, $1,230,000.

Marine Corps Base, Twentynine Palms, California: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, $6,704,000.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California: Maintenance facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, $11,290,000.

Marine Corps Recruit Depot, San Diego, California: Troop housing, $912,000.

Camp H. M. Smith, Aiea, Oahu, Hawaii: Troop housing, $1,549,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

TENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Facility, Antigua, West Indies: Utilities, $87,000.

Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: Troop housing, $3,918,000.

Naval Air Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: Troop housing, $1,600,000.

Naval Hospital, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $1,468,000.

Naval Hospital, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico: Hospital and medical facilities, and troop housing, $6,283,000.

Naval Radio Station, Sabana Seca, Puerto Rico: Troop housing and community facilities, $513,000.

FOURTEENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Station, Midway Islands: Utilities and ground improvements, $1,669,000.

ATLANTIC AREA

Naval Station, Bermuda: Operational facilities, $1,253,000.

EUROPEAN AREA

Naval Communication Station, Londonderry, Northern Ireland: Medical facilities, $116,000.

Naval Radio Station, Guardamar del Segura, Spain: Community facilities, $58,000.

Naval Station, Rota, Spain: Operational facilities, and community facilities, $288,000.

Naval Communication Station, Nea Makri, Greece: Maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $133,000.

PACIFIC OCEAN AREA

Naval Air Station, Agana, Guam, Mariana Islands: Operational facilities, and community facilities, $467,000.

Naval Communication Station, Finegayan, Guam, Mariana Islands: Troop housing, $142,000.

Naval Facility, Guam, Mariana Island: Operational facilities, $200,000.

Naval Station, Guam, Mariana Islands: Troop housing, $284,000.

Naval Supply Depot, Guam, Mariana Islands: Supply facilities, $2,590,000.

Navy Public Works Center, Guam, Mariana Islands: Utilities and ground improvements, and real estate, $8,452,000.

Naval Radio Station, Totsuka, Japan: Utilities, $97,000.

Naval Ordnance Facility, Yokosuka, Japan: Maintenance facilities, $336,000.

Marine Corps Air Facility, Futema, Okinawa: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing, $6,169,000.

Fleet Activities, Ryukyus, Okinawa: Community facilities, $80,000.

Naval Air Station, Cubi Point, Republic of the Philippines: Medical facilities, $105,000.

Naval Communication Station, San Miguel, Republic of the Philippines: Community facilities, $501,000.

Naval Station, Subic Bay, Republic of the Philippines: Community facilities, $179,000.

VARIOUS LOCATIONS

Various Locations: Operational facilities, $65,000.

Various Naval Communication Activities: Utilities, $662,000.

SEC. 202. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop classified naval installations and facilities by acquiring, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of $6,784,000.

SEC. 203. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop Navy installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Navy missions and responsibilities which have been occasioned by: (a) unforeseen security considerations, (b) new weapons developments, (c) new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or (d) improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $10,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Navy, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, immediately upon reaching a decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire as of September 30, 1968, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

SEC. 204. (a) Public Law 88–174, as amended, is amended in title II, section 201, under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" and subheading "BUREAU OF SHIPS (Naval Shipyards)" with respect to Naval Shipyard, Mare Island, California, by striking out "$850,000" and inserting in place thereof "$908,000".

(b) Public Law 88–174, as amended, is amended in section 602, clause (2), by striking out "$116,031,000" and "$202,930,000" and inserting, respectively, in place thereof "$116,089,000" and "$202,988,000".

SEC. 205. (a) Public Law 88–390 is amended in title II, section 201, under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" and subheading "BUREAU OF SHIPS FACILITIES (Naval Shipyards)" with respect to the Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, New Hampshire, by striking out "$4,760,000" and inserting in place thereof "$5,240,000".

(b) Public Law 88–390 is amended in section 602, clause (2), by striking out "$160,237,000" and "$225,639,000" and inserting respectively in place thereof "$160,717,000" and "$226,119,000".

SEC. 206. (a) Public Law 89–188, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 201, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "BUREAU OF SHIPS FACILITIES (Naval Shipyards)" with respect to Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, California, and Naval Shipyard, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Hawaii, strike out $2,931,000" and "$3,591,000", respectively, and insert in place thereof "$3,857,000" and "$4,650,000", respectively.

(2) Under the subheading "FLEET BASE FACILITIES" with respect to Naval Station, Key West, Florida, and Naval Station, Treasure Island, California, strike out "$1,293,000" and "$1,856,000", respectively, and insert in place thereof "$1,462,000" and "$2,234,000", respectively.

(3) Under the subheading "MARINE CORPS FACILITIES" with respect to Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, strike out "$7,126,000" and insert in place thereof "$8,402,000".

(4) Under the subheading "SERVICE SCHOOL FACILITIES" with respect to Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois, strike out "$11,457,000" and insert in place thereof "$12,732,000".

(5) Under the subheading "MEDICAL FACILITIES" with respect to Naval Dispensary and Dental Clinic, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Hawaii, strike out "$2,800,000" and insert in place thereof, "$3,026,000".

(6) Under the heading "COMMUNICATION FACILITIES" with respect to Naval Autodin Facility, Albany, Georgia, and Naval Autodin Facility, Syracuse, New York, strike out "$313,000" and "$45,000", respectively, and insert in place thereof "$926,000" and "$135,000", respectively.

(7) Under the heading "OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH FACILITIES" with respect to Naval Research Laboratory, District of Columbia, strike out "$5,560,000" and insert in place thereof "$7,368,000".

(8) Under the heading "OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES" and subheading "FLEET BASE FACILITIES" with respect to Headquarters Support Activity, Taipei, Republic of China, strike out "$199,000" and insert in place thereof "$370,000".

(b) Public Law 89–188, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 602 "$228,770,000", "$34,436,000", and "$314,305,000" and inserting in place thereof "$236,590,000", $34,607,000", and "$322,296,000", respectively.

TITLE III

SEC. 301. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the following projects:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

AIR DEFENSE COMMAND

Duluth Municipal Airport, Duluth, Minnesota: Administrative facilities and community facilities, $316,000.

Hamilton Air Force Base, San Rafael, California: Utilities, $204,000.

Kingsley Field, Klamath Falls, Oregon: Administrative facilities and utilities, $290,000.

McChord Air Force Base, Tacoma, Washington: Operational facilities and utilities, $1,598,000.

Niagara Falls Municipal Airport, Niagara Falls, New York: Maintenance facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $377,000.

NORAD Headquarters, Colorado Springs, Colorado: Operational facilities, $1,201,000.

Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth, Massachusetts: Utilities, $184,000.

Oxnard Air Force Base, Camarillo, California: Training facilities, $264,000.

Paine Field, Everett, Washington: Operational facilities, $401,000.

Perrin Air Force Base, Sherman, Texas: Operational and training facilities and maintenance facilities, $1,105,000.

Peterson Field, Colorado Springs, Colorado: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $5,405,000.

Selfridge Air Force Base, Mount Clemens, Michigan: Utilities, $1,681,000.

Stewart Air Force Base, Newburgh, New York: Utilities, $166,000.

Suffolk County Air Force Base, Westhampton Beach, New York: Utilities, $475,000.

Tyndall Air Force Base, Panama City, Florida: Supply facilities, $85,000.

AIR FORCE LOGISTICS COMMAND

Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, New York: ministrative facilities, and community facilities, $1,628,000.

Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and community facilities, $1,628,000.

Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $2,147,000.

McClellan Air Force Base, Sacramento, California: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, $7,035,000. $7,035,000.

Newark Air Force Station, Newark, Ohio: Maintenance facilities and utilities, $365,000.

Robins Air Force Base, Macon, Georgia: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, $5,130,000.

Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma: Maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, $3,597,000.

Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, research, development, and test facilities, and utilities, $10,862,000.

AIR FORCE SYSTEMS COMMAND

Arnold Engineering Development Center, Tullahoma, Tennessee: Research, development, and test facilities, and supply facilities, $1,554,000.

Brooks Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Research, development, and test facilities, medical facilities, and troop housing, $4,185,000.

Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc, California: Operational facilities, research, development, and test facilities, and supply facilities, $4,023,000.

Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso, Florida: Operational facilities, research, development, and test facilities, administrative facilities, and troop housing and community facilities, $7,087,000.

Eglin Auxiliary Airfield Numbered 9, Valparaiso, Florida: Operational facilities, and troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, $1,732,000.

Grenier Field, Manchester, New Hampshire: Troop housing, $465,000.

Holloman Air Force Base, Alamogordo, New Mexico: Operational facilities, research, development, and test facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $3,621,000.

Kirtland Air Force Base, Albuquerque, New Mexico: Operational facilities and utilities, $181,000.

Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Bedford, Massachusetts: Research, development, and test facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $1,482,000.

Patrick Air Force Base, Cocoa, Florida: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and research, development, and test facilities, $1,040,000.

Eastern Test Range, Cocoa, Florida: Research, development, and test facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $4,787,000.

Western Test Range, Lampoc, California: Operational facilities, research, development, and test facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $15,333,000.

Satellite Tracking Facilities: Operational facilities, research, development, and test facilities, and utilities, $3,137,000.

AIR TRAINING COMMAND

Chanute Air Force Base, Rantoul, Illinois: Training facilities, hospital facilities, medical facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $2,523,000.

Craig Air Force Base, Selma, Alabama: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing, $1,665,000.

Keesler Air Force Base, Biloxi, Mississippi: Operational and training facilities and administrative facilities, $3,071,000.

Lackland Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing

Laredo Air Force Base, Laredo, Texas: and community facilities, $23,457,000. Utilities, $92,000.

Laughlin Air Force Base, Del Rio, Texas: Operational and training facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, $736,000.

Lowry Air Force Base, Denver, Colorado: Training facilities and troop housing and community facilities, $5,479,000.

Mather Air Force Base, Sacramento, California: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, hospital facilities, administrative facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $7,005,000.

Moody Air Force Base, Valdosta, Georgia: Operational and training facilities, $875,000.

Randolph Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Troop housing and utilities, $1,203,000.

Reese Air Force Base, Lubbock, Texas: Operational and training facilities, hospital facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $3,795,000.

Sheppard Air Force Base, Wichita Falls, Texas: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing, $3,655,000.

Vance Air Force Base, Enid, Oklahoma: Training facilities and utilities, $619,000.

Webb Air Force Base, Big Spring, Texas: Hospital facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, $2,296,000.

Williams Air Force Base, Chandler, Arizona: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, $2,939,000.

AIR UNIVERSITY

Maxwell Air Force Base, Montgomery, Alabama: Supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $302,000.

ALASKAN AIR COMMAND

Eielson Air Force Base, Fairbanks, Alaska: Maintenance facilities and utilities, $225,000.

Elmendorf Air Force Base, Anchorage, Alaska: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, $3,987,000.

Various Locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $11,618,000.

HEADQUARTERS COMMAND

Bolling Air Force Base, Washington, District of Columbia: Maintenance facilities, medical facilities, community facilities, utilities, and ground improvements, $7,819,000.

MILITARY AIRLIFT COMMAND

Altus Air Force Base, Altus, Oklahoma: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and troop housing, $3,655,000.

Charleston Air Force Base, Charleston, South Carolina: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, $7,892,000.

Dover Air Force Base, Dover, Delaware: Operational facilities and utilities, $866,000.

McGuire Air Force Base, Wrightstown, New Jersey: Operational facilities, and troop housing, $843,000.

Norton Air Force Base, San Bernardino, California: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, $4,219,000.

Scott Air Force Base, Belleville, Illinois: Maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, $459,000.

Travis Air Force Base, Fairfield, California: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $6,047,000.

PACIFIC AIR FORCE

Hickam Air Force Base, Honolulu, Hawaii: Medical facilities, troop housing facilities, and utilities, $2,566,000.

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport, Louisiana: Operational facilities, hospital facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $4,483,000.

Beale Air Force Base, Marysville, California: Supply facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, $356,000.

Blytheville Air Force Base, Blytheville, Arkansas: Utilities, $88,000.

Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Peru, Indiana: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, $795,000.

Carswell Air Force Base, Fort Worth, Texas: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing, $1,689,000.

Castle Air Force Base, Merced, California: Administrative facilities, $123,000.

Columbus Air Force Base, Columbus, Mississippi: Operational facilities, hospital facilities, and administrative facilities, $1,132,000.

Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Tucson, Arizona: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, $2,954,000.

Dyess Air Force Base, Abilene, Texas: Training facilities, administrative facilities, and troop housing, $537,000.

Ellsworth Air Force Base, Rapid City, South Dakota: Operational facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, $229,000.

Francis E. Warren Air Force Base, Cheyenne, Wyoming: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, $345,000.

Fairchild Air Force Base, Spokane, Washington: Operational facilities and medical facilities, $389,000.

Grand Forks Air Force Base, Grand Forks, North Dakota: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, hospital facilities, medical facilities, and administrative facilities, $1,652,000.

Homestead Air Force Base, Homestead, Florida: Administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $584,000.

K. I. Sawyer Municipal Airport, Marquette, Michigan: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, $1,032,000.

Little Rock Air Force Base, Little Rock, Arkansas: Operational facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, and troop housing and community facilities, $759,000.

Loring Air Force Base, Limestone, Maine: Operational facilities, administrative facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $388,000.

Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, Montana: Operational facilities, administrative facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $1,428,000.

March Air Force Base, Riverside, California: Administrative facilities, and community facilities, $5,471,000.

McCoy Air Force Base, Orlando, Florida: Supply facilities, administrative facilities, and troop housing, $430,000.

Minot Air Force Base, Minot, North Dakota: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $1,354,000.

Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebraska: Operational facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $960,000.

Pease Air Force Base, Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and administrative facilities, $2,203,000.

Plattsburgh Air Force Base, Plattsburgh, New York: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and community facilities, $2,068,000.

Vandenberg Air Force Base, Lompoc, California: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, $3,581,000.

Westover Air Force Base, Chicopee Falls, Massachusetts: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, $3,120,000.

Whiteman Air Force Base, Knob Noster, Missouri: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, $248,000.

Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Oscoda, Michigan: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $1,053,000.

TACTICAL AIR COMMAND

Bergstrom Air Force Base, Austin, Texas: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities,

supply facilities, hospital facilities, and troop housing and community facilities, $5,866,000.

Cannon Air Force Base, Clovis, New Mexico: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, $6,311,000.

England Air Force Base, Alexandria, Louisiana: Operational facilities, supply facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and real estate, $4,243,000.

Forbes Air Force Base, Topeka, Kansas: Operational facilities, and troop housing, $970,000.

George Air Force Base, Victorville, California: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, $2,454,000.

Langley Air Force Base, Hampton, Virginia: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing, $2,243,000.

Lockbourne Air Force Base, Columbus, Ohio: Utilities, $51,000.

Luke Air Force Base, Phoenix, Arizona: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, and troop housing and community facilities, $3,165,000.

MacDill Air Force Base, Tampa, Florida: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $6,169,000.

McConnell Air Force Base, Wichita, Kansas: Operational facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $2,395,000.

Mountain Home Air Force Base, Mountain Home, Idaho: Operational facilities and administrative facilities, $470,000.

Myrtle Beach Air Force Base, Myrtle Beach, South Carolina: Community facilities and utilities, $839,000.

Nellis Air Force Base, Las Vegas, Nevada: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $4,201,000.

Pope Air Force Base, Fort Bragg, North Carolina: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $5,680,000.

Seymour Johnson Air Force Base, Goldsboro, North Carolina: Training facilities, administrative facilities, and community facilities, $613,000.

Shaw Air Force Base, Sumter, South Carolina: Supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $1,582,000.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY

United States Air Force Academy, Colorado Springs, Colorado: Training facilities, hospital facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, $4,648,000.

AIRCRAFT CONTROL AND WARNING SYSTEM

Various Locations: Maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $1,876,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

AIR DEFENSE COMMAND

Various Locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing, $818,000.

MILITARY AIRLIFT COMMAND

Wake Island Air Force Station, Wake Island: Operational facilities and maintenance facilities, $484,000.

Kindley Air Base, Bermuda: Operational facilities, $84,000.

PACIFIC AIR FORCE

Okinawa: Community facilities, and utilities, $950,000.

Various Locations: Operational facilities and troop housing and community facilities, $1,355,000.

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

Andersen Air Force Base, Guam: Troop housing and utilities, $1,255,000.

Ramey Air Force Base, Puerto Rico: Administrative facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, $1,347,000.

Goose Air Base, Canada: Administrative facilities and utilities, $90,000.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCES IN EUROPE

Germany: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing and community facilities, $2,502,000.

United Kingdom: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, $10,457,000.

Various Locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, $4,520,000.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCES SOUTHERN COMMAND

Howard Air Force Base, Canal Zone: Operational facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $1,625,000.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE SECURITY SERVICE

Various Locations: Operational facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $486,000.

SEC. 302. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of $51,922,000.

SEC. 303. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop Air Force installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Air Force missions and responsibilities which have been occasioned by: (a) unforeseen security considerations, (b) new weapons developments, (c) new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or (d) improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next Military Construction Authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, on install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of $10,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Air Force, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire as of September 30, 1968, except for those public work projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

SEC. 304. (a) Public Law 87–57, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 301, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "TACTICAL AIR COMMAND", with respect to Nellis Air Force Base, Las Vegas, Nevada, strike out "$2,433,000" and insert in place thereof "$2,504,000".

(b) Public Law 87–57, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 602 "$146,868,000" and "$474,461,000" and inserting in place thereof "$146,939,000" and "474,532,000", respectively.

SEC. 305. (a) Public Law 88–390, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 301, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "MILITARY AIR TRANSPORT SERVICE", with respect to Scott Air Force Base, Belleville, Illinois, strike out "$3,137,000" and insert in place thereof "$3,998,000".

(2) Under the subheading "STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND", with respect to Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebraska, strike out "$1,888,000" and insert in place thereof "$2,259,000".

(b) Public Law 88–390, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 602 "$165,327,000" and "$303,447,000" and inserting in place thereof "$166,559,000" and "$304,679,000", respectively.

SEC. 306. (a) Public Law 89–188, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 301, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "AIR DEFENSE COMMAND", with respect to McChord Air Force Base, Tacoma, Washington, strike out "$3,736,000" and insert in place thereof "$4,277,000".

(2) Under the subheading "AIR TRAINING COMMAND", with respect to Chanute Air Force Base, Rantoul, Illinois, strike out "$5,442,000" and insert in place thereof "$6,347,000".

(3) Under the subheading "AIR TRAINING COMMAND" with respect to Lackland Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas, strike out "$5,510,000" and insert in place thereof "$6,663,000".

(4) Under the subheading "AIR TRAINING COMMAND" with respect to Moody Air Force Base, Valdosta, Georgia, strike out "$1,782,000" and insert in place thereof "$2,017,000".

(5) Under the subheading "AIR TRAINING COMMAND" with respect to Randolph Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas, strike out "$651,000" and insert in place thereof "$732,000".

(6) Under the subheading "AIR UNIVERSITY" with respect to Maxwell Air Force Base, Montgomery, Alabama, strike out "$770,000" and insert in place thereof "$970,000".

(7) Under the subheading "MILITARY AIR TRANSPORT SERVICE" with respect to McGuire Air Force Base, Wrightstown, New Jersey, strike out "$2,094,000" and insert in place thereof "$2,440,000".

(8) Under the subheading "MILITARY AIR TRANSPORT SERVICE" with respect to Scott Air Force Base, Belleville, Illinois, strike out "$2,240,000" and insert in place thereof "$2,612,000".

(9) Under the subheading "STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND" with respect to Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Peru, Indiana, strike out "$1,785,000" and insert in place thereof "$1,945,000".

(10) Under the subheading "STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND" with respect to K. I. Sawyer Municipal Airport, Marquette, Michigan, strike out "$148,000" and insert in place thereof "$223,000".

(11) Under the subheading "STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND" with respect to Lockbourne Air Force Base, Columbus, Ohio, strike out "$565,000" and insert in place thereof "$706,000".

(12) Under the subseading "STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND" with respect to McCoy Air Force Base, Orlando, Florida, strike out "$40,000" and insert in place thereof "$66,000".

(13) Under the subheading "STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND" with respect to Minot Air Force Base, Minot, North Dakota, strike out "$109,000" and insert in place thereof "$132,000".

(14) Under the subheading "STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND" with respect to Whiteman Air Force Base, Knob Noster, Missouri, strike out "$218,000" and insert in place thereof "$250,000".

(15) Under the subheading "STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND" with respect to Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Osconda, Michigan, strike out "$45,000" and insert in place thereof "$70,000".

(16) Under the subheading "TACTICAL AIR COMMAND" with respect to Langley Air Force Base, Hampton, Virginia, strike out "$3,696,000" and insert in place thereof "$4,063,000".

(17) Under the subheading "TACTICAL AIR COMMAND" with respect to Pope Air Force Base, Fort Bragg, North Carolina, strike out "$2,560,000" and insert in place thereof "$2,801,000".

(18) Under the subheading "TACTICAL AIR COMMAND" with respect to Shaw Air Force Base, Sumter, South Carolina, strike out "$1,189,000" and insert in place thereof "$1,267,000".

(b) Public Law 89–188, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 602 "$210,630,000" and "$334,376,000" and inserting in place thereof "$215,631,000" and "$339,377,000", respectively.

SEC. 307. (a) Public Law 89–568 is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 301, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "AIR FORCE SYSTEMS COMMAND" with respect to Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso, Florida, strike out "$6,277,000" and insert in place thereof "$7,262,000".

(2) Under the subheading "AIR TRAINING COMMAND" with respect to Chanute Air Force Base, Rantoul, Illinois, strike out "$586,000" and insert in place thereof "$885,000".

(3) Under the subheading "AIR TRAINING COMMAND" with respect to Vance Air Force Base, Enid, Oklahoma, strike out "$1,169,000" and insert in place thereof "$1,313,000".

(4) Under the subheading "ALASKAN AIR COMMAND" with respect to Elmendorf Air Force Base, Anchorage, Alaska, strike out "$1,265,000" and insert in place thereof "$1,500,000".

(5) Under the subheading "MILITARY AIRLIFT COMMAND" with respect to Norton Air Force Base, San Bernardino, California, strike out "$7,706,000" and insert in place thereof "$8,560,000".

(6) Under the subheading "STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND" with respect to Columbus Air Force Base, Columbus, Mississippi, strike out "$494,000" and insert in place thereof "$607,000".

(7) Under the subheading "STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND" with respect to Minot Air Force Base, Minot, North Dakota, strike out "$440,000" and insert in place thereof "$498,000".

(b) Public Law 89–568 is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 602 "$107,098,000" and "$198,014,000" and inserting in place thereof "$109,786,000" and "$200,702,000", respectively.

TITLE IV

SEC. 401. The Secretary of Defense may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for defense agencies for the following projects:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

DEFENSE ATOMIC SUPPORT AGENCY

Sandia Base, New Mexico: Administrative facilities and hospital and medical facilities, $1,732,000.

DEFENSE COMMUNICATIONS AGENCY

National Military Command System Support Center, Pentagon, Washington, District of Columbia: Administrative facilities, $600,000.

DEFENSE SUPPLY AGENCY

Defense Depot, Mechanicsburg, Pennsylvania: Supply facilities, $375,000.

Defense Construction Supply Center, Columbus, Ohio: Maintenance facilities and supply facilities, $847,000.

Defense Supply Depot, Tracy, California: Supply facilities, $4,026,000.

Defense Logistics Services Center, Battle Creek, Michigan: Administrative facilities, $305,000.

Defense Personnel Support Center, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Administrative facilities and utilities, $2,429,000.

NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY

Fort George G. Meade, Maryland: Operational facilities, production facilities, and utilities, $3,416,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

DEFENSE ATOMIC SUPPORT AGENCY

Johnston Island: Community facilities, and ground improvements, $1,410,000.

NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY

Various Locations, Europe: Operational facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $2,407,000.

SEC. 402. The Secretary of Defense may establish or develop installations and facilities which he determines to be vital to the security of the United States, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of $200,000,000.

SEC. 403. (a) Public Law 89–188, as amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 401 as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE AGENCY" with respect to Arlington Hall Station, Arlington, Virginia, strike out "$17,900,000" and insert in place thereof "$20,000,000".

(b) Public Law 89–188, as amended, is amended, by striking out in clause (4) of section 602 "$100,051,000" and inserting in place thereof "$102,151,000".

TITLE V

SEC. 501. The Secretary of each military department may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, which are necessary outside the United States in connection with military activities in Southeast Asia, or in support of such activities in the total amount as follows:

Department of the Army, $33,156,000

Department of the Navy, $17,964,000

Department of the Air Force, $23,880,000: *Provided*, That materials only are authorized in connection with dependent military housing facilities for the Vietnamese.

SEC. 502. The Secretary of Defense, in connection with construction projects undertaken in South Vietnam pursuant to section 501 above, shall furnish to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives such reports as were heretofore furnished pursuant to section 401(c) of Public Law 89–367 (80 Stat. 36, 37).

TITLE VI

MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING

SEC. 601. The Secretary of Defense, or his designee, is authorized to construct, at the locations hereinafter named, family housing units and trailer court facilities in the numbers hereinafter listed, but no family housing construction shall be commenced at any such locations in the United States, until the Secretary shall have consulted with the Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, as to the availability of adequate private housing at such locations. If agreement cannot be reached with respect to the availability of adequate private housing at any location, the Secretary of Defense shall immediately notify the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate, in writing, of such difference of opinion, and no contract for construction at such location shall be entered into for a period of thirty days after such notification has been given. This authority shall include the authority to acquire land, and interests in land, by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

Family housing units for—

(a) The Department of the Army, two thousand one hundred units, $38,444,000:

Redstone Arsenal, Alabama, two hundred units.

Presidio of San Francisco, California, two hundred units.

Fort Benning, Georgia, three hundred and sixty units.

Fort Gordon, Georgia, four hundred units.

Rock Island Arsenal, Illinois, fifty units.

Fort Meade, Maryland, three hundred units.

Fort Jackson, South Carolina, two hundred units.

Fort Hood, Texas, one hundred and twenty units.

Fort Stewart, Georgia, one hundred and twenty units.

Pacific Side, Canal Zone, one hundred and fifty units.

(b) The Department of the Navy, four thousand four hundred and sixty-two units, $90,760,000:

Marine Corps Air Station, Yuma, Arizona, four hundred and thirty units.

Naval Air Station, Lemoore, California, fifty units.

Naval Complex, Long Beach, California, five hundred units.

Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut, three hundred units.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Whiting Field, Florida, one hundred units.

Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Florida, fifty units.

Naval Supply Corps School, Athens, Georgia, forty-two units.

Naval Complex, Oahu, Hawaii, five hundred units.

David Taylor Model Basin Field Station, Bayview, Idaho, four units.

Naval Air Station, Glenview, Illinois, one hundred and fifty units.

Naval Security Group Activity, Winter Harbor, Maine, thirty-two units.

Naval Air Test Center, Patuxent River, Maryland, two hundred units.

Naval Facility, Nantucket, Massachusetts, fourteen units.

Naval Ammunition Depot, Hawthorne, Nevada, one hundred units.

Naval Ammunition Depot, McAlester, Oklahoma, thirty units.

Naval Complex, South Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, two hundred units.

Naval Complex, Newport, Rhode Island, two hundred units.

Naval Air Station, Quonset Point, Rhode Island, two hundred units.

Naval Complex, Charleston, South Carolina, one hundred and fifty units.

Naval Complex, Norfolk, Virginia, one hundred units.

Naval Shipyard, Bremerton, Washington, one hundred units.

Naval Security Group Activity, Marietta, Washington, thirty units.

Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island, Washington, two hundred and fifty units.

Naval Communication Station, Sugar Grove, West Virginia, twenty units.

Naval Station, Guam, two hundred units.

Naval Communication Station, North West Cape, Australia, seventy units.

Naval Base, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, two hundred units.

Naval Station, Keflavik, Iceland, one hundred and forty units.

Naval Station, Subic Bay, Republic of Philippines, one hundred units.

(c) The Department of the Air Force, three thousand three hundred and twenty-two units, $66,588,000:

Craig Air Force Base, Alabama, three hundred units.

Luke Air Force Range, Arizona, four units.

George Air Force Base, California, three hundred and seventy-two units.

Dover Air Force Base, Delaware, one unit.

Tyndall Air Force Base, Florida, one hundred and sixty units.

Hickam-Wheeler Air Force Bases, Hawaii, four hundred units.

Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Indiana, two hundred units.

McConnell Air Force Base, Kansas, two hundred units.

Offutt Air Force Base, Nebraska, two hundred units.

Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma, three hundred units.

Shaw Air Force Base, South Carolina, three hundred units.

Bergstrom Air Force Base, Texas, fourteen units.

Laredo Air Force Base, Texas, four hundred units.

Laughlin Air Force Base, Texas, one hundred units.

Reese Air Force Base, Texas, one unit.

Ramey Air Force Base, Puerto Rico, one hundred units.

Andersen Air Force Base, Guam, two hundred units.

Wake Island Air Force Station, twenty units.

Albrook-Howard Air Force Bases, Canal Zone, fifty units.

SEC. 602. Authorization for the construction of family housing provided in this Act shall be subject, under such regulations as the Secretary of Defense may prescribe, to the following limitations on cost, which shall include shades, screens, ranges, refrigerators, and all other installed equipment and fixtures:

(a) The average unit cost for each military department for all units of family housing constructed in the United States (other than Hawaii and Alaska) and Puerto Rico shall not exceed $19,500, including the cost of the family unit and the proportionate costs of land acquisition, site preparation, and installation of utilities.

(b) No family housing unit in the areas listed in subsection (a) shall be constructed at a total cost exceeding $32,000, including the cost of the family unit and the proportionate costs of land acquisition, site preparation, and installation of utilities.

(c) When family housing units are constructed in areas other than those listed in subsection (a), the average cost of all such units, in any project of fifty units or more, shall not exceed $32,000, and in no event shall the cost of any unit exceed $40,000. The cost limitations of this subsection shall include the cost of the family unit and the proportionate costs of land acquisition, site preparation, and installation of utilities.

SEC. 603. Notwithstanding the limitations contained in prior Military Construction Authorizations Acts on cost of construction of family housing, the limitations on such cost contained in section 602 of this Act shall apply to all prior authorizations for construction of family housing not heretofore repealed and for which construction contracts have not been executed by the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 604. The Secretary of Defense, or his designee, is authorized to accomplish alterations, additions, expansions, or extensions not otherwise authorized by law, to existing public quarters at a cost not to exceed—

(a) For the Department of the Army $7,000,000.

(b) For the Department of the Navy, $5,000,000.

(c) For the Department of the Air Force, $5,000,000.

(d) For the Defense Agencies, $671,000.

SEC. 605. Section 507 of Public Law 88–174 (77 Stat. 307, 326), as amended by section 505 of Public Law 89–188 (79 Stat. 793, 814), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 507. For the purpose of providing military family housing in foreign countries, the Secretary of Defense is authorized to enter into agreements guaranteeing the builders or other sponsors of such housing a rental return equivalent to a specified portion of the annual rental income which the builders or other sponsors would receive from the tenants if the housing were fully occupied: *Provided*, That the aggregate amount guaranteed under such agreements entered into during the fiscal years 1968 and 1969 shall not exceed such amount as may be applicable to five thousand units: *Provided further*, That no such agreement shall guarantee the payment of more than 97 per centum of the anticipated rentals, nor shall any guarantee extend for a period of more than ten years, nor shall the average guaranteed rental on any project exceed $185 per unit per month, including the cost of maintenance and operation."

SEC. 606. Section 501(b) of Public Law 87–554 (76 Stat. 223, 237) is amended by deleting the period at the end thereof and adding the following new clause: "and (3) notwithstanding any other provision of law, for the purpose of debt service, proceeds of the disposal of family housing of the Department of Defense, including related land and improvements, whether disposed of by the Department of Defense or any other Federal agency, but less those expenses payable pursuant to section 204(b) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 485(b)), to remain available until expended."

SEC. 607. Section 515 of Public Law 84–161 (69 Stat. 324, 352), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 515. During fiscal years 1968 and 1969, the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, respectively, are authorized to lease housing facilities, for assignment as public quarters to military personnel and their dependents, if any, without rental charge, at or near any military installation in the United States, Puerto Rico, or Guam if the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, finds that there is a lack of adequate housing facilities at or near such military installation and that (1) there has been a recent and substantial increase in the personnel strength assigned to such military installation and such increase is temporary, or (2) the permanent personnel strength of such military installation is to be substantially reduced in the near future, or (3) the number of military personnel assigned to such military installation is so small as to make the construction of family housing uneconomical. Such housing facilities may be leased on an individual basis and not more than seven thousand five hundred such units may be so leased at any one time. Expenditures for the rental of such housing facilities may not exceed an average of $175 per unit per month for each military department, including the cost of utilities and maintenance and operation."

SEC. 608. Subsection (g) of section 407 of Public Law 85–241 (71 Stat. 531, 556), as amended (42 U.S.C. 1594j(g)) is amended by adding the following sentence at the end thereof: "Any such housing so exempted in connection with depot-type installations, as to which the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, determines, subsequent to July 1, 1967, that indefinite retention may be necessary to satisfy unanticipated housing requirements resulting from future expanded activity at such installations, may be retained and utilized as necessary, notwithstanding that the foregoing criteria are no longer satisfied."

SEC. 609. The Secretary of Defense, or his designee, is authorized to acquire by transfer, without reimbursement, all rights and interests of the Federal Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice, in ten family housing units located on Auxiliary Field Numbered 6, Eglin Air Force Base, Florida.

SEC. 610. (a) None of the funds authorized by this or any other Act may be expended for the repair or improvement of any single family housing unit, or for the repair or improvement of two or more housing units when such units are to be converted into or used as a single family housing unit, if the cost of such repair or improvement to such unit or units, as the case may be, exceeds a total cost of $10,000, including any costs in connection with (1) the furnishing of electricity, gas, water, and sewage disposal; (2) roads and walks; and (3) grading and drainage, unless such repair or improvement in connection with such unit or units is specifically authorized by law. As used in this section the term "repair or improvement" includes maintenance, alteration, expansion, extension, or rehabilitation of any housing unit or units.

(b) The Secretary of Defense, or his designee, is authorized to accomplish repairs and improvements to existing public quarters in amounts in excess of the $10,000 limitation prescribed in subsection (a) of this section as follows:

United States Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland, eight units, $158,000.

Commandant, United States Marine Corps Quarters, Washington, District of Columbia, one unit, $67,000.

Chief, Naval Air Training Quarters, Pensacola, Florida, one unit, $19,900.

Quarters A, Naval Station, New York, one unit, $23,500.

Flag Quarters T–143, PWC San Diego, California, one unit, $18,100.

Flag Quarters Number 23, Honolulu, Hawaii, one unit, $16,300.

General Officers Quarters, Scott Air Force Base, Illinois, twelve units, $190,400.

Sandia Base, New Mexico, twelve units, $125,000.

(c) Section 609 of the Military Construction Act of 1961 (75 Stat. 111) is hereby repealed.

SEC. 611. There is authorized to be appropriated for use by the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, for military family housing as authorized by law for the following purposes:

(a) for construction and acquisition of family housing, including improvements to adequate quarters, improvements to inadequate quarters, minor construction, rental guarantee payments, construction and acquisition of trailer court facilities, and planning, an amount not to exceed $215,673,000, and

(b) for support of military family housing, including operating expenses, leasing, maintenance of real property, payments of principal and interest on mortgage debts incurred, payments to the Commodity Credit Corporation, and mortgage insurance premiums authorized under section 222 of the National Housing Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1517m), an amount not to exceed $520,000,000.

TITLE VII

HOMEOWNERS ASSISTANCE

SEC. 701. In accordance with subsection 1013(i) of Public Law 89–754 (80 Stat. 1255, 1292) there is authorized to be appropriated for use by the Secretary of Defense for the purposes of section 1013 of Public Law 89–754, including acquisition of properties, an amount not to exceed $27,000,000.

TITLE VIII

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 801. The Secretary of each military department may proceed to establish or develop installations and facilities under this Act without regard to section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529), and sections 4774(d) and 9774(d) of title 10, United States Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary improvements on land includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (40 U.S.C. 255), and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

SEC. 802. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this Act, but appropriations for public works projects authorized by titles I, II, III, IV, V, VI, and VII shall not exceed—

(1) for title I: Inside the United States, $284,447,000; outside the United States, $40,480,000; section 102, $2,873,000; or a total of $327,800,000.

(2) for title II: Inside the United States, $408,703,000; outside the United States, $39,515,000; section 202, $6,784,000; or a total of $455,002,000.

(3) for title III: Inside the United States, $297,008,000; outside the United States, $25,973,000; section 302, $51,922,000; or a total of $374,903,000.

(4) for title IV: A total of $217,547,000.

(5) for title V: Southeast Asia support—Department of the Army, $33,156,000; Department of the Navy, $17,964,000; Department of the Air Force, $23,880,000.

(6) for title VI: Military family housing, $735,673,000.

(7) for title VII: Homeowners assistance, $27,000,000.

SEC. 803. Any of the amounts named in titles I, II, III, and IV of this Act, may, in the discretion of the Secretary concerned, be increased by 5 per centum for projects inside the United States (other than Alaska) and by 10 per centum for projects outside the United States or in Alaska, if he determines in the case of any particular project that such increase (1) is required for the sole purpose of meeting unusual variations in cost arising in connection with that project, and (2) could not have been reasonably anticipated at the time such project was submitted to the Congress. However, the total costs of all projects in each such title may not be more than the total amount authorized to be appropriated for projects in that title.

SEC. 804. Contracts for construction made by the United States for performance within the United States and its possessions under this Act shall be executed under the jurisdiction and supervision of the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, or the Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Department of the Navy, unless the Secretary of Defense or his designee determines that because such jurisdiction and supervision is wholly impracticable such contracts should be executed under the jurisdiction and supervision of another department or Government agency, and shall be awarded, insofar as practicable, on a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder, if the national security will not be impaired and the award is consistent with chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code. Regulations issued by the Secretary of Defense implementing the provisions of this section shall provide the department or agency requiring such construction with the right to select either the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, or the Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Department of the Navy, as its construction agent, providing that under the facts and circumstances that exist at the time of the selection of the construction agent, such selection will not result in any increased cost to the United States. The Secretaries of the military departments shall report semiannually to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives with respect to all contracts awarded on other than a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder.

SEC. 805. (a) As of October 1, 1968, all authorizations for military public works (other than family housing) to be accomplished by the Secretary of a military department in connection with the establishment or development of military installations and facilities and all authorizations for appropriations therefor, that are contained in titles I, II, III, and IV of the Act of September 12, 1966, Public Law 89-568 (80 Stat. 739), and not superseded or otherwise modified by a later authorization are repealed except authorizations for public works projects as to which appropriated funds have been obligated for construction contracts or land acquisitions in whole or in part before October 1, 1968, and authorizations for appropriations therefor.

(b) Effective fifteen months from the date of enactment of this Act, all authorizations for construction of family housing, including trailer court facilities, all authorizations to accomplish alterations, additions, expansions, or extensions to existing family housing, and all authorizations for related facilities projects, which are contained in this or any previous Act, are hereby repealed, except (1) authorizations for family housing projects as to which appropriated funds have been obligated for construction contracts or land acquisitions or manufactured structural component contracts in whole or in part before such date, and (2) authorizations to accomplish alterations, additions, expansions, or extensions to existing family housing, and authorizations for related facilities projects, as to which appropriated funds have been obligated for construction contracts before such date.

SEC. 806. None of the authority contained in titles I, II, III, IV, and V of this Act shall be deemed to authorize any building construction project inside the United States (other than Alaska) at a unit cost in excess of—

(1) $36 per square foot for cold storage warehousing;

(2) $9 per square foot for regular warehousing;

(3) $2,300 per person for permanent barracks:

(4) $8,500 per person for bachelor officer quarters; unless the Secretary of Defense or his designee determines that, because of special circumstances, application to such project of the limitations on unit costs contained in this section is impracticable: *Provided*, That notwithstanding the limitations contained in prior Military Construction Authorization Acts on unit costs, the limitations on such costs contained in this section shall apply to all prior authorizations for such construction not heretofore repealed and for which construction contracts have not been awarded by the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 807. Section 610 of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1967 (Public Law 89-568; 80 Stat. 756) is amended as follows:

(a) By inserting, after the words "under this Act" appearing in subsection (b), the following: "or hereafter authorized" and

(b) By striking the period at the end thereof, substituting a colon therefor and adding the following: *"Provided, however,* That this authorization may be averaged and applied to a single facility of two or more facilities, or among projects on an installation, when such application will result in more fallout shelter space, or is needed to meet minimum fallout protection standards in such facilities or projects."

SEC. 808. None of the funds authorized by this Act shall be expended for the construction of any waste treatment or waste disposal system at or in connection with any military installation until after the Secretary of Defense or his designee has consulted with the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration of the Department of the Interior and determined that the degree and type of waste disposal and treatment required in the area in which such military installation is located are consistent with applicable Federal or State water quality standards or other requirements and that the planned system will be coordinated in timing with a State, county, or municipal program which requires communities to take such related abatement measures as are necessary to achieve area-wide pollution cleanup.

SEC. 809. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the lands constituting Fort DeRussy, Hawaii, may be sold, leased, transferred, or otherwise disposed by the Department of Defense unless hereafter authorized by law.

SEC. 810. Titles I, II, III, IV, V, VI, VII, and VIII of this Act may be cited as the "Military Construction Authorization Act, 1968."

TITLE IX

RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES

SEC. 901. Subject to chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of Defense may establish or develop additional facilities for the Reserve Forces, including the acquisition of land therefor, but the cost of such facilities shall not exceed—

(1) for Department of the Army:

(a) Army National Guard of the United States, $10,000,000.

(b) Army Reserve, $10,000,000.

(2) for Department of the Navy: Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, $4,500,000.

(3) for Department of the Air Force:

(a) Air National Guard of the United States, $9,800,000.

(b) Air Force Reserve, $4,000,000.

SEC. 902. The Secretary of Defense may establish or develop installations and facilities under this title without regard to section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529), and sections 4774(d) and 9774(d) of title 10, United States Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary improvements on land includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (40 U.S.C. 255), and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

SEC. 903. This title may be cited as the "Reserve Forces Facilities Authorization Act, 1968."

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. JACKSON. Mr. President, the pending bill provides construction and other related authority for the military departments and Defense agencies within and outside the United States, including authority for the construction of facilities for the Reserve components. The sum total of the new authority contained in the bill is $2,251,225,000. In addition, approval is granted for an increase in prior years' authority of $29,963,000 for a total authorization of $2,281,188,000.

The Army is authorized $327.8 million; the Navy, $455 million; the Air Force, $374.9 million; Defense agencies, $217.5 million; Southeast Asia requirements, $75 million; military family housing $735.7 million; homeowners' assistance, $27 million; and $38.3 million for the Reserve components.

The military construction bill this year is the largest to come before Congress in many years. As proposed, it called for a

total authorization of about $2.7 billion, and the authorization recommended by the Committee on Armed Services is $379,195,000 below the amount requested for a total decrease of about 14 percent. Likewise, this is $127.6 million less than the new authority approved by the House of Representatives.

The magnitude of the bill this year, we are told, results from two major reasons. First is a resumption of a long-range program on behalf of the Department of Defense to replace outmoded and inadequate facilities, and secondly, a return to the Department's objective of including annual increments of military family housing in the annual construction program.

The committee has made every effort to analyze each individual request in light of the importance of the mission to be performed and eliminated those projects that lack urgency, those that appear to be overdesigned and overpriced, and those where present facilities could be continued in use without disruption to the various programs.

One significant element of this year's request is directed toward implementing the recently enacted Federal Water Pollution Control Act, and about $45.3 million was asked for this purpose. The committee seriously questions some of the waste treatment and disposal projects, as did the House of Representatives, since some were slated for extremely remote locations and others were in areas where it is apparent that local authorities are lagging behind in their responsibility. We strongly endorse the need for military installations to set an example of leadership in pollution control, but at the same time it would well prove wasteful of public funds and futile in terms of end results if these military bases were to construct modern treatment facilities while cities and factories in the same areas will continue to discharge inadequately treated waste. Approval has been granted for each such project requested, however, but a general provision has been included in the bill which is designed to preclude the expenditure of any funds for this purpose until the Secretary of Defense or his designee has consulted with the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration of the Department of the Interior and has determined that the planned system is in keeping with local and Federal standards and is coordinated in timing with similar State, county, or municipal programs which require communities to take such related abatement measures as necessary to achieve areawide water pollution cleanup.

Now, the new authority granted to the Department of the Army is $90.7 million less than the amount requested; and in regard to the Army program, I wish to specifically mention three matters of some importance.

First, the House inserted in the bill $7,132.000 for troop housing and utilities at Fort DeRussy, Hawaii. The committee is in agreement with this. As we know, Fort DeRussy is located on Waikiki Beach in the Honolulu area and is the principal rest and recreational area for the military in Hawaii. Many of our military personnel involved in the Southeast Asia conflict are returning daily to Hawaii for rest purposes, and there is now a lack of facilities to provide for their needs. There have been some attempts made in the past on the part of the Department of Defense to dispose of a portion of this valuable property, and the committee was of the unanimous opinion that this property should be held within the Department of Defense inventory to provide a rest and recreational area for the military. And a provision has been included in the bill to preclude the Department from disposing of any of this property without specific authorization by law. The committee endorses the construction of low density troop billets since they can be in place and ready for use much earlier than a high-rise structure. And in any event, it will be expected that such facilities as may be constructed will be shared on an equitable basis by both enlisted and officer pesonnel. Secondly, I mention the Walter Reed Medical Center in the District of Columbia. That outstanding medical center has operated for years in what might be termed inadequate, antiquated, and substandard structures. There has been added to the bill $12,480,000 to provide for the first phase of replacing the buildings at this medical center.

The amount granted will permit the removal of various community and related activities from the reservation proper to the Forest Glen, Md., annex, thus relieving unwarranted congestion and permitting the orderly replacement of hospital facilities.

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

Mr. JACKSON. I would prefer to finish the statement, but I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I recall I was present when that matter was brought up. The congestion is due to the fact that we have a few commissaries at Walter Reed to which all of the dependents of soldiers come to purchase food and other articles.

Mr. JACKSON. That is partly true. Also, it is the place where military personnel stationed within the District of Columbia, who may be assigned to other installations, can also purchase whatever is available at the Walter Reed commissary.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is the program to provide other facilities to take care of this situation at another place?

Mr. JACKSON. There are two features to the proposals. One involves the removal of the commissaries, and PX, and the other unrelated hospital facilities to nearby Forest Glen, Md., Annex, which is, I believe, about 3 miles away.

Mr. ELLENDER. How much would be spent to increase the facility at the new location?

Mr. JACKSON. The total amount, including the removal of the buildings and the new structures at Forest Glen is $3.6 million.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator will recall that I objected to that provision. I do not see why we should provide commissaries when we have many such facilities that are nearby. This is an expense that could be avoided.

Mr. JACKSON. It is not just the commissaries. It pertains to garages and other installations.

Mr. ELLENDER. I know. However, we are providing for commissaries at quite an expense. These commissaries would be operated by the Army. Great expense will be incurred, and added to the burden of our taxpayers.

I wonder why this is being done now in view of the huge deficit we are running. That situation, of course, obtains not only with respect to this particular project, but I notice also in the report that we are providing in excess of $15 million to enlarge West Point.

Today, at West Point, as I recall, there are approximately 2,400 students, and the plan is to increase that number to 4,400.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2388) to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that S. 2388 be temporarily set aside, and that the Senate continue with its consideration of H.R. 11722.

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

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION ACT, 1968

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11722) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Under this measure, in excess of $15 million is being provided to expand West Point from a capacity of 2,400 to 4,400. This is an item that I feel could be easily deferred.

I am sorry, Mr. President, that I could not participate in the markup of the bill because I am not a member of the Committee on Armed Services. I was present at the hearings on the bill because they were held jointly by the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Armed Services. Nevertheless, I intend to take a very close look at all items in the forthcoming appropriations bill.

As the Senator knows, we now have three military academies. To educate a man at West Point requires $12,776 per year. At Annapolis, the cost is $9,296 per year, and the cost of training an air cadet is $12,564. This amount is about half of what the cost was a few years ago when the enrollment at the Air Force Academy was less than the present enrollment.

As I pointed out before the Committee

on Appropriations, during the hearings that were held on the regular defense appropriation bill, more than 80 percent of our officers come from ROTC establishments and officer candidate schools To educate an officer in the ROTC program is much less than the cost of training cadets at the academies. As I recall a full 4-year ROTC course will approximate $5,600.

In view of these facts, I just cannot understand why it is proposed to expand West Point to the extent of doubling its student capacity. I was hopeful that this could be postponed at least until we were able to balance the budget, if that day will ever come.

I also pointed out at the hearings, Mr. President, that we have been acquiring much land in order to add to our various forts throughout the country. A couple of years ago, we expanded Fort Carson, Colo., through the purchase of 78,648 acres of land, although we have much land in various parts of the country that can be used for the purposes for which the land at Fort Carson is now being used. At Fort Riley, Kans., we acquired 46,384 acres at a total cost in excess of $13 million.

Mr. President, as I pointed out during the hearings, we have Fort Polk in Louisiana which includes 7 million acres of the finest land for training soldiers and carrying on maneuvers. Yet, we let this fine training area remain idle while we expand other forts at tremendous cost to the taxpayer.

I am not necessarily pleading for Louisiana, by any means; but it seems to me that before we enlarge and expend huge sums to further increase the size of these other forts, we should try to utilize those now in existence. If that were done, I am confident that much money could be saved.

I am gravely concerned about the large amount that is authorized in the bill for family housing.

In the past, we provided for 7,500 units. In this bill we are being asked to provide 9,888 units, at a cost of $735,673,000.

It seems to me that this is a poor time to ask for such huge sums, when the President is asking for a cutback, and when he is asking, in the same breath, for increased taxes. It seems to me that many projects, in addition to those deleted by the committee, could well be delayed, in order to deprive the fires of inflation with additional fuel.

Mr. President, I shall not go further into this matter at this time. I realize that this is only an authorizing bill and that, so to speak, we will have a second shot at these projects when the bill comes to the Committee on Appropriations. I serve notice that, so far as I am concerned, when these requests come before the Committee on Appropriations, I shall do my best to scrutinize each item carefully, in the hope that we can either eliminate some of the items or postpone them. In my opinion, this is a bad time to expand these facilities.

As the Senator from Washington may recall, some efforts were made to expand hospital facilities at many of our forts in order to construct permanent buildings. To what extent has that program been cut in the bill?

Mr. JACKSON. We cut the funds for at least 3 complete replacement hospitals. A substantial sum was requested for Beaumont General Hospital. There were funds for Otis Air Force Base in Massachusetts, England Air Force Base, Louisiana, and we denied some seven hospital additions, such as Fitzsimmons in Denver, Colo., and Lackland Air Force Base, Texas, the latter in the amount of $13,737,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. Those were eliminated?

Mr. JACKSON. That is correct, and in addition, several other editions and renovations.

Mr. ELLENDER. Which were included?

Mr. JACKSON. We have money in the bill for the Navy hospital at Roosevelt Roads and several others.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is in Puerto Rico?

Mr. JACKSON. In Puerto Rico. As the Senator is aware, the Navy is building a large naval support facility at Roosevelt Roads. In my judgment, it is in a part of the world that is very vital. We denied the money in the past, as the distinguished Senator from Louisiana will recall, on the ground that we had not been given assurance that the services would not build another hospital in San Juan, which is 30 or 40 miles away.

In connection with the hearings, we obtained a letter from the Department of Defense assuring us that the hospital facilities now available—primarily the VA hospital in San Juan—would be utilized, that they would not come in and ask for funds.

On that condition, we approved the money for Roosevelt Roads.

Mr. ELLENDER. The report was available only about an hour ago, and I did not have a chance to go over it. As I recall, there were quite a few other facilities to be constructed at places in which we already had sufficient facilities.

Mr. JACKSON. There are 3 complete hospitals that we eliminated.

Mr. ELLENDER. I find that our three services endeavor to take advantage of us by seeking an increase of funds to build permanent facilities at these various forts while we are at war. This has traditionally been the case.

Mr. JACKSON. The Senator is quite right. This is a danger. We have tried to be very prudent. In going through the bill we cut $127 million below the House figure. We have cut 14 percent from the administration request. That is a fair cut, I believe.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator mean 14 percent of the money?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes. We have cut 14 percent from the administration request.

Mr. ELLENDER. I notice that the bill contains an authorization to buy 5,021 acres of land at a cost of approximately $4,000 an acre at Concord, Calif.

Mr. JACKSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wonder if the distinguished Senator can justify the purchase of this land at $4,000 an acre.

Mr. JACKSON. The Senator is asking a very proper question.

Mr. ELLENDER. I always try to do that.

Mr. JACKSON. Yes, sir. I shall try to give the Senator a forthright answer.

First of all, we are not talking about unimproved land. We are talking about the fundamental problem that exists at Port Chicago. The Senator will recall that in 1944 at this naval ammunition loading facility 320 people were killed in a disastrous accident. That accident occurred during World War II.

We have been concerned about safety standards at Concord, as it is called, for a long time.

There is involved in that request the acquisition of 5,021 acres surrounding and including the town of Port Chicago to take them out of the danger zone. This item involves $19,800,000. Now, we learned that there are three chemical plants that employ approximately 700 people. One plant has about 300 employees. We were of the opinion in the committee that if they are going to take the residential and business property in the city of Port Chicago and other surrounding property, in connection with these 5,000 acres they will have to take the plants and we do not know what that will cost. I venture to say that if they are going to comply with existing regulations as to safety in handling ammunition it might come to $60 to $80 million. The committee authorized the amount requested in dollars and told the Navy, "You had better check some alternate solutions to the problem; maybe you should move from Port Chicago."

Mr. ELLENDER. That is what I was going to suggest.

Mr. JACKSON. That is right.

Mr. ELLENDER. Has the committee given any thought to that suggestion, instead of buying this land? It would seem to me that it would be cheaper to move away from this area than to purchase this land at $4,000 an acre.

Mr. JACKSON. I shall explain the options. If they move out and completely replace this facility, we are talking, in terms of expenditure of funds, over $100 million.

I call to the attention of the Senate that the subcommittee warned the Navy about it as far back as 12 years ago and told them they should be looking at another location. Now, we are confronted with a situation where we have to do something. If we do not, we could have another disaster at Port Chicago in which many hundreds of people, if not thousands of people, could be killed in the event of an accident.

In this bill, as reported from the committee, we tell the Navy that we are not satisfied with their proposal to acquire the residential property in the Concord area because they are going to have to take factories with it and it will cost a large sum of money. We have told them they should check the other alternatives. We are making that very clear so that we will know what we are getting into. However, we did not want to deny all funds because then the burden is placed on the Senate and it could be said that we denied funds to eliminate the hazard in this area.

Mr. ELLENDER. But money was provided to buy 5,000 acres.

Mr. JACKSON. No. The way we have it now is that it is discretionary. The

House action was to approve this amount to acquire the land in the Concord area. It is a safety zone.

Unless these people are moved out, in the event of an accident there could be fatalities within that area or serious injury.

The way the situation stands now, the Navy can either go this route or they can go any other route, starting with the authorization of $19 million. They are not confined and limited to acquiring this land, if they have a better alternative. We think the present proposal is not adequate. We think they should look at other options to see what they can come up with.

Mr. ELLENDER. How does the Senator expect the Navy to act, if after 10 to 12 years they have not done anything?

Mr. JACKSON. There was an alternative proposal involving the building of a causeway out to an island adjacent to the Concord weapons station which might possibly avoid this large land acquisition. However, there are structural problems in building in that area. So we are not in a position to direct the Navy to go to that area. What we are saying is that other possibilities should be considered, because we feel the route the Navy is going will run the cost up to $80 million or $90 million if they acquire all land required to meet safety standards.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is it the Senator's opinion that the money now being provided, if the Navy goes the route that is proposed—that is, to acquire these 5,000 acres—will be the end, or will it be necessary to purchase more land than is now proposed?

Mr. JACKSON. There is no question in my mind that this is but a downpayment proposal.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator have any idea of what the total cost might be? Are we going in blindfolded?

Mr. JACKSON. We are partially blindfolded. I am trying to give a forthright answer. The proposal that was submitted to Congress this year is not confined to $19.8 million. I want to make that clear, because they had eliminated three chemical plants. We do not know the true value of those plants.

The Senator from Louisiana and I know that estimates are always misleading. We know they will cost more. We have informal information that would indicate that those three plants—well I do not want to give the estimates here, because this is something later to be bargained for if the Navy goes that route.

I want to make it clear to the Senate that this is only a downpayment on the problem. I wish I could give a more favorable report, but I cannot.

The west coast needs a munitions loading facility. It involves, in every nature of its operation, dealing with a highly dangerous situation that could result, obviously, in disaster in the course of loading or handling munitions at such a facility.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. The distinguished Senator from Louisiana raised the issue of family housing in the defense installations we have. I notice on page 55 of the report, dealing with the request of the Department of Defense for 1968, that they request 12,500 units of family housing, of which 1,010 are designated for overseas locations. I notice also, for the Army, at Fort Leavenworth, Kans., 400 units. As I understand this report on housing units for Fort Leavenworth, in addition to those mentioned for the Army, Navy, and Air Force, they were deleted; is that not correct?

Mr. JACKSON. That is correct.

Mr. CARLSON. Does the distinguished chairman, the Senator from Washington, have any suggestions as to why they might have eliminated, not Fort Leavenworth, but the entire group?

Mr. JACKSON. The reason is that in many instances the local communities provide adequate housing or, in other instances, it might be that they can be postponed. It is our impression that the situation at Fort Leavenworth is one which could be postponed and one in which there is reasonable housing already available in that area, to provide for current needs.

Mr. CARLSON. I appreciate very much the Senator's statement.

Mr. JACKSON. In many instances on housing, as the Senator knows, we run into trouble in some areas in which they oppose military housing on the ground that there is already adequate housing in the local community, and that to build a large set of new housing could upset the market locally.

Mr. CARLSON. I appreciate that statement very much. I am not personally familiar with the situation at Fort Leavenworth. I do know that enrollment at the staff college there was doubled last year, so that a housing problem did develop.

Secretary of the Army Resor wrote me under date of March 9, 1967, in which he said in part:

> Based on the requirements and assets, both on-post and in the community, that were given to you in my previous letter, there will be a continuing long range deficit of more than 500 housing units required in support of Ft. Leavenworth, after the FY 1966 and 1968 projects are completed.

I wanted to get that statement into the RECORD, in view of the fact that I believe the House did include this item in H.R. 11722, page 60, line 20, I believe.

I want the RECORD to show that when we go to conference, after further study, I hope the chairman will look into it and see if it is not possible to restore this housing.

Mr. JACKSON. I want to assure my good friend, the distinguished senior Senator from Kansas, that we will be happy to do that, and I will be glad to talk to him personally. We have a problem at Fort Leavenworth, too, where the numbers of personnel go up and down. This causes a problem in connection with the operation of the school. If we build to excess capacity, when enrollment later on goes down, then the community is plagued with a substantial number of vacancies.

Therefore, looking at this matter as a whole, it was our judgment, based on information we had, that this was a matter which could be postponed. However, I will be happy to discuss it further with the distinguished Senator, so that when we go to conference we will have the benefit of any additional information that might be available.

Mr. CARLSON. I know that the distinguished chairman and those who worked on the committee have gone into every detail. I am confident that when this matter comes up for final consideration, he will keep in mind this discussion we have had.

Mr. JACKSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. I want to take this occasion to express for myself and my junior colleague appreciation for the selectivity used by the distinguished Committee on Armed Services on the military construction branch, in providing a headquarters building for the region for electronics in GEEIA, at Tinker Air Force Base, with an award of a building as a headquarters for the laboratories and the very highly technical and selective electronics installation at Tinker Air Force Base in Oklahoma City.

I deeply appreciate the fact that such careful consideration was given, and that as a result of many years of study it has now been incorporated in the bill. I think it is a very necessary and a very important building to have. It will save a great deal of money in providing for an adequate, fireproof building, and modern in every detail, which will be able to handle this important distribution to all Air Force sources.

Again I thank the distinguished chairman for his interest and the special consideration given to this matter.

Mr. JACKSON. I wish to thank the able Senator from Oklahoma. He did speak to me on this matter at some length. The information he gave to us was extremely helpful in trying to come to an appropriate decision on the matter.

Mr. MONRONEY. I also appreciate the 300 units of housing which are very necessary for Tinker Air Force Base, where the personnel has increased in order to maintain the viability of our heavy bombers and other jet aircraft.

Mr. JACKSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I should now like to return to my prepared remarks. The authority provided for the Walter Reed Medical Center will also provide for an neuropsychiatric and extended-care facility. The replacement of facilities at Walter Reed is long past due and it is hoped that the Department will proceed with this replacement program promptly.

The third item on which I wish to comment briefly is the construction funds for the Nike X antimissile system which are contained in this bill. As we are all aware, the Secretary of Defense announced on September 18 that production and deployment of the Nike X system would be undertaken. As I have indicated previously, I strongly concur in this course of action and I urge that all Members do likewise.

There are $64 million Nike-X construction funds contained in this bill

which will support initiation of construction activities essential to deploying this missile defense system which can provide protection for the whole Nation, including our strategic missile forces on a thin basis. Additionally, there is $12,255,000 for construction of the research, development, and testing work on the Kwajalein Atoll. These funds will also allow accomplishment of the necessary soil and subsurface explorations as well as oceanographic surveys required for this facility design and the follow-on construction. This design and site investigation work is necessary since the facilities required are unique to the Nike-X system. Then, based upon these essential preliminary activities, the majority of these funds, that is $64 million, will be utilized to construct tactical and support facilities at the first Nike-X site. The tactical facilities at this site will be composed of a perimeter acquisition radar and missile site radar and launch facilities for both the long-range Spartan missile, which will provide defense of an extended area, and the shorter range Sprint missile, for defense of the immediate facility. In addition to facilities at the first site, the $64 million will also provide power generation equipment required to operate the radars and other equipment at the second site as well, and acquisition of some additional land required for the first sites.

Since it will take months and even years to produce and deploy the Nike-X system, regardless of the level of deployment ultimately achieved, I fully support initiation of production now. We can make judgments at the proper times in the future as to the necessary final level of deployment.

As a Nation, we need the protection that only the Nike-X antimissile system can provide. I ask for the full support of all Members in providing the funds needed, not only in this bill to initiate construction, but those additional funds that will be required to complete an adequate deployment.

The $455 million granted the Navy is $90.6 million below their request. Of particular significance within the Navy program, approval is granted for a new and larger hospital for the Navy station at Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico, which was denied by the House. This facility has been previously denied by the Congress because we had received no assurance that additional facilities would not be programed for the San Juan area. We have now received this assurance in writing and believe that this project should be approved.

The House, in introducing the bill, omitted $8,495,000 the Navy had requested for an underseas warfare laboratory at Los Alamitos, Calif., which work is now being performed primarily at Pasadena. The committee has denied the project because there is considerable doubt as to the proper location of the facility and as to whether in fact it is necessary.

Finally, I wish to mention the Navy's request for $19,800,000 to acquire a buffer zone around the Naval Weapons Station at Concord, Calif., which would include the town of Port Chicago. This has been the cause of much controversy and emotionalism and is not a new problem to the Congress. It is a matter that has been under consideration for the past 15 years. Many studies have been made and many proposals advanced. The time is at hand, however, when some solution must be forthcoming to this problem. The committee was not convinced that the current Navy plan is the most desirable one or that the Navy can obtain the 5,000-odd acres of property for the sum specified. As a result, the committee has broadened the language in the bill to permit the selection of an alternate proposal if such is deemed more appropriate. The Secretary of the Navy will be expected to restudy all proposals and advise the Committees on Armed Services of both the House and the Senate of his decision prior to proceeding with the proposal selected.

A reduction of $148 million was made in the Air Force request. Here, as in connection with the requirements of the other two services, the committee found itself in agreement with many of the reductions made by the House of Representatives. Additional reductions were made, primarily in the classified portion of the bill. For example, $19.5 million was denied for additional war reserve materiel storage overseas which is unrelated to the Southeast Asian crisis. Considerable funds have been provided for this purpose in past years which are believed to be sufficient for the present. Twenty-five million was requested for a joint venture in the Indian Ocean area, of which only a portion is proposed for funding, and the committee has denied the balance although it has approved the program in general. A reduction was also made in the amount requested for the theater airbase vulnerability program, concerning which the committee has serious reservations. The amount approved for this program relates primarily to airfield pavements which are considered to be a valid operational requirement.

For the Defense agencies, the principal amount approved was a $200 million contingency fund for the Secretary of Defense, which it is expected will be used primarily in Southeast Asia as a supplement to $75 million approved under title V for specific projects in that area.

Next, I should like to mention the military family housing program, which is an important one, but also is one that has been difficult to monitor. As a result, the committee spent considerable time and effort to place this year's request in the proper perspective and to clear up what have proved to be certain ambiguities in existing law. Approval was granted for 9,884 new units of the 12,500 where community support is believed to be adequate to fulfill the housing needs.

An increase was granted in the limitations on the average unit cost from $17,500 to $19,500 per unit, and the maximum cost of a single unit has been increased from $28,000 to $32,000. These increases are justified in light of the increase in building costs since the old limitations were established. The committee also took steps to clarify and tighten up somewhat on the amount of funds that may be spent per unit on the rehabilitation and repair of existing Government quarters and has spelled out the committee's intent in regard to the domestic leasing program.

Now, Mr. President, I should like to refer briefly to title VII of the bill, which provides $27 million to cover the cost of assistance payments, property acquisition and administration under the homeowners assistance program during fiscal year 1968. It is to be recalled that this program was established by the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966, which in section 1013 authorized the Secretary of Defense to render assistance to homeowners, both military and civilian, who were displaced as a result of the base closure program subsequent to November 1, 1964, and who have run into difficulty in disposing of their homes. You will recall that in April of this year, the Senate approved the bill, S. 1216, which authorized the appropriation of $11 million to carry out the program during the balance of fiscal year 1967. The House failed to act on this measure and during consideration of the bill before us, approved only $22 million of the amount requested and restricted the assistance to military homeowners only. The committee considers this to be injudicious, and if any relief is to be forthcoming under the provision of the law, it should apply to both military and civilian homeowners of the Department of Defense who have been affected by base closures.

The administration proposed this year to amend section 159 of title 10, United States Code, by adding a new section which would grant the Secretary of Defense broad general authority to carry out bilateral or multilateral agreements with any foreign government by sharing the cost of acquiring and constructing military facilities, et cetera, for collective defense. The House in considering the bill properly revised this provision to apply only to NATO countries and specified $60 million for this purpose during the coming year and placed the responsibility under the Department of the Army. Subsequently, however, this authority was included in the foreign aid bill as passed by the Senate, and it has, therefore, been deleted from the bill before us.

Finally, I should like to mention the provisions made for the construction requirements of the Reserve components. A total of $38.3 million has been provided for this purpose. The committee agrees with the House action in adding to the bill $10 million in new authorization for both the Army National Guard and the Army Reserve. In submitting the bill to the Congress, the Department did not request funds for these two Reserve components because of the unresolved status of the restructuring of the Army Reserve and National Guard. Since it appears likely, however, that these restructurings will proceed early in 1968, it is believed the construction programs of the Army National Guard and the Army Reserve, which have been in a deferred status for over 2 years, should be rapidly accelerated.

Mr. President, I believe, I have fairly summarized the committee's action in regard to the military construction authorization bill for this fiscal year. I am

confident we have generously provided for the essential requirements as we see them.

Mr. President, before I conclude, I do wish to take this opportunity to express my deep appreciation for the fine support that was obtained at all times by the members of the subcommittee. The minority was very ably represented by a senior member of the committee, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER]. On the Democratic side, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], and the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE] were of invaluable help in working out this bill.

Mr. President, as I indicated earlier, the hearings this year were held on a joint basis. We met with the Subcommittee on Appropriations that handles military construction, ably presided over by the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE]. This joint arrangement of holding hearings, I think, has been extremely helpful to both committees and to the executive branch as well.

In connection, of course, with the holding of hearings, there is nothing more important than having an able staff. Mr. Gordon Nease, who has served as the staff director for the Military Construction Subcommittee for a number of years, rendered invaluable assistance to the subcommittee. Mr. Mike Rexroad, who has likewise served as the able staff director for the Appropriations Subcommittee on Military Construction, worked very closely with the committee and with Mr. Nease and did a terrific job in supporting the committee in trying to come up with the right answers. I commend Mr. Rexroad and Mr. Nease most highly. I am sure all members of the subcommittee will concur in my appraisal of the assistance they gave, as well as all members of the committee. Without an able staff, it is pretty difficult for Senators to do a satisfactory job.

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

Mr. JACKSON. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator for yielding. First I wish to congratulate him warmly because of the fine work that he and the other members of the subcommittee, the full committee, and the staff have done upon this very complex and very difficult bill. It seems to me that as a result of their hearings and work, they have brought forth an excellent bill. I note that the hearing record shows that the committee took 766 pages of very careful testimony, and the report speaks for itself of long and arduous work done in this field.

Mr. President, I wish to state that the Senators from Florida appreciate—though we did not ask for a single one of these items, as the Senator knows; we never do, but we leave it to the Defense people themselves—the fact that for Navy, Navy Air, and Air Force installations in Florida—there were no Army installations there affected—the committee has recommended a total of $63,691,000, which I am sure represents the fact that the committee thinks that the strategic locations of those various facilities justified and indeed required that recommendation.

Mr. President, I always reserve the right to bring back to the committee matters which reach me, either from the Armed Forces themselves or from affected citizens, employees, or personnel relative to facilities in my own State; and it is with reference to two communications that I wish now to speak to the distinguished Senator from Washington—both of which communications, by the way, I have heretofore furnished him.

First, I note that the committee has deleted the item for a steamplant and electric system addition at the Navy Public Works Center, Pensacola, Fla., as it was, "of the opinion that additional electrical power needs may be satisfied through commerical sources."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a letter from Mr. Robert C. Tyler, president, National Association of Supervisors, addressed to me under date of September 13, 1967. The distinguished Senator from Washington has a copy of the letter.

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

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SUPERVISORS,
Pensacola, Fla., September 13, 1967.

Hon. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HOLLAND: We have been informed that the Senate Sub-Committee on Military Construction is considering the removal of Pensacola Naval Air Station Steam Distribution Plant and Electrical Distribution System request from the current budget.

We request that you consider retention of these items because of the following facts:

A. STEAM PLANT

1) Present steam system utilization at full capacity.

2) The portion of the steam system located in building 47 is obsolescent and has been slated for demolition.

3) Additional new buildings needed for support of this activity will overtax the present system. The new facilities principally are Barracks, BOQ, Avionics and Training Facilities.

4) Trend is to steam absorption air-conditioning units which are more efficient and reliable which give year round steam requirements for essential climate control in major vital environmental areas.

5) No commercial source of steam is available to augment present capacity.

B. ELECTRIC DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM

1) Part of required electric power is generated "in house" and a portion is purchased from Gulf Power Company.

2) Gulf Power has extended a second power line to our station. This new line cannot be used until funds are made available to connect to it and make proper distribution.

3) Additional new buildings again will overtax present "in house" capacity and currently available Gulf Power capacity.

4) Inadequate distribution is now resulting in power failures costing many manhours and delaying the training and reducing our war effort capability.

In light of the foregoing facts, we rest assured that you will make maximum effort to see that these projects are retained.

With best regards, I remain,
Sincerely,

ROBERT C. TYLER,
President.

Mr. HOLLAND. As the letter indicates, the need for this facility is primarily for steam generation as present facilities are obsolete and overtaxed due to the increased support facilities being constructed and the trend toward steam-absorption air-conditioning units.

Since this item will be a subject of conference, I do not intend to ask that the bill be amended. I am hopeful, however, that the conferees will carefully consider this matter and that the item will be retained by the conference committee, if in the judgment of the committee that correction is justified.

I have noted, of course, the statement in the report of the committee that this item was omitted because they felt that the electrical power that was needed could better be purchased from local commercial utilities, with which I would certainly agree, because I am in favor of private industry in that field.

The letter, however—it is one of several which I have received, and I think the one that is fullest in the information given—indicates that the real need for this particular facility was largely for the production of steam, rather than of electrical power, and I do hope that the distinguished Senator and his conferees will carefully examine the situation in conference, with a view to determining exactly what the facts are respecting this project.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I wish to assure the able Senator from Florida that we will do precisely that. I think the Senator has stated very well the basis on which the committee proceeded. There may have been a misunderstanding. We had the definite impression that the primary problem was electric power. However, there is this new factor that is stated in point 4 in Mr. Tyler's letter, with reference to the steam absorption air-conditioning units. I do not quite understand it, but the point apparently is that the steam is to be used in connection with an air-conditioning program.

We will certainly, before going to conference, go into the matter very carefully. We have no predisposition to deal with the matter except on an objective basis. I assure the Senator from Florida that that will be done.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator. I expected nothing else. I am sure that is the way he goes into all these projects, and that is why we all have such confidence in his reports and in the action of his committee.

Mr. President, there is one other project in my State on which I have received a letter, which I have conveyed to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee some days ago. That is relative to the basic training center at Orlando.

I note that the committee, in considering the bill, did not include the authorization for the Wave Training Center at Orlando, Fla., that was deleted by the House, as stated in House Report 512, "to allow the Navy to reconsider its decision" to relocate the activity from Bainbridge, Md.

Mr. President, I do not intend to offer an amendment to the bill to provide for this relocation, but I do call to the attention of the distinguished Senator from

Washington, Senator JACKSON, that I have recently received a letter from the Secretary of the Navy, the Honorable Paul R. Ignatius, under date of September 15, 1967, reiterating the Navy's desire to move the Wave Training Center to Orlando, and I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., September 15, 1967.

Hon. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HOLLAND: I am replying to your request for information regarding the current status of the Military Construction Program for the Naval Training Center, Orlando.

As you recall, the 89th Congress approved seven line items at a cost of $14.9M to provide the necessary facilities to commence our recruit training complex. These line items were the first increment of the first 4,000 man Recruit Training Camp and construction has already commenced on the majority of these items. A detailed listing by line item is contained in the attachment. The ultimate Recruit Training Complex will provide for facilities to train a total of 8,000 recruits.

The FY 68 Military Construction Program for NTC Orlando as submitted to Congress contained 24 line items at a cost of $21,072,000 (listed in the attachment). One line item at $2,980,000 is for the relocation of the Advanced Undersea Weapons School from Key West, Florida which is not directly related to the recruit training aspect of the Naval Training Center. Sixteen line items at a cost of $12,801,000 are for the 2nd increment of the Male Recruit Camp and seven line items at a cost of $5,291,000 are for the relocation of WAVE Recruit Training Camp from NTC Bainbridge, Maryland. The House Authorization Action deleted two line items from the Male Recruit Camp—Indoor Rifle Range at $322,000 and Fire Fighting Training Facility at $995,000—and all seven items for the WAVE Recruit Training Camp. All of these items are urgently required for the planned orderly development of the Naval Training Center, Orlando.

The Indoor Rifle Range and the Fire Fighting Training Facility are required to provide two of the most important elements of recruit training. Training in these areas is basic to "at sea" operations and there is no substitute for the need for these facilities. Familiarization with small arms and elemental emergency shipboard type fire fighting practice are among the most essential aspects of the training of new recruits. Not all Navy men will become highly proficient in the use of pistols or rifles. However, recent emphasis on unconventional warfare, such as river patrols and counter-insurgency activities in Vietnam has increased the importance of small arms training. Personnel requiring concentrated training will receive it in later training and in addition to recruit training. However, in a military organization every man must be familiar with weapons for reasons of safety to himself and others. This familiarization is obtained in recruit training with small arms. An indoor range is dictated at Orlando by safety precautions because of its proximity to residential areas. An enclosed range will also minimize the noise of gun fire and permit its use under all conditions thus facilitating training all recruits on a closely timed schedule.

We all recognize that any fire on any ship is an extreme emergency. Fire fighting involves every many aboard ship, often in a life or death situation. Training in fire fighting is imperative for every Navy man because fire fighting is a team effort dependent upon the capability of every member of the team. Realistic, hands on, fire fighting drill is a vital exercise for every recruit. Here he first learns the rudiments of fighting large fires in company with team mates. More importantly, the recruit learns to minimize the natural, human fear of uncontrolled fire that often causes untrained persons to behave in a manner disastrous to themselves and others. Fire fighting must be included in the curriculum for adequate, complete recruit training.

Denial of these two line items will make it necessary for us to eliminate two of the most fundamental elements of recruit training in the newly authorized Orlando Recruit Training Center.

The seven line items for the WAVE Recruit Training Camp are needed to provide the Navy adequate facilities for WAVE recruit training as a part of the planned development of the approved third Recruit Training Center at Orlando, Florida. This requirement has been evaluated several times, including a special review by the Congress in 1966. This review, based on a Navy recommendation, concluded that the third recruit camp should be located at Orlando, Florida. The Navy proposal, approved by the Congress, encompassed the WAVE recruit training camp at Orlando. This will permit consolidation of East Coast recruit training under a single command permitting economies of operations and overhead, curricula, classification and examination functions and the use of closed circuit television and other training aids resources. This could not be economically provided for in a separate WAVE recruit training establishment.

The evaluation regarding location at Orlando has taken into consideration facilities now at Bainbridge, Maryland. Except for a recently constructed barracks building, new construction would be required for all other WAVE recruit needs at Bainbridge at a cost commensurate with costs at Orlando. Since other needs at Bainbridge will fully utilize the WAVES barracks, the operating economies for Orlando, noted above, outweigh any benefit to be derived from retaining WAVE recruit training at Bainbridge.

Denial of these items will delay the orderly progression of the establishment and operation of the Navy's urgently required recruit training center at Orlando, approved by the Congress in 1966. This delay will require continued use of substandard facilities (classrooms, mess hall, community center) at Bainbridge by young WAVE recruits.

I hope the above provides you with all of the information you desire. I will be pleased to provide any additional information you may desire.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL R. IGNATIUS,
Secretary of the Navy.

Fiscal year 1967 military construction program for NTC, Orlando

Recruit training building	$1,985,000
Drill field	247,000
Recruit dispensary and dental clinic	2,442,000
Recruit barracks (3,200 spaces)	6,727,000
Recruit messhall	1,767,000
Utilities	407,000
Heating and air-conditioning plant	1,325,000
Total	14,900,000

Fiscal year 1968 military construction program for NTC Orlando

AUW training building (2d increment)	$2,980

Fiscal year 1968 military construction program for NTC Orlando—Continued

MALE RECRUIT CAMP	
Indoor rifle range	$322
Recruit REOU building	2,034
Ship mockup	300
Outdoor training pool	250
Fire fighting training facility	995
Cold storage warehouse	274
Warehouse	778
Administration building	970
Staff barracks	886
Recruit barracks (2d increment)	1,957
Receiving barracks	1,241
Chapel and Sunday School	600
Reception center	223
Gymnasium, fieldhouse and theater	918
Community center	567
Utilities	486
Subtotal—1st male recruit camp	12,801
WAVES' RECRUIT CAMP	
Training and administration building	1,050
Drill field	75
Waves' recruit barracks	1,297
Waves' staff barracks	773
Messhall	460
Community center with training pool	876
Utilities	760
Subtotal—Waves' recruit camp	5,291
Grand total	21,072

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I call particular attention to one paragraph of this letter which clearly shows the purpose and the savings such a move would accomplish:

The seven line items for the Wave Recruit Training Camp are needed to provide the Navy adequate facilities for Wave recruit training as a part of the planned development of the approved third Recruit Training Center at Orlando, Florida. This requirement has been evaluated several times, including a special review by the Congress in 1966. This review, based on a Navy recommendation, concluded that the third recruit camp should be located at Orlando, Florida. The Navy proposal, approved by the Congress, encompassed the Wave recruit training camp at Orlando. This will permit consolidation of East Coast recruit training under a single command permitting economies of operations and overhead, curricula, classification and examination functions and the use of closed circuit television and other training aids resources. This could not be economically provided for in a separate Wave recruit training establishment.

That is the portion of Secretary Ignatius' letter which deals with this subject.

I am hopeful that the committee will bear this in mind when it next considers a military construction authorization bill.

I repeat what I stated a while ago, that I did not ask for the Orlando project. It was a recommendation of the Navy. I do not know how important or necessary it may be to include as part of that project the WAVE training project also, but I do ask that the program originally suggested, and still strongly recommended, by the Navy, be again considered by the committee when it next considers a military construction authorization bill.

I further understand that the committee has appropriately restored the authorization for firefighting training

facility for the male recruit training center. That was another major additional request made by Secretary Ignatius. I strongly commend the committee for this action for, as is stated in the letter from the Secretary of the Navy, familiarization with elemental emergency shipboard-type firefighting practice is most essential in the training of recruits. This training need has recently been borne out by the most unfortunate accident that recently occurred on one of our larger naval vessels in the Vietnam area. I urge the Senate conferees to insist upon the retention of this vitally important item.

I do not see how any of us reading the report of not only that major disaster in the Gulf of Tonkin, but also the report with respect to two other smaller ones could fail to note the tremendous importance of the firefighting training program.

I again commend the distinguished Senator from Washington and the committee for including this item in the bill, even though it was eliminated in the other body.

The final item referred to by the letter from the Secretary concerns authorization for an indoor rifle range which the Secretary wanted to have included. This item was deleted, as I understand it, by House action and considered by the committee, but after careful consideration the committee believed that this item should be deferred. After discussing this matter with the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], I concur in the action taken that this item can be deferred—meaning that it does not have to be constructed right now, and not that it would not be a desirable portion of the facility.

Mr. President, again I congratulate the Senator from Washington for doing his usual good job in reporting a good bill to the Senate, and I shall certainly support him strongly.

I do wish to state again, however, that I hope the committee will very carefully consider the relocation of the WAVE Training Center to Orlando at the time of its consideration of the next military construction authorization bill and carefully weigh the statement of the Navy in its desire for such location, which is a reiteration of its previous position in this matter.

Mr. President, I thank the Senator for yielding, and if he has any comments to make on any of the subjects I have mentioned, I shall appreciate it, and particularly with reference to the remarks on the recommendations of Secretary Ignatius with reference to the WAVE Training Center.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Florida for his very helpful remarks on the three specific items he has just covered.

The first item was with reference to the facilities for the transfer of the WAVE training operation from Bainbridge to Florida.

I should like to observe that one of the things that troubled the committee related to the amount of money that the Navy has just finished investing at Bainbridge. It is my recollection that the new barracks facility which had just been completed represented an investment of $4 million. The committee felt that in light of that fact alone, we ought to go slow in considering the possibility of a removal at this time.

We therefore deferred action on that.

With reference to the item of $995,000 for the firefighting school at Orlando, the House had deleted this item, as the able Senator has pointed out. The members of the committee were unanimous in their judgment that this is a high priority item.

It is obvious that it is essential as part of a training program for all Navy recruits. I can, therefore, assure the able Senator from Florida that we will take a very firm position in conference on that item.

With reference to the item for the indoor rifle range, it seemed to us that this is something that could at least be handled outdoors. The Army and the Marines in connection with their small arms program use out-of-door ranges. In any event, it was not of such a high priority that it could not be deferred for the present.

I thank my good friend, the senior Senator from Florida, for his helpful comments.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. JACKSON. I have in mind the wonderful weather, of course, in Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I was going to say that I think the Navy recruits will be able to withstand the rigors of the Florida weather sufficiently for the time being so that they may have their small arms training out of doors.

I have already stated in my remarks that I have agreed with the distinguished Senator that here is an item that can be deferred.

I again say that I think the whole matter has been very carefully considered. I have no complaint to make. I think that the willingness of the Senator to reexamine the Pensacola situation is typical of him.

I hope that such a reconsideration will ensue in conference, since the House put the item in the bill, as I understand it, and it was eliminated in the Senate committee.

Mr. JACKSON. There is no question with reference to the powerplant facility at Pensacola to which the Senator has called our attention, that some information was not appropriately brought to our attention at the time the matter was before the committee. I therefore personally thank him for the information he has given us on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Washington and commend him for the tremendously hard work he has done as chairman of the subcommittee.

Perhaps I should not even ask the question, but I wonder regarding a couple of items.

I would like to ask the distinguished chairman first concerning an item I observe on page 83 of the subcommittee report—"Location not specified, Office of Secretary of Defense, $200 million."

I then observe on page 138 in the bill an item——

Mr. JACKSON. What page of the report?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. On page 83 of the report there is an item that reads: "Location not specified, Office of Secretary of Defense, $200 Million."

That is a very bare statement regarding the expenditure of a large sum of money, $200 million. I wonder if that is a Central Intelligence Agency item.

Mr. JACKSON. No. There is nothing really secret about it at all. The $200 million is a contingency fund for the Secretary of Defense.

In other words, this gives him authority to expend up to $200 million, upon appropriate reporting to the committees of Congress, on any items that he may be able to certify of an emergency nature. So many changes take place in a program as large as this that, unless you have some flexibility, you are in trouble.

The Senator has said that this situation is subject to abuse. I can only say that, if any Secretary should attempt to abuse it, the next time the matter came up he would be so tied in knots that he would not be able to function the way he should function. Therefore, we have not had any situation called to our attention in which there has been an abuse of discretion in the use of these funds. We went into that matter very carefully.

I do wish to point out that, of the $200 million, some funds may be expended for construction of facilities of a classified nature. But the $200 million is simply a contingency fund.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. And some such provision has been customarily included?

Mr. JACKSON. For the past several years, a contingency fund has been available to the Secretary.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Now may I ask a question regarding another item on page 90 of the bill? It indicates for Germany, supply facilities for the Air Force, $2,502,000, and for our Army in Germany, $2 million. The total sum, $4,502,000, is for Germany.

It is on page 129 of the bill and on page 82 of the report, Mr. President.

I am wondering about the request for an authorization of such a tremendous sum of money at a time—22 years after World War II—when we have 425,000 servicemen and their dependents in West Germany, when we are the only NATO country, as the chairman knows, who has fulfilled its NATO obligations. I am wondering whether it is really essential, when many of us feel that we should cut down on our forces in Germany. I believe the chairman feels that way—I hope he does. That is a tremendous sum of money. Was more than that authorized in the House bill?

Mr. JACKSON. We made a reduction in connection with the Army's request for depot facilities in Germany of $1,577,000. We approved $2 million.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. That is, $2 million for the Army?

Mr. JACKSON. Two million dollars for the Army. But we made a reduction of $1,577,000.

Mr. President, so that we understand the reason for these two items, let me explain. This relates directly to the move out of France. These facilities are essential in connection with the redeployment of American forces. We can thank our good friend, General de Gaulle, for having to expend this sum of money. It relates directly to that situation.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. General de Gaulle, our good friend, as the Senator says——

Mr. JACKSON. Do not take it literally.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I take it in the same manner that the Senator meant it. After all, we moved our headquarters from France to Belgium, and this is an expenditure not in Belgium. This calls for a huge expenditure of $4,502,000 in West Germany, at a time when we have 425,000 servicemen and their dependents in West Germany; and there has been no aggression threatened from the Soviet Union toward Western Europe, at least in the past 15 years.

It appears to me that, instead of adding $4,502,000, we should reduce our expenditures in West Germany, and that is why I bring up the question.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I should like to correct the RECORD in one respect. We took out for the Army alone, in connection with the requests made for Germany and depot facilities, $1,577,000. I referred to that item previously. In addition, we took out a request for a controlled-humidity storage facility in the sum of $3,618,00. What we left in and what we approved relates directly to the redeployment of Air Force personnel and Army personnel from France to Germany. The personnel from France were redeployed either to Germany or to England. We have a small item or two in the bill that relate to that situation.

I understand that we have been engaged in negotiations with the French for compensation for at least part of the cost we have sustained as a result of being given an eviction notice by General de Gaulle. I hope we can recover some of the costs in connection with the redeployment of American forces from France.

Mr. President, I believe that the items we have approved are essential to support the forces that have been redeployed to Germany.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. The Senator from Washington believes, then, that the $4,502,000 contemplated in the bill for West Germany has been trimmed as much as it should be?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes. I believe we have trimmed as much as we can for Germany, and the $4,502,000 the Senator refers to is not necessarily for Germany, but for several items at several locations in Europe.

I have not mentioned the theater airbase-vulnerability program. We have included some money to upgrade the airdromes, in Germany that are very close—a matter of minutes—to Soviet forces. However, we have cut some of those funds. We have given a priority to upgrading the airdromes that are very close to the East German border. Again, we went about it very carefully, and we tried to make prudent cuts. We did not approve everything that they requested, by any means. The military construction investment in Europe is relatively small in the budget this year.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I should like to ask a final question. In that connection, I observe that for the United Kingdom, for operation and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing for the Air Force, the bill contains an extremely large authorization, it seems to me, of $10,457,000. Has that amount been trimmed?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes, we did make some cuts in connection with the United Kingdom installations.

I believe that my good friend, the Senator from Ohio, will agree that the British have been quite cooperative in trying to honor their commitment.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. That is correct. They have come closer than anyone else.

Mr. JACKSON. Of all our allies, considering what they have had to go through, they have been there when the going has been rough.

I must say, Mr. President, that we again found it necessary to redeploy primarily some Air Force units to the United Kingdom. The expenditures involved in the figure of $10,457,000 cover, in large part, the developments in connection with the move out of France.

There are some continuing maintenance requirements and new facilities that go back to the operation of American bases in the United Kingdom over a period of a number of years.

I think the Senator from Ohio would be interested in this. In connection with all direct overseas items we had before us a request from the administration for $315 million. We cut $145 million. That is a pretty big cut.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Yes.

Mr. JACKSON. That leaves $170 million. It is nearly one-half, and would leave $170 million in the budget, as I have said.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I wish to thank the Senator from Washington for the information he has supplied.

Mr. JACKSON. It represents over one-third of the total cuts in the bill.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I thank the Senator. I appreciate the information.

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

Mr. JACKSON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Washington for yielding to me. I wish to commend and congratulate the distinguished Senator from Washington and the members of the Committee on Armed Services, together with the staff, for the excellent bill which they have presented to the Senate.

I am pleased, Mr. President, that the committee has seen fit to authorize the sum of $45 million for necessary Army, Navy, and Air Force projects in the State of Hawaii.

I am also pleased that the committee has seen fit to authorize over $7 million for the construction of billeting and other facilities at Fort De Russy. I wholeheartedly support additional accommodations for military personnel. Such facilities are sorely needed and would add greatly to the enjoyment of Waikiki by servicemen and women, including thousands on rest and recuperation leave from Vietnam.

I wish to ask a question of the Senator from Washington concerning the endorsement of these facilities at Fort De Russy expressed in the report, particularly about the intent of the committee.

I have been told there has been some fear in the committee that Fort De Russy land, which may be in excess, may be disposed of by the Department of Defense, and consequently that the committee wrote into the bill a new section 809 as follows:

> SEC. 809. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the lands constituting Fort DeRussy, Hawaii, may be sold, leased, transferred, or otherwise disposed by the Department of Defense unless hereafter authorized by law.

Was the committee concerned that the Department of Defense might dispose of this excess land if no provision were written in the bill?

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, going back some 12 years, there have been a series of moves by the Department of Defense which made it clear to the committee that they were interested in disposing of all or a part of Fort De Russy. The committee was concerned lest a similar move be made again.

Therefore, the committee was of the unanimous judgment that there should be a provision, not in the report, but in the statute, to the effect that no part of Fort De Russy could be disposed of except pursuant to specific authorization by law.

Mr. FONG. Section 809 provides that the Department of Defense must come back to Congress if the Department of Defense wishes to dispose of excess land. Under present law, the Department would have to have just the consent of the two Committees on Armed Services?

Mr. JACKSON. That is not correct. The existing law provides that the Department of Defense merely has to report to the committee its proposed action. We have no authority to insist on consent. We can write a letter saying we do not agree with them but they can go ahead and sell it.

Mr. FONG. This provision, if enacted, would prevent the Department of Defense from disposing of it?

Mr. JACKSON. By unilateral action it would require them to go to Congress to get a bill through for it.

Mr. FONG. With section 809 in the bill there is no fear that the Department of Defense will ever dispose of excess land without Congress approving it?

Mr. JACKSON. There is no question that they could not do it legally. Any deed they might give would be invalid.

Mr. FONG. With the writing in of this provision, there is no fear that the Department of Defense will ever alienate any Fort De Russy land.

Mr. JACKSON. Not without the approval of Congress.

Mr. FONG. The endorsement of the committee, which is on page 25 of the committee report, reads:

> The committee endorses the construction of low-density troop billets.

Is that a mandatory provision or a flexible provision, as far as the members of the committee are concerned, now that

the committee has written into the bill that the Department of Defense cannot alienate the land?

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

Mr. JACKSON. I yield to the junior Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, on behalf of the committee, I wish to respond to my senior colleague from Hawaii.

This phrase "low-density troop billets" would apply to the number of people per acre, the density of population. It does not apply to the height of buildings or the number of stories involved in construction.

The committee was not in favor of cluttering Fort De Russy with a jungle of high rise buildings or using up every square foot. We wanted to maintain the atmosphere there. This would not prohibit the Army from building high rise buildings.

Mr. FONG. I am happy to hear the explanation of my colleague from Hawaii. This matter has been of great concern to our people in Hawaii. Fort De Russy is situated in a densely populated area of our community. This land is estimated to be worth $60 a square foot. The 72 acres are probably worth $188 million. Every planner and designer of hotels, and every person who owns land in Waikiki, is trying to use every portion of land for the best possible use.

I am happy to hear the explanation of my colleague that the low density applies only to acreage. This will give the Department of Defense the flexibility to do what they think is best for Waikiki.

Mr. INOUYE. Definite engineering plans have not been drafted.

Mr. FONG. I understand.

Mr. INOUYE. We are still in the process at this moment. The commanding general in Hawaii is discussing this with local authorities in Hawaii.

Mr. FONG. I hope the Department of Defense and the architects in the Army will consult with our planners in the city and county of Honolulu and the State of Hawaii, so that we can arrive at the best possible solution acceptable to all parties concerned.

Mr. INOUYE. I have discussed this with General Lassiter, the commanding general of the U.S. Army, Hawaii. He has been there and he will continue to discuss this matter with authorities for the city and county of Honolulu and the State of Hawaii.

Mr. FONG. I am happy to receive the explanation of the junior Senator from Hawaii and the explanation of the Senator from Washington. I wish to congratulate the Senator from Washington for a very excellent bill.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I wish to say for the record, so that the matter is clear, on behalf of the committee, I concur in the comments made by the junior Senator from Hawaii in response to the questions propounded by the senior Senator from Hawaii as to the intent of the committee.

The Army does have the discretion for working out details as to the kind of facility that should be located at Fort De Russy.

Mr. FONG. I thank the distinguished Senator for yielding to me.

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

Mr. JACKSON, I am happy to yield to the able senior Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I commend my esteemed colleague, the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], for his excellent statement concerning the military construction authorization for fiscal year 1968, and wish to add a few comments in its support.

Having had the privilege to serve on the subcommittee during the review of this bill, I know the depth to which this dedicated group examined each item of the proposed construction. The subcommittee was able to report to the full committee a well-rounded program that takes into consideration the realities of the war in Vietnam and recommends only what is really needed by our Armed Forces. There is no window dressing here—just hard-and-fast requirements for sorely needed construction.

I support this bill wholeheartedly and, at the same time, respectfully invite attention to certain items of interest.

First, there is the specific language in the legislation that preserves for the Armed Forces the extremely valuable tract of land at Fort De Russy on Waikiki Beach in Hawaii. We all know how our servicemen look forward to periods of rest and recreation from the rigors of service in Vietnam. Fort De Russy has been a veritable mecca for combat-weary tired men since the beginning of World War II. In spite of this, we know that in the past certain actions have been taken by the Department of Defense to declare some of this valuable property excess in favor of commercial real estate interests. The language of the bill before us contains provisions which will prevent the disposal of this land and will retain the entire property—72 acres—under Federal jurisdiction for use as a military rest and recreation center. Although the report on page 25 provides that the committee endorses construction of low-density troop billets, this will leave the Department of Defense in a flexible situation so that it could erect either low- or high-rise apartments for our servicemen.

Mr. President, the second item that I bring to your attention concerns the replacement of outmoded medical facilities at Walter Reed Hospital here in the District of Columbia. The addition to the bill of $12,480,000 for the hospital is only the first step of a larger program of repair and extended construction. You will note that approximately $3.5 million is earmarked for relocation of the commissary and other community facilities not necessary to the provision of medical service to hospital patients. The Army did not anticipate this action by the subcommittee and, consequently, did not have a master plan for the total program ready in time for our consideration. I hope that next year we will be able to continue this important replacement on a high priority basis with a complete plan for guidance.

Some Senators may share the earlier concern that I had for the third item that I will mention. It has been mentioned in debate today. This is the $200 million contingency fund for defense agencies. Some of us in the subcommittee had reservations over providing the Secretary of Defense a lump sum of money in this large amount. While I will not object to this fund at this time, it would appear to me to be better management practice for the Congress to have more control over the use of these funds. For example, the Secretary of Defense could submit his plan for emergency use to the committee and obtain prompt consideration and approval if the expenditures were justified.

In conclusion, I wish to commend Senator JACKSON for the careful and thoughtful review that he directed in the subcommittee. It was indeed a pleasure for me to work with him. I also wish to commend the other subcommittee members on both the majority and minority sides.

And lastly, it is my pleasure to invite attention to the outstanding work performed by the staff members of the Senate Armed Services Committee in the preparation of this comprehensive review.

In particular, I wish to compliment Mr. Gordon Nease, one of the ablest and most dedicated staff members I have known since I became a Member of the Senate. Also, Miss Mary Keough of that staff for the excellent work she has done. I wish also to commend Mr. Vorley Rexroad of the Appropriations Committee who worked with the staff members and was instrumental in rendering fine service in preparation of the report.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I want to thank and commend the able senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] for his very helpful participation in connection with the hearings held on the military construction bill, the markup of the bill, its reporting to the full committee, and the action we are now taking today. He was extremely helpful, as were other members of the committee. The result is that we have submitted to the Senate a unanimous judgment of the committee on the bill.

Mr. President, I call up my amendment now at the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. JACKSON to the bill (H.R. 11722) to authorize certain construction at military installation, and for other purposes:

On page 95, line 16, insert the following: Strike out "$3,747,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$4,368,000."

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is to restore $621,000 for an officers' mess hall for the Naval Station at Newport, R.I., which is badly needed.

This project was denied in the belief that it was to be a replacement for an officers' open mess, which is an officers' club, when in fact it would be for a closed mess, which is a regular dining hall now located in a deteriorating and unsanitary facility.

I have discussed this matter with the ranking minority members of the com-

mittee, the able Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], and there is no objection to the amendment.

I therefore ask that it be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Washington.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JACKSON. I believe there are no more amendments to be offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I support the military construction authorization bill which is today before the Senate. Although the sum requested is large, I recognize that these funds are necessary if we are effectively to conduct the war in Vietnam and shore up our military installations here at home and at our bases abroad.

The fiscal 1968 military authorization bill contains a total of $2,308,000 for construction in the State of Utah. This includes $680,000 for Tooele Army Depot for the construction of maintenance, production, and supply facilities.

Hill Air Force Base, which is the largest military installation in the State of Utah, will receive authorization to renovate and construct new facilities in the total amount of $1,628,000.

The Ogden Air Material Area, Hill Air Force Base, Utah, is one of the largest depots of the Air Force Logistics Command. This installation has prime responsibility for the Minuteman missile and also for the RF-4-C aircraft. The Minuteman is a key weapon in the U.S. missile system and consequently this Utah installation is one of the strategic facilities in our Nation's defense. The RF-4-C aircraft is making a primary contribution to our war efforts in Vietnam.

The 2705th Airmunitions Wing is stationed at Hill and it has the responsibility for testing many of the munitions and weapons systems used by the U.S. Air Force. Hill Air Force Base is also a major supply depot for aircraft and missile parts, and last year this installation moved more than 150,000,000 pounds of cargo to air bases all over the world. Consequently, I feel that the modest request made in the military construction bill for updating and renovating a number of buildings at Hill Air Force Base is fully justified.

Mr. President, I am concerned about the long delay in getting the military construction bill to the Senate floor for consideration. Normally this legislation is one of the first matters considered by the Congress. Usually this legislation is called up early in the session so that the Defense Department might advertise for bids during the summer months for the renovation of existing buildings and the construction of new buildings authorized by this legislation. This year the Senate has waited until one-third of the 1968 fiscal year has passed before calling up the military construction authorization bill.

A further delay will of necessity occur before we receive and vote on the military construction appropriations bill. This will mean that much construction which could have started this fall probably will have to wait until next spring. In many areas of our country it is impossible to begin construction of new facilities during cold weather and this is especially true in areas where we have severe winters. I express the hope that in future years an effort might be made to get this vital military bill to us at an earlier date so that we will not experience any delay in constructing urgently needed facilities.

I fully support the military construction authorization bill and appreciate and understand the complex problem faced by the members of the Committee on Armed Services and their competent staff in reviewing the proposed legislation. I urge speedy passage of the bill by the Senate.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent—and do so with the concurrence of the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]—that the vote on the pending bill, H.R. 11722, take place at 3 o'clock p.m. on Monday next.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Is this a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. CLARK. For a rollcall vote?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, on Monday next, at 3 o'clock.

Mr. CLARK. At 3 o'clock on Monday next on the pending bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana ask also that rule XII be waived?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, Mr. President.

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

The unanimous-consent agreement was subsequently reduced to writing, as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That on Monday, September 25, 1967, at 3:00 o'clock p.m., the Senate shall proceed to vote on H.R. 11722, an Act to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FEDERAL PAYMENT AUTHORIZATION AND BORROWING AUTHORITY ACT OF 1967

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a message from the House on H.R. 8718.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8718) to increase the annual Federal payment to the District of Columbia and to provide a method for computing the annual borrowing authority for the general fund of the District of Columbia and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. SPONG. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Chair appointed Mr. SPONG, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. MORTON conferees on the part of the Senate.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, now I ask unanimous consent that the Senate return to the business which was laid aside temporarily, Calendar No. 548, S. 2388.

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2388) to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is the hope of the joint leadership that we will be able to get started on the pending measure this afternoon. There has been a certain amount of delay in the consideration of the so-called Economic Opportunity Act, and it would be my hope, at least, that enough will be stated this afternoon so that some of us could study the statement of the distinguished manager of the bill, the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], over the weekend.

This bill, in my opinion, will take some days before we reach a final conclusion on it, and I think it is deserving of the most serious, intimate, and close study.

Mr. President, before the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania embarks on his opening remarks, which I hope he will, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll. The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

LACK OF HELP FROM ALLIES IN THE VIETNAMESE WAR

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the Washington Daily News of today carries a special article written by the editor in chief of the Scripps-Howard newspapers, which is datelined Manila.

The editor in chief of the Scripps-Howard newspapers is Walker Stone, an unusually able newspaperman, and a very keen observer of political and eco-

nomic conditions throughout the world over a long period of time.

Mr. Stone is making a visit to a number of Southeast Asian countries, and I feel he has written a very enlightening article on the situation in some of those countries, particularly as it pertains to the opportunity for the United States to obtain some help in Vietnam from some of the Asian nations.

Mr. Stone points out that South Korea has approximately 50,000 troops in South Vietnam now, and that those troops are doing a very valiant job.

Then he gets to the Philippines. There is a paragraph in his article concerning the Philippines which I think is worthy of mention on the floor. I quote now from the article by Mr. Stone. In his interview with President Marcos, he asked whether or not the Philippines might be sending more troops to Vietnam. As you know, they have sent 2,200, but they are noncombat troops. I quote Mr. Stone:

> Asked if the Philippines in the future might send combat troops to Vietnam, President Marcos said the policy of the ruling party as well as the opposition party is to send only construction troops. "This aid," he said, "was specifically requested by Vietnam. Vietnam being a protocol state of SEATO, necessarily, if there is any request of the Vietnamese government to this end, then we will have to reassess our policy."

I am just wondering why it is that the Philippines, as well as the other countries, have not been formally requested to send troops to Vietnam. I remember a press conference which Secretary of Defense McNamara held in Washington several months ago in which he said, "We do not ask our allies for troops." Why do we not ask our allies for troops? President Marcos of the Philippines seems to recognize, in his interview with Mr. Stone, that, being a signatory to the SEATO agreement, the Philippines are obligated to send troops if they are requested to do so.

That brings up the matter of Great Britain. Great Britain is a signatory to the SEATO agreement, and Great Britain has sent no combat troops whatsoever to help in this struggle in Vietnam. Not only that, Mr. President; not only are we not getting help from our allies, not only are we not getting help from those nations with whom we have mutual defense agreements, but the facts show that during the first 8 months of 1967, 49 ships flying the flag of free world nations carried cargo into the enemy port of Haiphong.

I submit that the Government of this country, if it is going to draft men, if it is going to take men from their homes, their families, and their communities and send them to Southeast Asia to fight, has an obligation to see that our allies come to its defense; and if they are not willing to come to our defense, at least see that our allies are not permitted to carry on trade, such as is being done now, with the enemy in Vietnam.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I am glad to yield.

Mr. GRUENING. I would like to call the attention of the Senator from Virginia to the fact that most of our allies are conspicuously missing in this area. It is rather distressing, because newspaper dispatches refer to our allies there, but none of our allies from the free world are there. I make an exception of Australia, which has rather reluctantly sent 5,000 troops there.

The Philippines, after a splendid handout given to the President, I think sent a few engineers there.

As far as Korea is concerned, of course, they have sent a division, I believe, but only when we keep two divisions there, and of course we are paying handsomely, at higher prices, for their participation.

As far as our allies are concerned, they might as well not be there at all. They are not. That includes most of our SEATO allies.

So while I might not agree with everything being done there, this is a fact the American people should bear in mind.

I have long felt that if we are going to carry on a crusade against communism on behalf of the free world, we should do it with our allies, and not virtually alone, which we are doing.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I thank the distinguished Senator from Alaska. I agree 100 percent with what he says with regard to the lack of support which this Nation is getting from our allies.

Both of us were talking about the SEATO agreement, the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization. Besides the United States, there are seven other signatories to that agreement. Three of those are not involved in any way, shape, or form in South Vietnam. The other four are furnishing some support.

Mr. GRUENING. Token.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. In most cases, token support.

I again thank the Senator from Alaska for his contribution to this discussion.

To get back to Mr. Stone's report from Manila, he then discusses Japan. He says:

> Japan is making money on the war. Direct payments of U.S. dollars into Japan's economy due to Vietnam are at the rate of $200 million a year. That, plus markets opened to Japan by American industry's diversion to war production, account for an estimated $750 million advantage in Japan's balance of payments.

There again, I do not like to see profits being made out of a war in which the United States, this one year, 1967, from the period January 1 through September 16, has suffered 52,000 casualties. Fifty-two thousand casualties in that time, and that on top of the 35,000 casualties which were suffered by our Nation during the year 1966.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the entire article entitled "We Can Expect Very Little More Aid From Allies," written by Walker Stone, editor in chief of the Scripps-Howard newspapers, and published in the Washington Daily News of Friday, September 22, 1967.

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

[From the Washington Daily News, Sept. 22, 1967]

SCRIPPS-HOWARD EDITOR ON TOUR GETS THE MESSAGE: WE CAN EXPECT VERY LITTLE MORE AID FROM ALLIES

(By Walker Stone)

MANILA, September 22.—If the Vietnam war drags on into an indefinite future, how much more help can America expect from our friends in this part of the world?

From two weeks of questioning high officials and private citizens in Japan, Korea and the Philippines, the answer as to those countries comes thru clear; Not much more.

In South Korea spirit is strong, but resources are limited.

The Koreans now have nearly 50,000 troops in Vietnam, mostly combat, and they have performed magnificently as guerrilla fighters. Yet, that number is just about equal to the count of American troops still in Korea helping patrol the UN armistice line.

If let alone, the Koreans would proudly do more in Vietnam. But in recent months, there has been an increase of communist incursions across the demilitarized zone and of subversion terms infiltrating along the coast.

At present the situation is under control. The Koreans have an efficient constabulary and, more important, a co-operative citizenry who quickly tell police of suspicious strangers in their midst. It is not a politically porous land in which fifth columns can operate successfully.

A further step-up of communist harassments—a logical tactical operation to make the Koreans more concerned with internal security—could cause the Seoul government to hesitate before making heavier commitments in Vietnam.

The Philippines also has difficulties at home. Thirty thousand of 50,000 Filipino troops are devoted to internal security. The old HUK communist movement, smashed by the late President Magsaysay, has not been rebuilt, but small bands of HUK terrorists and mafia types in the provinces still are engaged in assassination and extortion tactics. On the whole, Philippine internal security is in hand.

A Philippine battalion of 2200 non-combat engineers is engaged in reconstruction work in Vietnam. A Philippine election campaign is on, and the 15 remaining engineering battalions have been put to work at home building roads and schools, much to the political credit of President Marcos' Nationalista Party. Yet there is a criticism that the engineer troops in Vietnam might also well be employed at home. Indeed there are enough potholes in Manila streets alone to give substance to that argument.

Asked if the Philippines in the future might send combat troops to Vietnam, President Marcos said the policy of the ruling party as well as the opposition party is to send only construction troops. "This aid," he said, "was specifically requested by Vietnam. Vietnam being a protocol state of SEATO, necessarily, if there is any request of the Vietnamese government to this end, then we will have to reassess our policy."

Japan, the great economic power of Asia, is one country which could make a truly large contribution to the Vietnam effort, but it is not likely to unless it comes to think it needs to.

Japan is making money on the war. Direct payments of U.S. dollars into Japan's economy due to Vietnam are at the rate of $200 million a year. That, plus markets opened to Japan by American industry's diversion to war production, account for an estimated $750 million advantage in Japan's balance of payments.

Yet from the beginning of the Vietnam trouble up to now Japan's total economic assistance to Vietnam has been only about $55 million, partly reparations, mostly in

construction of a large power dam across the Danhim River. Other contributions include a six-man medical team, 4544 cases of medical supplies, 20,000 transistor radios and 25 ambulances.

Will Japan give more? Maybe.

Recent moves of Prime Minister Eisaku Sato, including a visit to Taiwan, of which Red China took a dim view, seem to be putting him in a neutral position more sympathetic to our side.

Whatever Japan does has to be limited to economic aid. American military power, including atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, convinced Japan of the folly of war and the virtue of pacifism.

AUTHORIZATION OF ADDITIONAL TIME FOR THE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE TO FILE REPORT ON CAMPAIGN FINANCING

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance have whatever additional time may be necessary to file a report on campaign financing that was, by previous order of the Senate, due to be filed before the close of business today.

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. (Mr. CHURCH in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL CONFERENCE FOR NEW POLITICS

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, for a long time the Internal Security Subcommittee has been accumulating evidence with respect to the activities and the plans of the National Conference for New Politics.

This is an organization spawned by the so-called New Left, with a little financial midwifery by the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, that left-liberal stepchild of the Ford Foundation, out of the Fund for the Republic.

Mr. President, in a little over 2 years the National Conference for New Politics, which started out with some genuinely radical but non-Communist leaders, has become a fairly sophisticated and somewhat complicated organization working hand in glove with the Communist Party, U.S.A.

Originally controlled by a small group of white socialists and other radicals, the NCNP has become a large group which is now, ostensibly, controlled by Negro black power organizations. The original goal of the NCNP was revolution in the United States, and that is its goal today. The new emphasis of the NCNP is on attaining this goal through the actions and activities, both violent and political, of Negro organizations and Negro groups throughout the country.

There is substantial evidence that the Communist Party has been successful in its drive to infiltrate the National Conference for New Politics, and that the recent decisions of the NCNP at its Chicago convention earlier this month, even including the shameful capitulation of that convention to the so-called black caucus, were Communist-dictated.

There is no doubt that the Communist Party has had the hope of turning the new politics movement into a political front, as a successor to the now-defunct Progressive Labor Party. There is substantial evidence that the Communists are succeeding in this objective; but their new political front has become and will remain a black party. The degree of success which may be achieved by this Communist effort will depend, in very substantial degree, upon what proportion of the Negro population can be whipped into line by the black power organizations through which NCNP now is working.

Mr. President, I do not want my statement today to be construed as an announcement that the Internal Security Subcommittee will hold public hearings on the National Conference for New Politics and its activities; because the subcommittee has not yet voted on a resolution to authorize such hearings. However, I do not consider it either misleading or improper to mention the possibility that the subcommittee may vote to hold such hearings. Evidence already in the possession of the subcommittee is adequate to justify such hearings.

We know that the black power activities of the NCNP extend into many States, and involve many organizations.

Because of the possibility that the Internal Security Subcommittee will hold hearings in this area, I do not propose to discuss this subject in more detail, except with respect to certain information which concerns my own State, the State of Mississippi. I am turning this information over to the Internal Security Subcommittee, for consideration along with all the other material relating to the National Conference for New Politics which the subcommittee has accumulated; but I propose to make certain items of this information public by putting them in the RECORD today.

Because of the possibility that these items of evidence and information which I make public today may form a part of the record of public hearings before the Internal Security Subcommittee in the near future, I shall not attempt to draw conclusions, but shall confine myself to asking certain rather obvious questions. The evidence in the record can then speak for itself.

Since the early part of 1961 I have discussed publicly, from time to time, what I referred to in May 1961, in a Senate speech, as the activities of provocateurs who have descended upon the Southern States in the name of so-called civil rights, but whose sole purpose was the stirring up of discord, strife, and violence. I have warned repeatedly that if such tactics were permitted to go forward in the South, they would be spread to other parts of the country when it suited the purposes of the Communist Party. Now we have seen these predictions borne out.

I have discussed in considerable detail, here on this floor, the so-called Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party and its supporters, and I have provided documentation with respect to some of the organizations and individuals participating in the fomenting of racial violence in Mississippi and elsewhere, and some of the connections of these organizations and individuals with the Communist conspiracy. I have discussed some of the evidence of Communist support, both national and internationally, for these activities which involve magnifying racial tensions and capitalizing upon racial unrest to create violence and bloodshed, all in furtherance of the Communist objective of weakening this Nation internally to advance the day of the projected Communist takeover.

More than 2 years, in March 1965, I pointed out that the people of Mississippi had known for more than 2 years, at that time, that Communist incitement was at the bottom of most of the racial strife which has been making so many headlines.

I have pointed out here on this floor how Communist infiltration of the so-called Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party can be traced clearly and demonstrated readily.

The files of the National Conference for New Politics contain a document entitled "Proposal for 6-Month Project for Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party." This document shows on its face that it refers to a period beginning July 1, 1967, and running through December 31, 1967. This document was submitted by four individuals whose names appear thereon. There are Joseph Harris, listed as "organizer for Sunflower and Morehead May 2, 1967, election"; Lawrence Guyot, listed as "chairman, Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party"; the Reverend Ed King, listed as "committeeman, Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party"; and Mrs. Fannie Lou Hamer, listed as "vice chairman, Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party."

The budget outlined for this project amounts to more than $141,000 for the 6-month period, in support of a 6-month political campaign in 20 counties of Mississippi.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of this document to which I have referred, headed "Proposal for 6-Month Project for Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party," may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

PROPOSAL FOR 6-MONTH PROJECT FOR MISSISSIPPI FREEDOM DEMOCRATIC PARTY, BEGINNING JULY 1, 1967–DECEMBER 31, 1967

(Submitted by Joseph Harris, organizer for Sunflower and Moorhead May 2, 1967 election; Lawrence Guyot, chairman, Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party; the Reverend Ed King, committeeman, Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party; Mrs. Fannie Lou Hamer, vice chairman, Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party)

BACKGROUND

The Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party is a rank and file controlled political organization open to all without regard to color,

although presently—and quite understandable—composed primarily of Negroes.

The Freedom Democratic Party, believing that racial equality is only the first step in solving the basic problem of poverty, disease and illiteracy confronting American Society, welcomes the participation of all Mississippi citizens in a joint effort to realize the goals of economic growth and individual self-fulfillment in a spirit of human concern for the welfare of every person.

With all humility, we ask the guidance of Almighty God in these difficult times. May His power and spirit fill us all as we approach these problems that beset us all.

This is a proposal to conduct a six month political campaign in *twenty counties* at the county level, by and for Mississippi Negroes and public affairs, legislative and political processes and social problem. The project will be sponsored by the Executive Committee of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party. The program will be managed by this group, who will have full responsibility for this project.

The Needs: 1967 is a critical year in Mississippi. It is a year of great social and physical hardship for the very poor as they feel the impact of the national minimum wage act of 1966. It is also a year of political opportunity. The impact of the year of struggle for voting rights is slowly being felt as the number of registered Negro voters climb in each of the Mississippi counties. But people need voter education. It is the year of local election for the key county positions, sheriff, tax assessor, board of supervisors, board of education and circuit clerk. It is the year that Negroes, for the first time since Reconstruction, can realistically aspire to political office. It is the year for political and civic awareness, education and responsibility.

PROPOSED PROGRAM

The proposal which follows outline a program which will provide intensive work for 100 indigenous residents of Mississippi over a six month period. After the initial six months working period, 100 people would be continued to utilize themselves to carry on a more extensive program in their county. The proposed program is to develop local leadership in Mississippi.

PROGRAM

I. One person from each beat in the county will be responsible for organizing the beat. (a) Politically, (b) Economically, (c) Other Services Needed.

II. Create new leadership, ideas and programs for the county.

III. Conduct numerous workshops with candidates or potential candidates.

IV. Conduct voter education and literacy classes and explain nature of duties and office.

V. To be of any service to the county and work along with any program the county initiates.

The need for such a program is and has been for a long period of time in Mississippi. It puts responsibility in local Mississippians hands.

ADMINISTRATION AND SUPERVISION

Policy Direction

The program and policies of the project will be determined by the Executive Committee of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party. Responsibility for the employment of staff will be vested in the Executive Committee and the Executive Director when once hired.

PROGRAM SUPERVISION

Responsibility for direct supervision of the program will be vested in the Director and Executive Secretary. They will be the chief administrators.

Staff: The Director will be assisted by an Executive Secretary, 2 secretaries, 2 office workers and a researcher.

Budget for office staff for a period of 6 months

Director, $125 per week	$3,300
Executive secretary, $110 per week	2,860
2 secretaries, $60 per week	3,120
2 office workers, $40 per week	2,080
Researcher, $70 per week	1,820
Total	13,180

FIELD STAFF

100 people, $50 per week	120,000
Rent, $60 per week	360
Office supplies	700
Office equipment	500
Telephone	1,400
Postage	600
Transportation in State for 20 counties for field workers	3,000
Travel out of State	600
Miscellaneous expense, $40 per week	960
1 car and insurance	4,000
Total	128,120
Grand total	141,300

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on July 12, 1967, a letter signed by Owen Brooks on the letterhead of "Mississippians United To Elect Negro Candidates, Post Office Box 202, Greenville, Miss. 28701" was addressed to Mr. Michael Wood, National Conference for New Politics, Midwest Region, National Convention Headquarters, 1517 West Howard, Chicago, Ill. 60626. This letter included a list of the names of Negro candidates, or prospective Negro candidates, in Mississippi. Under date of July 17, a letter was addressed to Mr. Joseph Harris, of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party by William F. Pepper, of the National Conference for New Politics, with a carbon copy to Mike Wood of NCNP, discussing "cooperative effort" between the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party project and the convention organization of the NCNP.

Mr. President, I ask that the full text of these two letters, including the list of Negro candidates to which I have referred, may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

MISSISSIPPIANS UNITED TO ELECT NEGRO CANDIDATES,
Greenville, Miss., July 12, 1967.

Mr. MICHAEL WOOD,
National Conference for New Politics, Midwest Region, National Convention Headquarters, Chicago, Ill.

DEAR MR. WOOD: Mrs. Lucy Montgomery suggested that you would be interested in the material we have put together on the needs for the campaigns of Negro candidates in Mississippi this year.

We need to get the widest coverage possible with this and would certainly appreciate your help. Additional copies of the brochure, which points out priority areas in which Negro candidates have excellent chances of being elected, and of the printed cover letter are available if you would have use of them.

If we can be of any further help to you with information on the campaign or individual candidates and counties, please do let us know. We will be supplying you with more detailed information throughout the summer as the campaigns develop.

Sincerely,

OWEN BROOKS.

JULY 17, 1967.

Mr. JOSEPH HARRIS,
Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party, Sunflower, Miss.

DEAR MR. HARRIS: Thank you for your letter of July 30. All of the staff energy and financial appropriations of NCNP at this time are being devoted to the national convention at which we hope the MFDP will be well represented. I have sent a request to our Chicago office and asked Mike Wood, the convention coordinator, to be in touch with you. If there could be some cooperative effort relating your project to our convention organizing, I would encourage it and have suggested that Mike negotiate it.

Thanks so much.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM F. PEPPER.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, files of the National Conference for New Politics contain a card index of so-called key contacts in various States. Under "Mississippi," two names are listed in this index. David Doggett is listed twice, once with the address "Millsaps College, Jackson, Miss.," and again with the address "In care of Freedom Information Service, Box 120, Tougaloo, Miss." Also listed is John Buffington, 461 Cottrell Street, West Point, Miss.

Files of the NCNP also contain a "list of names and/or groups" designated as "those which have so far registered as representatives for the convention, donated money to the NCNP, or who have either recently joined the NCNP or contributed money."

A note heading this "list of names and/or groups" states that—

> Regardless of their affiliation, they are all in support of the policy of NCNP. All pertinent information regarding each individual or organization was taken verbatim from their own credentials and reports. Each applicant listed sent a minimum of $5 membership or registration fee and will attend as a delegate, observer, or representative (from a Congressional district) as indicated.

Item 57 on this "list of names and/or groups" is "Friends of Children of Mississippi, 507½ North Farish Street, Jackson, Miss. 39202." Under this heading, two individuals are listed as delegates. They are Frederick R. Mangrum, Jr., designated as "director," and Dave Fleming, listed as "deputy director." Under the heading of "Miscellaneous Information," this entry shows that the organization "Friends of Children of Mississippi" was formed on January 18, 1967, and has 435 members.

A so-called credentials report of the Convention of the National Conference for New Politics dated August 31, 1967, carries a headnote that—

> The following is a list of all the organizations credentialed for delegate status up to the present, with notations for groups which the Credentials Subcommittee is querying for future determination of their status.

In this report, groups are listed in one column, with a second column showing either the number of persons allegedly "credentialed," or a question mark. Under the subhead "Mississippi," the following are listed:

1. Child Development Group of Mississippi	(?)
2. Freedom Democratic Party, A.C.B.C.	400
3. Freedom New Brick Co.	50
4. Friends of Children of Mississippi	435

5. Hinds County Mississippi F.D.P. 150
6. Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party ..... (?)
7. People's Corp ..... (?)
8. Sunflower County Improvement Association ..... (?)
9. Tougaloo College Political Action Committee ..... (?)

Mr. President, I would like to call particular attention to one of the organizations listed as being accredited by the Credentials Subcommittee of the National Conference for New Politics.

The Child Development Group of Mississippi is apparently accredited to send delegates to conventions of the NCNP. This organization is one of the most heavily funded of the Federal poverty programs. It has already received and is scheduled to receive for the current calendar year $7 million. The preceding year it received $4,700,000, and the year before $1,500,000, making a gross total of $13,200,000 in Government money that has gone to this organization. I will say it has gone over the protests of the entire congressional delegation from Mississippi, and this same group was subject to an investigation by the Senate Committee on Appropriations for illegitimate use of funds and for shortages in substantial sums. Members of this same group were likewise investigated by the Department of Justice for excessive activity in the recent Mississippi elections and charges that many Negroes were terrorized and abused by members of this group in connection with these elections.

I am greatly concerned that an organization heavily funded by the Federal Government and supposedly dedicated to the education of children and adults to combat poverty should be involved with a national organization apparently infiltrated by the Communist movement.

According to the exhibited documents, one of the purposes of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party in attending the NCNP convention was to submit a budget to solicit the aid of the member organizations in raising funds.

It is only logical to assume that if an organization such as the Child Development Group, of Mississippi, which handles millions of dollars in Federal funds, is called on through its membership to raise money, they might be in a tempting position to make a handsome contribution.

In fact, I understand it has been discovered that the Child Development Group of Mississippi has more than a half million dollars in expenditures which cannot be accounted for.

I think we should ask where this Federal money has gone.

I am including for the RECORD a copy of the Hinds County Chapter of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party newspaper of September 8, 1967, which further illustrates the type of politics being generated by the National Conference for New Politics. This newspaper lists as delegates to the Chicago meeting of the NCNP Henry Hatches, Ralph Wheeler, and Louis Clark of Hinds County. On the front page of this publication is a fully illustrated diagram on the construction of a Molotov cocktail, which is labeled "New Politics." The publication describes the activities of the delegates at the convention with emphasis on black power and how to run a successful revolution.

Three letters from Arnold Johnson, public relations director of the Communist Party, U.S.A., and one letter from Daniel Rubin, national organization secretary of the Communist Party, U.S.A., are contained in the NCNP convention files.

Under date of July 24, 1967, the public relations director of the Communist Party, U.S.A., addressed a letter to Mr. Michael P. Wood, chairman, convention steering committee, National Conference for New Politics, making formal application for participation in a steering committee meeting. In this letter, Johnson described himself as "a member of the National Board of the Communist Party, U.S.A." and stated that he has "a responsibility in the areas of political action and peace as well as in the total field of politics."

Johnson also stated, in this letter, that he has been active "on the leading Committees of the National Coordinating Committee To End the War in Vietnam and more recently, on the Spring Mobilization Committee and its continuing work."

On the same date, July 24, 1967, Arnold Johnson addressed a letter to William Pepper, executive director of the National Conference for New Politics, enclosing a copy of his letter to Michael Wood asking for accreditation at the steering committee meeting of the NCNP, and suggesting that he have a preliminary meeting with Pepper.

One day later, July 25, 1967, the public relations director of the Communist Party, U.S.A., addressed another letter to Michael Wood, chairman of the convention steering committee of the National Conference for New Politics, enclosing a copy of the Communist paper, the Worker, of July 16, 1967, and calling attention to an editorial in that paper dealing with the New Politics Convention. In this letter, the Communist Party's public relations director also expressed his confidence that the chairman of the NCNP Convention steering committee would be "interested in the section of Gus Hall's report to a recent meeting of the Communist Party which deals with the question of political action."

On August 11, 1967, Daniel Rubin, national organization secretary of the Communist Party, U.S.A., addressed a letter to Mr. Michael P. Wood, chairman of the convention committee, National Conference for New Politics, listing six individuals as having been elected as delegates of the national committee of the Communist Party, U.S.A., to attend the Convention of the National Conference for New Politics. The six listed delegates were Arnold Johnson, Claude Lightfoot, Gilbert Green, Roscoe Proctor, Thomas Dennis, and Mike Zagarell.

In this letter, the national organization secretary of the Communist Party, U.S.A., stated that—

> We have designated our delegation as representative of our National Committee of 80 members so as to avoid any concept that we are seeking to influence the Convention by the voting strength of our total membership throughout this country.

Then he continued:

> Arnold Johnson and Gilbert Green will be in Chicago from August 28th to attend any preliminary meetings, and to confer and cooperate on all matters in which we may have an interest.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the four letters to which I have just referred, three signed by Arnold Johnson, public relations director of the Communist Party, U.S.A., and one signed by Daniel Rubin, national organization secretary of the Communist Party, U.S.A., may be printed in the RECORD.

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

JULY 24, 1967.

Mr. MICHAEL P. WOOD,
National Conference for New Politics,
Chicago, Ill.

DEAR MR. WOOD: In the "New Politics News" with all the information on the forthcoming convention there is a notice that "deadline for application from groups and individuals wishing to be accredited at the July 29–30 Steering Committee meeting is July 28th. On this basis I assume that you are accepting applications and I trust that you will consider this letter as an application to attend and be accredited at the July 29–30 meeting.

As to a bit of information, I am a member of the national board of the Communist Party, U.S.A. and have a responsibility in the areas of political action and peace as well as in the total field of politics. I have been active on the leading committees of the National Coordinating Committee to end the War in Vietnam and more recently, on the Spring Mobilization Committee and its continuing work.

In the past I was the district organizer of the Communist Party in Ohio from 1940 to 1947 during which time I ran for School Board in Cleveland in 1943 and received some 47,000 votes and in 1945 when I got some 60,000 votes. I have also run for other offices.

I became the National Legislative Director of the Communist Party, USA in 1947 and since then have been on the staff of the national office of the Party except for a brief 3-year sentence under the Smith Act from 1955–57.

I make this application to participate in a Steering Committee meeting in an individual capacity with the understanding, of course, that my organizational affiliation is with the Communist Party, U.S.A.

I trust the above information is sufficient and that you will let me know the time and place of the Steering Committee meeting by air mail.

Sincerely yours,
ARNOLD JOHNSON.

NEW YORK.

JULY 24, 1967.

Mr. WILLIAM PEPPER,
National Conference for New Politics,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. PEPPER: I am enclosing a copy of a letter which I have just sent to Michael Wood as an application to be accredited at the Steering Committee meeting this coming weekend. I trust that this will receive favorable consideration and if it is at all possible to see you before that date, I would appreciate an appointment, although I can also recognize that you must be very, very busy.

Sincerely yours,
ARNOLD JOHNSON.

NEW YORK.

COMMUNIST PARTY, U.S.A.
New York, N.Y., July 25, 1967.

MICHAEL WOOD,
National Conference for New Politics, Chicago, Ill.

DEAR MR. WOOD: I am enclosing herewith a copy of the *Worker* of July 16th because I feel you should have directly from us the editorial on the New Politics Convention, as well as other references to the call to your Convention contained in this particular issue.

I trust that you will also be interested in the section of Gus Hall's report to a recent meeting of the Communist Party which deals with the question of political action.

I am also sending a copy of this to William Pepper.

Sincerely yours,

ARNOLD JOHNSON,
Public Relations Director.

COMMUNIST PARTY, U.S.A.,
New York, N.Y., August 11, 1967.

Mr. MICHAEL P. WOOD,
National Conference for New Politics, Chicago, Ill.

DEAR MR. WOOD: In accord with the purposes of the Convention as outlined in the Call to the Convention and the Rules and Procedures as presented in "New Politics News", the following have been elected as delegates of the National Committee of the Communist Party, U.S.A. to attend the Convention: *Arnold Johnson, Claude Lightfoot, Gilbert Green, Roscoe Proctor, Thomas Dennis* and *Mike Zagarell.*

While we are confident that our policy and activities which can be documented by many publications does not need extensive elaboration, yet we are enclosing copies of pamphlets which can be used for reference.

We have designated our delegation as representative of our National Committee of 80 members so as to avoid any concept that we are seeking to influence the Convention by the voting strength of our total membership throughout the country.

Arnold Johnson and Gilbert Green will be in Chicago from August 28th to attend any preliminary meetings, and to confer and cooperate on all matters in which we may have an interest.

Trusting that this is satisfactory and awaiting a favorable reply, I am

Sincerely yours,

DAVID RUBIN,
National Organization Secretary.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I have said that I would not prejudice possible future hearings before the Internal Security Subcommittee by attempting to draw conclusions from the documentation I have presented here, but would only ask a few obvious questions.

My questions are these:

In the face of this evidence, who can doubt the cooperation between the Communist Party and the Conference for New Politics?

Who can doubt the cooperation between the Conference for New Politics and the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party, and the other Mississippi organizations and individuals referred to, or the participation of those organizations and individuals in the convention and activities of the NCNP?

Who can doubt that the political activities of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party are in furtherance of the general objectives of the National Conference for New Politics; or, to put it another way, that these political activities of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party are a part of the drive to bring about Negro revolution in this country?

How much of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party's budget of more than $140,000 for political operations in Mississippi during the second 6 months of 1967 has been supplied, either directly or indirectly, by the Communist Party or by organizations or individuals connected with or influenced by the Communist Party?

How much of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party's budget for its operations during 1968 will be similarly supplied?

How much is the National Council of Churches going to contribute to the activities of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party or for its operations?

I hope, Mr. President, that the Internal Security Subcommittee will hold public hearings on the National Conference for New Politics and its activities, and that these hearings will supply positive answers to these questions, and to similar questions applicable to other areas of the country where the black power movement is making itself felt.

We are approaching a crisis in this country, where it will be determined whether law and order is to triumph over revolution and anarchy, whether black power is to be substituted, either in the country as a whole or in any of our States, for normal and peaceful political processes; and whether the Communist Party, U.S.A., is to be permitted to grasp the reins of political power through the mechinations of the National Conference for New Politics and other cooperating organizations.

Unless we meet this crisis with firmness and resolution, unless we free ourselves from an attitude which renders immune from criticism, and even immune from investigation, any organization or activity which chooses to wrap itself in the banner of so-called civil rights, this Nation may not awake to the realities of the situation until it is too late; and if the Communists are permitted to attain their objectives, the loss to all the people of this country, including the minority for whose alleged benefit the forces of revolution have been set in motion, will be irredeemable.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2388) to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the pending bill, S. 2388, is known as the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967.

This is an original bill, prepared initially by the Subcommittee on Employment Manpower, and Poverty of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. The subcommittee considered at some length the administration bill, and held extensive and quite unusual hearings, to which I will advert in a moment.

The purpose of the bill is twofold: First, to modernize, streamline, and bring up to date the original Economic Opportunity Act of 1964; and, second, to add thereto an emergency employment program, occasioned by reason of the disturbances in some 30 cities across the country this year—disturbances which resulted in an almost unanimous consensus of informed opinion that while there is no simple solution to the complex social problems and disorders which plagued so many of our cities this spring and summer, one thing is superabundantly clear, and that is the vital necessity to give useful employment to minority groups, both in rural and urban areas, old as well as young, but more young than old, who all too frequently have tended to be the ringleaders in those distressing violations of law and order which have caused so much concern, not only all over our country, but to friends of the United States all over the world.

Let me briefly refer to the preliminary work which has resulted in bringing this bill to the floor.

Last year, when I had the honor to floor manage the 1966 Amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act, there was great criticism from Senators that there had not been an adequate study in depth of the poverty program, which had then been in effect somewhat less than 2 years, having been passed in the late summer or early fall of 1964. Last year, we held only 4 days of hearings, listening mostly to administration witnesses, but also giving, to a brief and somewhat inadequate extent, an opportunity for other interested citizens and organizations to be heard.

When I brought the bill to the floor last year, I made a commitment that before we moved to the floor of the Senate with the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967, the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty would undertake to study the poverty program in substantial depth, so that when we came back with the legislation this year, the members of the subcommittee would know a great deal more about the program than they did last year, and would have made available, to other Senators and to the public generally, the results of a searching congressional investigation or inquiry into the poverty program.

On February 20, 1967, the Senate, through the Committee on Rules and Administration, authorized the subcommittee, in effect, to undertake a thorough examination of the war on poverty.

When we instituted that examination, I stated categorically that the inquiry would be neither a whitewash nor a witch hunt. I stated that we wanted to find out what was wrong with the legislative aspects of the war on poverty and the administrative aspects, too, in order that we might repair some of those deficiencies.

I also stated that we wanted to find out what was right about the administration program and the legislative guidelines which had been set down for regulating the conduct of the Office of Economic Opportunity and its extremely able Director, Mr. Sargent Shriver.

In the performance of those commit-

ments, the subcommittee has conducted 33 days of public hearings in Washington and around the country. We heard 401 witnesses. Their testimony took 144 hours. We received countless statements for the record. We made 11 inspection trips in the field all over the United States.

I have been in the last 6 months to Jackson, Miss., Phoenix, Ariz., Albuquerque, N. Mex., San Francisco, Calif., and to the San Joaquin Valley in California to study the migrant program and rural poverty. I have been not only to Jackson, Miss., but also from there north to the Tennessee border, investigating and taking testimony with respect to abject poverty in the Mississippi Delta counties. I have been to Johnstown, Pa., Chicago, Ill., and New York cities.

My colleagues frequently accompanied me and, in order appropriately to share the burden, conducted hearings, at which I was not present, in Boston, Mass., Providence, R.I., and Sparta, Wis.

We studied in some depth poverty in the District of Columbia, including a couple of field trips. We retained a consultant who made separate investigation of the administration of the poverty program in each of the seven regions into which the Office of Economic Opportunity is divided for administrative purposes in the United States.

Each of those seven consultants studied five areas, city or rural areas, in each of those regions. So, we have 35 separate consultant reports on poverty programs in 35 communities in the seven regions.

We have also received 18 staff reports from consultants who studied various aspects of the organization, administration, and implementation of the poverty program. For example, they studied seven State technical assistance agencies involving a sample of the program in 26 States. They interviewed more than 1,000 persons.

Six other consultants wrote special studies for the committee, with particular concentration on statistical analyses of the manpower program.

The subcommittee's effort is contained in 18 volumes of hearings and eight volumes of consultant and staff reports, the more important of which are presently looming high on the desk of every Senator.

At this stage the committee is ready to report on the first examination of the poverty program. We deal with the Economic Opportunity Act, its operation and what legislative changes should be made.

The report which accompanied S. 2388, therefore, encompasses both the findings of the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty and the committee's legislative recommendations as contained in the reported bill.

Here is a copy of the report which is also on the desk of all Senators. I think I can say with accuracy that this is an unusually comprehensive report, including as it does 223 pages of findings of fact, conclusions, and recommendations.

Included in the report are minority views signed by all six members of the Republican minority which, generally speaking, commend the Economic Opportunity Act and its administration, and take credit—appropriate and just credit—for many changes made in the bill at the behest of the minority, and list those changes, eight in number.

In addition, there are supplemental views filed by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], to which I take grave exception, and with which I will deal in detail later on during the debate.

There are also supplemental and somewhat differing views of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN], with which I also find myself in substantial disaccord.

There are supplemental views of the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], with respect to which I regretfully make the same comment.

There are extensive supplemental views of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN], very well conceived views if one accepts his point of view—which I do not—but views which will have to be met in the course of the debate if those of us in the majority are to carry the burden of pressing this bill to enactment in the Senate.

Mr. President, I have spoken on what has taken place so far in our investigation and of what is contained in the report currently available to Members of the Senate. However, a second and final report will deal in a more general way with the total array of Federal programs affecting the poor, for we must remember that only a small part of the funding in the war on poverty is encompassed in the Economic Opportunity Act amendments which are presently before the Senate.

As the President pointed out in his comprehensive message some months ago dealing with urban and rural poverty, approximately $25 billion of Federal funds are in the budget this year for programs which have a direct impact on poverty, but only less than $2 billion is directly under the administration of the Office of Economic Opportunity. The remainder is in such areas as primary and secondary education, including technical and vocational education; manpower training of many kinds; health programs; higher education programs; welfare programs; the vast array of programs to help the poor which, from time to time, have been authorized by Congress and are presently being administered by a host of Federal agencies.

On the basis of the examination which the committee has made to date, we have come to five general conclusions.

First. The magnitude of poverty in America continues to be a serious national problem and deserves continuing national attention. The United States has experienced steady progress in the reduction of poverty for 30 years, and this progress has accelerated since the inception of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

I should point out that the first real poverty programs began in the early days of the New Deal, in the administration of President Franklin D. Roosevelt. Two of the programs achieved the greatest "notoriety."

One was the PWA program—the Public Works Administration—which put millions of Americans then out of work to work on useful public works projects, the results of which shine out in grandeur all over the United States today and bear living testimony to the wisdom of President Roosevelt and his administration.

The second program was known as the WPA, or Works Progress Administration, subject to strenuous criticism at the time, sneers about men leaning on shovels and raking leaves. Very little public recognition was given to the spiritual value of that program in saving the souls as well as the bodies of millions of Americans. As an example, some of the finest art that came out of the thirties was painted and sculpted by artists who did not know where to look for the next meal, in view of the massive unemployment of those days and the fact that there were no longer any rich people to buy the product of their labor. Some of that art will live in history. This is just one example of the overall benefit which the WPA program achieved.

So I say, Mr. President, that the war on poverty has been going on now for the better part of 35 years; and yet, today, almost 30 million Americans are still poor. Who are the poor today? They comprise about 11 million households. About 12½ million of the roughly 30 million poor, 43 percent of the total, are children under 18—far too many of them living in homes without a man at the head of the household, far too many of them illegitimate children, far too many of them children in families so large that one wonders how their mothers can support them on the meager welfare grants which are available in many States.

At least 1,500,000 of the poor are young adults between the ages of 19 and 21. Most of them by then are out of school. Most of them are unable to find jobs because they do not have the technical qualifications which only a liberal arts or a technical or a vocational education could give them, to enable them to obtain useful employment.

Five million aged Americans are impoverished. Eight million additional Americans are saved from the quicksands of poverty only by their usually totally inadequate social security benefits. About 5,700,000 of the latter are 65 years of age or over.

The second conclusion to which the committee has come is that the basic programs authorized by the Economic Opportunity Act are desirable and should be continued. However, the experience of the last 3 years has shown a number of ways in which administration can be improved and how the legislation can be strengthened. The committee's report proposes a number of administrative improvements, and the reported bill embodies the committee's legislative recommendations. In many instances, it seemed better to put the recommendations in the RECORD in order to give adequate flexibility to the administrating agency. In others, it seemed wise to the committee to write the recommendation into the proposed legislation. This has been done, and this is one reason why we were unable to accept the administration bill and decided, as a result of our extensive study, that we would bring in a clean bill.

The third point we make is that the Office of Economic Opportunity has been an essential national instrument for focusing attention on the problems of poverty, for serving as an advocate for the poor within the Federal Government, and for conducting and overseeing a number of useful programs.

Let me expand a bit on the third point. Whitney M. Young, Jr., the executive director of the National Urban League, testified before the subcommittee:

> Destruction of the Office of Economic Opportunity would turn out to be the destruction of the most ambitious innovative and imaginative program the Nation has ever undertaken to help the poor become self-sufficient.

We considered carefully in our deliberations—I should say, Mr. President, that we had eight executive sessions, each of which lasted a couple of hours or more—such questions as: Is the Office of Economic Opportunity necessary? Is it desirable to have a separate agency in the Executive Office of the President as the command post for the war on poverty? Or should the OEO be abolished and all its functions turned over to other Federal agencies? A majority of the committee determined that the answer to that question should be "Yes"—OEO is necessary. It should not be abolished. Its programs should not be spun off.

During the course of the coming debate, amendments will be proposed to spin off a number of the OEO programs to other conventional bureaucratic agencies of the Federal Government.

Mr. President, I use that word "bureaucrat" in no invidious sense, for every agency of every department which has more than a few Government employees is a bureaucracy; some are good, some are bad, and most are indifferent.

However, the majority concluded that it would be a mistake to spin off any of these programs and that Mr. YOUNG was correct that it would be a serious mistake to eliminate the OEO. Most of the minority disagreed. They think, for example, that the vastly successful Headstart program should be transferred to the Office of Education. They think the same of the embryonic Followthrough program, which is an effort to carry youngsters, who have successfully met the challenge of Headstart, through the first couple of years of school so that the benefit of the Headstart program would not be lost in utterly inadequate schooling sometimes provided in many of our States for the first, second, and third grades, particularly in the urban and rural slums, where, the record shows, without peradventure of doubt, that the child of a slum family starts behind and falls further behind the longer he or she stays in school. One of the major efforts of the poverty program must be to see that that does not happen. In the opinion of the majority of the committee, the way to keep it from happening is to keep OEO's finger on the tiller, where it is now. Because of OEO and the poverty program this Nation has begun to come to grips with poverty problems.

OEO has placed poverty in the public spotlight and it has served as a rallying point for a broad spectrum of our citizens who want to eliminate poverty—businessmen, labor union officials, religious leaders, State and local officials, social welfare professionals, minority group leaders, and hundreds of thousands of plain citizens and, most of all, the poor themselves.

OEO has been an experimenter, an originator of pilot projects, a designer of new programs which have the potential for solving problems of poverty. If OEO were abolished its unique contribution could not be duplicated by any other agency. Worst of all, the poor, whose hopes have been raised, would feel a deep sense of repudiation.

The time may come, and the time will come within the foreseeable future, when the administration of the poverty program will have been such a success, and local school boards will have become so fired with the idealism inherent in programs like Headstart and Follow Through, that it will be administratively sound and wise to transfer these programs to other governmental agencies.

However, there is a strong feeling by the majority of the committee that that time has not yet come. When it does come, and I hope it comes soon, I shall be the first person to advocate the transfer.

I should point out, Mr. President, that it is only in relatively rare instances that the OEO itself actually administers the programs which some persons presently desire to have spun off.

In the usual instance the OEO delegates to the older and more conventional bureaucracy the actual operation of the program, but by retaining a finger on the paycheck and by setting standards which it insists shall be complied with as a condition to receiving a Federal grant, OEO, without bringing up a bureaucracy all its own, is able to control standards of operation by others of programs that some presently desire to spin off.

The view I have just expressed is not merely the committee's point of view. This may surprise many of my colleagues. It is the opinion of nearly every witness who appeared before the committee at its hearings throughout the country, both poor and nonpoor, both white and Negro, Spanish-American and native Protestant.

Of all 400 witnesses, only two advocated abolishing OEO and the transfer of its functions to other agencies. Not one witness recommended termination of the programs under the Economic Opportunity Act.

I should say here that those 400 witnesses were not, as is intimated in one of the minority reports, carefully selected and screened individuals with a preconception of Mr. Shriver and his organization. We heard everybody who wanted to be heard. I pleaded with the minority to bring in their own witnesses. Every now and then they did. This was no whitewash, but I say again, neither was it a witch hunt.

Nevertheless, OEO's contribution to American life has not been without difficulty. We found a lot of things wrong with OEO. There are a lot of things that are still wrong with OEO today and it is only very recently, indeed, that the agency has begun to achieve sound internal management. Let us remember that the OEO Act was passed in the late summer of 1964. It was in many ways a jerry-built organization. It was put together with scotch tape and baling wire.

Mr. Shriver was called out of the Peace Corps and was given two hats to wear, one for the Peace Corps, and one for the Office of Economic Opportunity. He had to put together an organization almost overnight, and it is a great tribute actually that the first grants were made by OEO in November of 1964, only 6 weeks after the appropriation for the agency was approved.

Mr. Shriver and his assistants had a great feeling of urgency. They wished to launch an all-out attack on poverty, and they did. Within the limitations inherent in the time and organization of the agency, in my opinion, they have done overall an excellent job with some exceptions.

Let us remember that most Federal agencies take from 3 to 6 months, and sometimes as long as a year, to get a new program underway.

Much of the early application review was done by the senior staff which made policy decisions on an ad hoc basis as issues arose. This worked well for awhile. By the summer of 1965 the process was beginning to bog down and that is when the criticism began to buzz. Much of that criticism was justified. Some of it is still justified. But under the whiplash—if I may say so—of the subcommittee, an alert press, and the keen interest taken by community action agencies all over the United States in the program—many of them very critical, indeed, of the administration of the OEO—the administration of the program has been steadily and constantly improved until, in my opinion, today it is at least as good, if not better, than that of many far more seasoned Federal agencies.

For example, it was not until January of 1966 that a joint management survey team of Federal officials assigned to develop a better organization and more effective procedures went into action. There was a 6-month delay in initiating the improvements. That is a source of some of the difficulty which is still plaguing the OEO.

This interagency team presented its report in June of 1966 and by now virtually all of its 68 recommendations have been put into effect.

In the 15 months since June of 1966, OEO has carried forward a process of administrative decentralization in seven regional offices. The view of the subcommittee in its hearing, and in studies by its experts, is that most of the current administration difficulties come into focus in these regional offices. There has been, on the one hand, too much delay and redtape in passing on requests for funding from local community action programs which go to the regional offices and sometimes have to be submitted to Washington for final approval.

There has been too much delay in Washington getting back to the regional offices, and the regional offices, in turn, getting back to the local community action agencies and other local groups administering a part of the poverty program.

The final decision was as to whether—and if so, how—the request for funding

was to be granted. Based on a year-long study by McKinsey & Co., Inc., retained by Mr. Shriver and his organization, OEO is presently reorganizing its regional offices and is instituting a series of uniform procedures which, if properly implemented, should remedy many of the difficulties.

I think the subcommittee can take some credit for having pressed the OEO to move effectively in that direction.

In short, the committee has found that the administrative practices of the OEO have shortcomings. The committee, however, is also convinced that the shortcomings can be, and are being, remedied. As these defects are taken care of, OEO will be in a much better position to serve as the command post for the poverty program and lead the way to achievement of the goal which President Johnson has held up to the American people.

THE ELIMINATION OF THE SCOURGE OF POVERTY

Mr. President, to summarize again the third point, our third general conclusion is that the OEO has been an essential national instrument in focusing attention on the problems of poverty by serving as an advocate of the poor within the Federal Government, and for conducting and overseeing a number of useful programs.

The OEO should, therefore, continue in operation under the changes recommended, administrative and legislative changes both, as recommended in the report and in the bill.

At this point, I think it would be helpful to quote from President Johnson's message to Congress entitled "America's Unfinished Business; Urban and Rural Poverty," wherein he says:

> We have recognized that public housing, minimum wages, and welfare services could not, standing alone, change the bleak environment of deprivation for millions of poor families. A successful strategy requires a breakthrough on many fronts—education, health, jobs and job training, housing, public assistance, transportation, recreation, clean air, and adequate water supplies.
>
> The basic conditions of life for the poor—

Said the President—

> must and can be changed.

The fourth major conclusion to which the committee came was that one of the major, unsolved problems of the poverty program is the lack of sufficient coordination among the wide variety of programs which serve the poor.

This problem exists at the Federal, State, and local levels, and in layers between these layers.

Accordingly, the reported bill contains a number of proposed remedies for the difficulties, remedies we thought to be necessary to put in the legislation and in the report because of our strong view that one of the weaknesses in the administration of the program was in the area of coordination.

Thus, I should like to direct a few words to the subject of coordination and explain what the bill and report do in this regard.

George Niccolo, commissioner of the community development agency in New York City, who testified before the subcommittee, told us:

> It is difficult enough to plan programs involving multiple funding sources, but when a number of Federal agencies do not plan together, it becomes almost impossible to plan essential multiple funding projects.

When the President announced unconditional war on poverty in the United States in January of 1964, he defined that war in terms of the concerted use of all the weapons at the Government's command, and all existing programs with an impact upon the problems of the poor, plus new programs to be enacted. As the new programs, which eventually became the OEO Act of 1964, were developed, two organizational possibilities were available.

First, these programs could be assigned to existing agencies, to be administered in coordination with existing programs relating to the elimination of poverty.

Second, they could be assigned to the new agency which was being set up in the executive office of the President as the command post for the war on poverty in the OEO.

The former alternative was chosen for six of the 10 new programs; that is to say, they were assigned to existing agencies. These programs were the Neighborhood Youth Corps, the college work-study program, the adult basic education program, rural loans, small business loans, and work-experience and training.

Except for this latter, work-experience and training, which was assigned to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, statutory responsibility was placed in the Office of Economic Opportunity, but delegated by the Director to existing Federal agencies; and to those I referred a few moments ago.

In the case of the college work-study and adult basic education, the programs were later transferred by statute.

The four remaining original programs were assigned to OEO for direct operation, including the two that were the most complex, innovative, far reaching, and costly—the Job Corps and the community action programs, VISTA, or Volunteers in Service to America, and the migrant labor program.

While most of the Economic Opportunity Act dealt with the authorization of the 10 new programs, four sections were included to provide a statutory basis for OEO's role as Government-wide coordinator across-the-board—meaning programs which were never remotely in OEO but were part of the overall war on poverty—programs embracing general education and college work; that is to say, sections 604, 611, 612, and 613 of the act.

These sections specifically charge the OEO Director with "coordination of antipoverty efforts by all segments of the Federal Government." That is section 604. In the same section a Cabinet-level Economic Opportunity Council, chaired by the Director, is created to assist him.

Section 611 empowers the Director to obtain data and reports from other agencies regarding their antipoverty programs and directs them to cooperate with him.

Section 613 authorizes the Director to establish an information center on all Federal antipoverty programs and to make information available to States and communities.

Section 612 directs all agencies, within limits of feasibility and legal authority, to give preference to projects which are elements of approved community action programs.

All this, of course, deals with coordination at the Federal level.

At the community level, the community action agency was designed as a mechanism with a coordinating role analogous to that of OEO at the Federal level.

The community action program would, in the language of existing law (sec. 202(a)(1)), "mobilize" and "utilize" public and private resources in the attack on poverty, as well as provide direct services.

There are presently over 1,000 of these local community action agencies. I would be less than candid if I did not say some of them are better than others. Some of them are working splendidly. Some of them are working badly. Most of them are working, in my opinion, pretty well, all things considered; and I am confident that they are working better every day, as constant supervision over administration at local, State, and national levels is constantly improving.

We must remember the very difficult coordinating problem that exists when, for example, a Headstart program is put underway in, let us say, a Pennsylvania community, or in any community in any State in the Union. Theoretically, the Headstart program is under the jurisdiction of the local community action program. This means that the community action agency has to get an authorization for funding out of Washington.

That application has to go first to the regional office of OEO. Then it goes to the top office for approval, except to the extent—and this is becoming more and more the case—where authority has been decentralized, under very strict guidelines, to the regional office to make the decision, subject to the right of appeal.

Having gotten the money, then the local community action agency has to go to the local school board and hope to find it sufficiently cooperative, as in many instances it is, but in many instances it is not, so that it will provide classroom space and teachers to take on the Headstart project. And when the local school board either cannot or will not cooperate, then, as I have seen with my own eyes in places in Mississippi and elsewhere, the community action agency has to find some public-spirited citizen or citizens who will find some shack or some abandoned dwelling, or frequently make available their own dwelling, where the program can be conducted, and also has to find the individuals adequately qualified—and it does not take a trained psychiatrist to run a Headstart program—to take care of the kids.

But this is only a part of it, because one of the great benefits of the Headstart program is the involvement of parents in this work. Many of these children come from the homes of illiterate parents. In many of these homes there has never been a book. In many of these homes there is only the most rudimen-

tary undertanding of measures of public health and sanitation. So the coordination of a program like this is a very difficult one.

I have not mentioned the States, because in many States, although not all, because the laws are so different, the State superintendent of education would have something to say, and so would the State welfare commissioner and the State department of health.

I make these comments only because of the desirability of indicating the immense complexity of the coordinating task and because OEO is assigned the formidable task of organizing new programs of unusual difficulty and sensitivity. Because of this task, the agency adopted a conscious strategy of dealing with the coordination of other antipoverty programs only as that became necessary to the implementation of the programs for which it was responsible.

This was probably a good short-term decision, but it was an impossible way to run an agency on a long-term basis.

This became apparent once the programs got well underway and the need for further coordination was understood. Nevertheless, OEO does list a number of accomplishments in its capacity as coordinator. It is the view of the committee that these are real accomplishments and that the OEO has good reason to be proud.

First, it has developed, for internal use only, a national antipoverty plan, projecting for 5 years recommended funding levels for antipoverty programs throughout the Government and proposing new programs and program modifications.

I may say that, in what I consider personally to be an utterly unjustifiable exercise of executive privilege, the Director of the OEO, under instructions from higher authority, refused to make that 5-year program available to the committee. In the bill, we require him to do so. How effective that will be with higher authority in the light of present rulings on executive privilege, one may perhaps leave to the imagination. But we do not want it to be said on behalf of Congress that that kind of information which has nothing whatever to do with the national security should not be made available to every Member of Congress.

The second achievement in coordination is that OEO has stimulated and taken a leading part in discussions of basic questions of policy, such as income maintenance proposals—this, as Senators know, being what was considered a good many years ago a far-out suggestion that we should substitute for current welfare programs a proposal or a program under which every man, woman, and child in the United States should receive a minimum allowance for subsistence.

In my view, we are a good long way from that. The time may come—and it will come unless we can bolster up our present welfare and social security systems to take far better care of the almost 30 million impoverished citizens with whom we are dealing today.

The third achievement in coordination is that, through technical assistance grants, it has provided each State with an agency, usually located in the Governor's office, which has the potential for dealing with a wide range of State and Federal-State functions.

The fourth achievement is that, through grants to community action agencies, it has encouraged the formation of broadly based agencies which in many communities are contributing to the coordination of Federal assistance programs at the receiving end. It has negotiated "checkpoint" procedures with Labor, HUD, and agencies of HEW to assure that applications for aid under their programs are submitted for comment to community action agencies.

The fifth achievement in coordination is that OEO has encouraged and funded projects, such as neighborhood centers, which have a special potential for mobilizing and coordinating community resources.

This, Mr. President, is a very great achievement in coordination at the local level, and will be immeasurably assisted by the bill we passed yesterday, which gives to HUD a substantial amount of money to acquire neighborhood community facilities in which community action agencies can conduct their neighborhoodwide program, bringing under one roof, as I saw done in Phoenix, Ariz., this spring, all the multiple agencies dealing with welfare, health, education, job placement, and a score of other programs which bring badly needed services to the poor.

This sixth achievement in coordination is that OEO has combined its funds with assistance from other agencies, such as the Department of Labor, to undertake joint projects. This is a real achievement in a Federal bureaucracy, with all the jealousies which usually afflict inter-agency projects. OEO has been able, not only with Labor but with HEW and to some extent with HUD, to work out joint projects where they do the job together, without too much concern for who is going to receive the ultimate credit.

The seventh achievement is that the OEO has established an information center with data, county by county, on 160 programs.

The dissemination of this information all across the country, available to all 1,000 community action agencies, results in a spread of knowledge to make the most successful projects available for consideration by many other agencies. This is a very real achievement.

I point out as an example the opportunities industrialization centers, organized first in Philadelphia by that inspired Baptist minister, Rev. Leon Sullivan, which have had fantastic success in training the poor for useful employment, with the assistance of private industry which helps with on-the-job training. As our testimony shows, this was not only a fantastic success in Philadelphia, but as a result of the dissemination of information of which I have been speaking, similar programs have been instituted in 45 other cities.

We know they will not work in all 45, and the reason is that this kind of project requires inspired leadership of the type which Dr. Sullivan has so amply given. Where that kind of leadership can be obtained, it is going to work, and it is working in many another city.

The eighth achievement in coordination is similar to the one I have just outlined. It is the publishing of a "Federal Catalog of Programs for the Improvement of the Community and the Individual." In its information and training centers, the OEO has sought to cover the whole range of Government antipoverty activities, and make all of that information available in every community.

I might say that in Johnstown, Pa., I saw a U.S. Employment Service agency carrying on this antipoverty work under an inspired local director, and making all of these programs available to the wide range of the poor in both rural and urban Cambria County, Pa. This was a magnificent, splendid example of the collection, evaluation, and dissemination of useful information.

The final achievement in coordination is that the Economic Opportunity Council has organized multiagency projects to deal with problems of displaced farmworkers in the Mississippi Delta, problems of Indians on reservations, and consumer programs. This I have seen with my own eyes both on an Indian reservation in New Mexico and in the delta counties of Mississippi.

But not all is well in connection with coordination. There is much that is not good at all. For that reason, the subcommittee is recommending a number of changes in legislation and in administrative practices.

There remain very serious problems. Many of these show up, not in Washington, but at the local level, where the services are actually delivered. A constantly recurring theme in the subcommittee's field hearings and consequent study is the complaint of lack of effective coordination among Federal programs. I observe the able junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE] in the Chamber. I point out to him that Gov. John A. Volpe of Massachusetts, observed that coordination is paramount among the problems which have made themselves apparent in the operations of the antipoverty program.

One of the committee's consultants documented the interagency difficulties of following through on the President's speech made in Syracuse, N.Y., on August 19, 1966, calling for "the establishment in every ghetto in America of a neighborhood center to serve the people who live there." However, not until June of 1967, 10 months later, were any grants made, and these only for planning of pilot projects in 14 cities.

The committee has itself experienced the frustrations in dealing with several agencies on crucial problems of this sort as it has tried to stimulate the Department of Agriculture, the Public Health Service, and the Office of Economic Opportunity to respond quickly to the problem of hunger in America, which the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] and I saw so graphically before us in the inspection trip we made on a long, hot day in the Mississippi Delta country. This problem I know exists also in areas in Appalachia as well as in many urban ghettos.

It is so difficult to get these old-styled, entrenched bureaucracies off their rear-ends, if I may be mildly vulgar. We

started at the top and worked down. Finally we got some action. However, it was like trying to pour molasses outdoors in the middle of winter in Vermont.

Coordinated activities would help. However, in the opinion of the committee, section 612, which requires other Federal programs to give preference to components of community action programs, has been found unworkable in any literal sense because community action agencies usually do not develop comprehensive programs embracing programs funded outside of the Economic Opportunity Act.

As I pointed out earlier, only about one-tenth of the programs dealing with poverty in America in terms of funding are within the coverage of the Economic Opportunity Act or the Office of Economic Opportunity. And this is because other Federal agencies are generally unwilling and not disposed to honor the preferences which are established pursuant to section 612. Even the preference provision for programs funded by the OEO Act, and this is section 212, has little application. The OEO has substituted the checkpoint procedure to achieve the same objective.

The Economic Opportunity Council has been a useful forum for communications among Federal agencies and for discussion of some relatively minor problems of coordination on an ad hoc basis, but it has not served, in the opinion of the committee, as an effective tool for concerted action with coordinated followthrough. In this respect, it has the same weaknesses that we have seen so often in other interdepartmental committees.

If we are going to try to coordinate programs among various Federal programs, or State or local agencies as I know from my experience as mayor, there has got to be a coordinator with enough power to require coordination.

Mr. Shriver, sitting on this Interagency Committee as Economic Opportunity Director, presumably speaks with the voice of the President because he is located in the Executive Office of the President.

Try to tell that to the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, or to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, who sit in the Cabinet and consider themselves to some extent the superior, if not the peer, of the estimable gentleman who happens to have the titular right to say that he is in the Executive Office of the President in the White House.

So we have made a number of legislative recommendations to improve coordination. To start with, with respect to coordination at the Federal level, the committee bill completely rewrites part B of title VI of the original act, which deals with Federal coordination. It revises the Economic Opportunity Council, which is section 631, to provide the President a more versatile tool which he can use in assuring that Federal antipoverty efforts are well coordinated, for ultimately only the Chief Executive has final jurisdiction in resolving interdepartmental difficulties.

The bill does not name any specific members of the Council other than the Director of the OEO, but rather permits the President to designate whom he chooses from time to time and to appoint the Chairman. It gives the Council far stronger powers than at present, including the following ways in which he can assist the President:

First, it provides for coordination of Federal programs and activities related to the Economic Opportunity Act.

Second, it develops basic policies and sets priorities with respect to such programs and activities.

Third, and this is important, it resolves differences arising among Federal departments and agencies with respect to such programs and activities.

Fourth, it initiates and arranges for the carrying out of specific actions or projects designed to achieve the objectives of the act.

As important as these new powers is the creation of a full-time Executive Secretary with his own staff to serve the Council and to follow through on Council actions. He would be a level 2 executive appointed by the President, similar in rank to the Executive Secretary of the National Aeronautics and Space Council.

This is done by giving the same authority as the President himself possesses while permitting him full power to delegate authority by creating a full-time staff with loyalty to the Council, as opposed to administrators lent on a part-time basis by existing agencies.

The committee hopes that coordination at the Federal level can be substantially improved.

The bill contains additional provisions to achieve this result. It requires the Director of OEO to conduct continuing studies and evaluations, to identify problems of coordination, and to propose solutions. That is section 632.

It requires Federal agencies to cooperate with the Council and the Director, and it authorizes the President to direct agencies to carry out programs and functions in conjunction with the poverty program. That is section 633.

It encourages combinations of Federal projects and programs. That is section 634.

It sets forth procedures for joint funding. That is section 612.

Thus, it builds into the legislation itself procedures which have been used in some instances, and used pretty satisfactorily, for achieving these results, in the hope that, by giving a legislative mandate, the coordination will be vastly improved.

The legislation contains and expands the role of the information center. That is section 635.

It retains a provision of the original act which prohibits duplication of functions. That is section 636.

It retains a previous amendment designed to achieve greater coordination of manpower training programs. That is section 637.

I must say parenthetically that one of the things that concerned the subcommittee the most was the inadequate coordination of manpower programs. We saw in Greenfield, Miss., for example, relatively illiterate Negroes being taught under the Manpower Development Training Act to read and write.

It was hoped that after a year of this effort, they would achieve a level of fifth-grade education. Yet, the MDTA told us that unless one had a 10th-grade education, there was no job available anywhere in the county or, indeed, anywhere in the region.

We found young women being trained to be nurses' aides in a State which refused to accept Negro girls as nurses' aides.

So, there is a lot to be done in coordination in this area.

To give long-range perspective to coordinated Federal efforts to combat poverty, the bill requires the Director to prepare a 5-year national poverty action plan. That is section 632, subsection 3.

This plan should consider alternative periods of time in which poverty in America could be eliminated and should estimate Federal and other governmental expenditures and also contributions of the private sector necessary to achieve these alternative goals.

This plan should encompass all Federal programs related to the elimination of poverty, without regard to whether they are administered by the OEO, and should indicate what new programs might be necessary.

I say again, as I said earlier, that this plan is in existence. But they will not show it to the committee. They will not show it to Congress. I say again that this exercise of executive privilege, to my way of thinking, is unjustifiable and untenable.

One other means of coordination—the use of delegation powers—remains unchanged from existing law—section 602(h). Although the Director delegated six of the original 10 programs to other Federal agencies, the initial delegation orders contained no built-in controls which would assure coordination. However, new manpower programs, added last year—Nelson-Scheuer, and the Kennedy-Javits special impact programs—were delegated to the Department of Labor, and the Neighborhood Youth Corps was redelegated. This time the delegation instrument was broader in its scope and established a firm foundation for program coordination. One of the reasons the committee is opposed to the statutory transfer of programs from OEO to other agencies is that the delegation route offers a much higher potential for establishing an effective system of coordination.

Mr. President, for a brief moment, 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. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

2. STATE COORDINATION

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I now turn to the question of State coordination.

The original act provided two roles for the States. The first was technical assistance, and all of the States established technical assistance agencies—although

Indiana has since discontinued its agency. These agencies have been useful instruments in getting poverty programs started, especially in rural communities. The second role was the right of a Governor to disapprove projects, subject to an override by the Director for programs under titles I–B and II provided by a 1965 amendment. These were the Neighborhood Youth Corps and community action programs. This veto has been used 15 times during the first 3 fiscal years of the act, and the Director's override has been used twice. In an unknown number of instances the threat of the Governor's veto has led to the modification of a local program.

The committee has concluded that the roles given the States are too limited. The Governor's veto is essentially a negative role, and technical assistance, while useful, does not go far enough. Yet, a few States, such as New Jersey and Massachusetts, have shown that the States can potentially make a significant contribution to the poverty program. This is especially true for the coordination of Federal programs which are channeled through State governments and for programs which the States themselves finance.

Therefore, the committee bill allows the Director to provide financial assistance to State agencies not only for technical assistance but also to assist in coordinating State activities related to the poverty program. It would be up to a State to embark upon such coordinating efforts, but OEO could help finance the operation. These functions could be carried out for both the community action program—section 231—and the work and training program—section 129. The bill also gives the States a role in advising the Director of OEO and the Economic Opportunity Council. It allows for joint funding of certain projects which combine State and Federal funds and retains the Governor's veto in the same form as existing law—sections 114, 231, and 810.

The question of the Governor's veto is a vexing and controversial one. I know that many Senators on the other side of the aisle believe that it should be reinstated in full force. I know that my able colleague, the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], feels very strongly that the Governor should not have an ultimate right of veto; and I have no doubt there will be a lively controversy about that matter on the floor of the Senate before the matter is finally determined. The committee has indicated its view in support of Senator YARBOROUGH's position.

3. LOCAL COORDINATION

Program coordination is not an end in itself but only a means to an end. Coordination provides a means of dealing with complex, interconnected problems in their totality and of serving program participants as whole persons. In this perspective, the most important locale of coordination for the poverty program is at the community level where the poor live and work. Therefore, Federal and State programs must be organized to facilitate, not impede, local coordination.

The committee has concluded that the key to effective local coordination is the existence of a capable local agency with jurisdiction broad enough to deal with a variety of programs and with sufficient leverage to mobilize community resources. One of the best ways to obtain such leverage is through control over the allocation and expenditure of funds, such as those which come to the community under the Economic Opportunity Act.

This observation has led the committee to propose that the community action agency should be perceived as a prime sponsor for receiving and allocating community action funds—section 210. As prime sponsor it would not be expected to operate all programs directly but instead would channel funds to delegate agencies. But in determining what programs would be funded and by attaching conditions to the expenditure of funds, the community action agency would be in a position to bring about coordination. This, in fact, is what the most effective community action agencies are already doing, and this approach should be extended. As a planning and coordinating body, the community action agency would be required to adopt a systematic approach to the implementation of programs and the utilization of funds—section 220(b).

I point out that the concept here is to reduce authority to the lowest possible level as close as possible to the poor themselves. It is the view of the committee that the community action agencies in these thousand communities are far better able to deal with the wide variety of programs and administration which arise under this act than is any bureaucracy in Washington, be it in the OEO or elsewhere, or even at the State level. Therefore, our effort has been not to earmark programs but to leave a wide variety of decision to the community action agencies at the local level, having, in the end, implicit confidence in the successful workings of American democracy. If you cannot make these programs work at the local level, no bureaucrat is going to be able to make them work by issuing orders from Washington.

However, as the planning and coordinating role of the community action agency is strengthened, it will be necessary to assure that the agency is broadly representative of the community and does not represent a narrow segment—section 213.

Furthermore, it should be encouraged to use delegate agencies which would actually operate many of the programs—section 215. This role as prime sponsor would apply both to programs locally designed—section 220—and national emphasis programs, such as Headstart and legal service—section 221.

I should, perhaps, explain that these various programs are, roughly speaking, broken into two categories of what are called national emphasis programs, where OEO has indicated certain programs such as Headstart or the Neighborhood Youth Corps should be instituted, or communities where the program is being carried into effect. As I shall explain at greater length later, 50 percent of the funds are set aside for national emphasis programs. The other 50 percent of the funds are to be utilized in such a way as the local community action agency may determine.

The role as prime sponsor would apply to both programs locally designed—section 220—and national emphasis programs, such as Headstart and legal services—section 221.

However, the Director would have certain options to fund statewide or regional agencies to operate programs where community action agencies do not exist, as they do not in many rural areas of this country—section 212—or to fund independent agencies directly if it would better serve the purposes of the act—section 220(c). That would be in rare instances where a local community action agency has gotten out of hand and is no longer a reputable group.

The committee bill would extend the concept of prime sponsor to the work and training programs of part B of title I. This part B is a pulling together of most of the local programs, such as the Neighborhood Youth Corps and other programs which operate at the local level and deal with manpower and employment.

Generally the prime sponsor would be the community action agency unless the Director determines that an alternative agency is likely to have greater capability—section 12(b). As with the community action program, the work and training prime sponsor would be required to adopt a systematic approach—section 123(d)—and would be encouraged to use delegate agencies—section 122(d). Here, too, the Director would have the option of using State agencies—section 129—or other independent agencies—section 123(c)—under certain circumstances.

This brings me to the fifth general conclusion reached by the committee. As desirable as these new programs are, the United States has not yet committed sufficient resources nor developed all the programs needed to eliminate poverty in the foreseeable future. During the second phase of the study the subcommittee intends to study what else is needed to do the total job. Meanwhile, the committee is recommending the adoption of the Emergency Employment Act in order to make an immediate impact upon the lack of job opportunity in areas of severe concentrations of poverty and unemployment.

During the course of our hearings, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] pressed Mr. Shriver pretty hard with respect to his plans for eliminating poverty in the United States in the next 10 years, as he had expressed himself as being able to do, if he got sufficient support from the President and Congress.

Mr. Shriver, as I indicated, was reluctant to respond to the questioning of the Senator from Rhode Island. Senator PELL said to him:

> Mr. Shriver, if the poverty program continues to be funded at the rate recommended by the President in his budget message this year, how long will it be before the war is won?

Mr. Shriver squirmed in his seat, like a loyal representative of the President, ducking as best he could. He looked us in the eye, and said, "Never."

That is the problem which confronts

us in a world beset by war, with a military budget running in excess of $70 billion, and a $2.3 billion military construction bill, which only at the last moment was saved from being adopted by a voice vote with only three Senators in the Chamber.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I would like to inform the Senator from Pennsylvania that that is not quite the case. I did not know at that time what the majority leader's intention was. I later learned, upon his return to the floor, that it was his plan to go over until 3 p.m. on Monday. He did not arrive at that decision on the basis of any discussions that have lately transpired.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from West Virginia, the acting majority leader. I have been heartened by this information which restores some of my confidence, for the Senate faces up to its responsibility by having a rollcall vote when the amounts involved run over $2 billion. I thank my friend from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank my friend from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the war on poverty——

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. What is the definition of poverty?

Mr. CLARK. Poverty is defined as a level of income which, for a family of four, a wife, husband, and two children, does not exceed $3,000 a year. There would be a good deal of variation in that amount, depending, for example, on whether the family lived in the mountains of West Virginia or in Philadelphia, Pa. As the family increases, there would have to be modification.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Of course, there are mountains in Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. There are, indeed, beautiful mountains as those in West Virginia.

However, that is a rough and ready rule of thumb. The Senator from New York thinks that is too low an income level and it probably is for New York. I am sure that many persons in the South and in the Mountain States think that is too high. It has to be varied and flexible, but that is the rule of thumb.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. How would the Senator equate a $3,000 annual income today with, let us say, 1932?

Mr. CLARK. The Senator has me at a little bit of a disadvantage. I am trying to think through how much a 1932 dollar is worth today. My recollection is that it is about 25 cents, is it not?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. A $3,000 income today could, therefore, be equated with, let us say, $750 in annual income in 1932?

Mr. CLARK. Somewhere in that range. Of course, we have to remember not only the cost of living but I suppose, to a certain extent, some of the amenities of decent living today which were not even in existence then. I do not know if it is appropriate for a family living in poverty to have a television set. I am inclined to doubt it; they all do. I do not know whether they are entitled to have an old jalopy to take the children to school. I do not think that in 1932 they thought so, but they do today. So much of this developed without any plan that I find it difficult to apply the same standards to poverty today as one would have applied in the depths of the depression in 1932.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. If the Senator will yield further while I have interrupted him, would it not be better if the Headstart program were under the auspices of local school boards?

Mr. CLARK. I have to give the Senator a complicated answer to that question. I think in many, many school districts the answer would be clearly "Yes." But I have seen school districts where I would not turn it over to the local school board for all the tea in China.

This is largely a racial problem. It also has something to do with the competency of teachers. I do not want to be invidious and name States and locations, but the best answer I can give to the Senator is that, in my opinion, authority to delegate the local school boards should be always there in the director of the OEO, and he should be encouraged so to delegate unless, in his opinion—and I have seen some places where in my opinion this would happen—it would at least wreck the program by doing it.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Is the authority to operate the Headstart program vested within the local school boards in any jurisdictions throughout the country?

Mr. CLARK. No. The Director of OEO is given the authority with power to delegate. I should point out also to my friend that the Headstart program is not primarily an educational program. It is a child development program, as I mentioned earlier in my remarks, which includes in addition to an educational component, medical and dental services, nutritional and social services, and probably most important of all, parental involvement.

I have been to a score of these Headstart classes and have been extremely heartened by them. It would be difficult to convince oneself that the activities going on there are educational in anything other than the very broadest sense of the word. For example, many of the children are being taught the difference between their left and right hands. They are being taught things our parents taught us early in our lives.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Even so, would not these things be more within the capacity and capability of local schools than community action groups?

Mr. CLARK. If they want to, but there are so many cases and so many places where they do not. The Senator from West Virginia is an expert on the District of Columbia. I am not. I would hate to see a Headstart program turned over to the Board of Education in Washington, D.C., today.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I may disagree with the Senator on that.

Does the Director have the authority at the present time to delegate this responsibility to the local school boards?

Mr. CLARK. Oh, yes. He often does.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. In what percent of the Headstart programs throughout the country has he so done?

Mr. CLARK. One-third of the full year, and two-thirds of summer programs are run by the public school systems. The Senator appreciates the difference in administrative difficulty between a summer program, when the school boards are generally more relaxed and have more time, than in all-year-round programs, in which—with so many different school districts—there is not any room and no teacher to take on the additional load of a Headstart program.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I have had, in general, good reports concerning the operation of the Headstart program. Most of the criticism I have heard has been to the effect that it should be operated by the school systems.

Mr. CLARK. This is the strong lobbying position of the National Education Association and the teacher unions. There is an enormous vested interest in this country trying to get the Headstart program away from the OEO and to have it placed in the school boards. I have great respect for the National Education Association. I have quite a lot of respect for the various teacher unions. But we must recognize it for what it is; namely, a lobbying effort.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. With regard to VISTA, does the Governor of a State presently have the privilege of vetoing the operations of VISTA?

Mr. CLARK. Yes, he does.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. How many of such vetoes have occurred?

Mr. CLARK. I do not know of any. I am speaking off the cuff here. I can get the information for the Senator by Monday next. Generally speaking, the VISTA program, I know, has been in trouble in West Virginia. But West Virginia is one of the very few places where there has been any trouble. We have been proud of VISTA in Pennsylvania.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. There has been a great deal of trouble with VISTA in West Virginia. Can the Governor of West Virginia take action to preclude any further activities by VISTA in West Virginia?

Mr. CLARK. I am sorry, I did not hear the Senator's question.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Even though VISTA has been operating in West Virginia, can the Governor, at some future date, veto further activities of VISTA?

Mr. CLARK. It is my understanding that he can.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Did the Senator's subcommittee hold any hearings in West Virginia?

Mr. CLARK. No. We intend to do so. What happened was that because of administrative problems, the Senator's colleague [Mr. RANDOLPH] who is on the subcommittee, and I, were unable to agree on a date when I could go with him to West Virginia. We set three different dates. Something came up each time. It certainly was not his fault. I had other obligations. We fully intend to go there.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I know that the hearings had been announced and that the dates were changed from time to time. I did not know what the problems were. I wish that the subcom-

mittee had conducted hearings in West Virginia.

Mr. CLARK. I can assure the Senator that we will.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I wish it had done so prior to the discussion on this bill because we have had problems with VISTA in West Virginia. I think it would have been good for the subcommittee, and for Congress, to know just precisely what the facts are regarding VISTA in West Virginia.

Mr. CLARK. I quite agree with the Senator.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I am sorry that the subcommittee did not conduct hearings in West Virginia. As I recall, I think I wrote to the distinguished chairman suggesting that hearings be conducted in Beckley, which is the county seat of my home county. Also, I believe, in Williamson in Mingo County.

Mr. CLARK. The reason we did not accept the invitation was that the Senator's colleague [Mr. RANDOLPH] had already selected Charleston and Princeton in West Virginia. I certainly do not want to pass the buck to the Senator's colleague [Mr. RANDOLPH], who is not here to defend himself. But I took it from him. I wanted to go where he wanted us to go.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Certainly, I am sure that my colleague needs no defense, but I say again, I wish that the subcommittee had held hearings in West Virginia prior to debate on the bill before us.

Mr. CLARK. I wonder whether the Senator is possibly confusing VISTA volunteers with the Appalachian volunteers, which are entirely different cases?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I am not at all sure that I may not be. Yet, I do not think I am. I know about the latter cases also, and their difficulties which have arisen in the State of Kentucky. But, in any event, I am quite sure that VISTA people have created some problems in West Virginia.

Mr. CLARK. All I can say to my friend is that if the Governor does not like it, he can throw them out at any time, under the provisions of section 810(b) of the present act which reads in part:

Volunteers—

And this applies to VISTA—

shall not be assigned to duties or work in any State without the consent of the Governor.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I say to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania that I hope the Governor of West Virginia will do just that.

Is the Senator from Pennsylvania aware of the fact that Gov. Hulett C. Smith wrote a letter to Mr. Shriver complaining recently about the activities of VISTA workers?

Mr. CLARK. I read about it in the newspapers.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Well, I suspected that the Governor could refuse consent under the law. However, I cannot tell him what to do. I know what I would do if I were in his place.

Mr. CLARK. I cannot tell my Governor what to do, either. He is a Republican.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania for yielding to me.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I intend, almost immediately, to terminate my remarks for the day. First, however, I should like to note a number of impressive accomplishments which the war on poverty has achieved.

First, 1,300,000 children have participated in Headstart and have received its educational, medical, and nutritional benefits.

Second, nearly 70,000 men and women have graduated from Job Corps centers. Seventy percent of them have moved directly from graduation into jobs, many of them for the first time in their lives. A good many others, I might note, went into the military service.

Third, at least 300,000 poor people have received advice and services provided by the legal services program.

Fourth, more than 7,000 VISTA volunteers have served or are currently serving at least a year in rural poverty areas, urban slums, or Indian reservations, or with the migrant poor.

Fifth, 30,000 poor but talented high school students have participated in the Upward Bound program to equip them for the opportunity to attend a college.

Sixth, more than 900,000 boys and girls from 16 to 21 have received full time or part time work-experience in the Neighborhood Youth Corps.

Seventh, more than 42,000 Americans have received rural loans for farm improvements and small income-producing enterprises.

These are only a few of the many specific achievements of the war on poverty. They speak of specific and measurable gains. There are, of course, other gains very difficult, if not impossible, to measure, I shall deal with them in the course of the debate.

Mr. President, I think that is a good place to stop for today. I have attempted to lay down the general philosophy of the bill, the work done by the subcommittee in bringing it before us, the five major conclusions which the committee came to. I have discussed in some depth the problem of coordination.

Frankly I am not too sure whether it would be wise to go into an extended explanation of these programs before permitting general debate and consideration of amendments, but I would like to do two things: first, to outline the various programs which are dealt with in the act; and, second, to give some indication of the floor issues which will come up in the debate next week as indicated by the minority and individual views.

There will be much discussion of the Job Corps. That is title IV of the report, and title I–A of the bill.

We have consolidated into title I–B all of the work and training programs. That is title V of the report.

We have put the special impact program, which is the brainchild of Senators KENNEDY and JAVITS of New York, into title I–D of the bill. It is title VI of the report.

Title II of the bill—title VII of the report—contains the community action program.

The rural loan program is title III(a) of the bill and title VIII of the report.

The migrant program is title III(b) of the bill, and title IX of the report.

The small business part of the bill is title IV of the act and title X of the report.

The day care part of the bill is title V(B) of the act and title XI of the report.

The public assistance and training income section is title XII of the report.

VISTA is title XIII of the report.

The emergency employment program is title XIV of the report.

With respect to each of these titles in the report, which I strongly commend to Senators who are interested in acquiring a mastery of this complex bill, each of the titles is divided into a finding which, generally speaking, describes the program and what the committee thinks about it, and then the legislative recommendation.

I would not expect Senators to wade every bit of the way through this entire report, but nevertheless a reading of the full report will provide a far better picture than I can in a floor speech reported in the RECORD of the various complex issues with which we will be confronted.

I would like, however, to summarize, in conclusion today, the floor issues which, in my judgment, will come before the Senate in a rather extensive debate.

The first one has to do with the spinoff or transfer of programs from OEO to other agencies. There might be an effort to transfer the Job Corps—an effort made unsuccessfully last year.

There is the possibility of an effort to transfer Headstart to the Office of Education, Follow Through to the Office of Education, and Upward Bound to the Office of Education.

In each case the committee considered the suggestions and rejected them.

That would be the position of the floor manager of the bill.

The second category of issues would have to do with funding. In this connection, the bill provides a 2-year authorization but does not state a figure for the second year, slightly increases the administration's recommended budget for the antipoverty programs, and contains a separate 2-year, $2.8 billion Emergency Employment Act.

I will be prepared to justify the position of the committee in these regards, and I feel the committee's position is unquestionably justified.

There may be an effort to earmark funds for Headstart instead of permitting the local community action agencies to have far greater flexibility as to how they desire to spend the funds at the local level. It is the view of the committee that this effort to earmark puts the strong Federal hand into the administration of programs at the local level. This is an unwise move. We think greater local flexibility is highly desirable. To sit here and tell Charleston, W. Va., Newark, N.J., Springfield, Mass., or anywhere else how much they should spend for each one of these programs is unwise.

A highly controversial area, which I mentioned earlier, has to do with the

Governor's veto. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and I have already had a discussion on that point, but it applies to areas far wider than VISTA.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator again at this point?

Mr. CLARK. Certainly.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I think the Director of OEO indicated, in response to the Governor's letter, that a number of VISTA workers were being withdrawn. However, I am not sure that they would not have been withdrawn anyhow, because summer had ended. Moreover, I would not want to leave the impression that it is my intention to cast any reflection on all VISTA personnel. Undoubtedly some of them may have had good intentions. But so far as the proof of the pudding in West Virginia is concerned, I think our people have been quite disturbed and dissatisfied with the operation of the VISTA program there.

I have a good impression of the Neighborhood Youth Corps as it has been operated in my State. I think the people of West Virginia have been favorably impressed with this program and with some of the community action programs.

Although the subcommittee has not been able to go to my State to hold hearings, which I think would have been highly beneficial at this point, I hope that it still will go. I hope it will conduct hearings in the communities to which I have referred, as well as in any other communities where the subcommittee may wish to hold hearings. But I would hope to speak with the distinguished chairman and suggest to him certain communities and certain persons within those communities.

Mr. CLARK. I should be happy to discuss that with the Senator. I feel certain that he would agree that the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] should be brought in on these discussions, since he is a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Absolutely.

Mr. CLARK. Some other issues may be raised concerning the Job Corps. There may also be other issues concerning the community action program, which is not uncontroversial. I have no doubt that a discussion of these problems will take a good deal of time.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. As witness Washington, D.C.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct. The subcommittee had 2 days of hearings on the community action program right here in the District of Columbia. I must say to the Senator that we also had a special staff assistant make a study, in some depth, of the workings of this program. Say what one will, in my opinion it was working pretty well.

Mr. President, I think I have said enough for today to outline the general course the debate will take. It may be necessary for me, on Monday, to return to this subject in order to make a more detailed statement in some depth, and I reserve that right.

Mr. President, for the time being, I yield the floor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the AFL-CIO Executive Council, in its recent session in New York, urged Congress and the American people to support the bill amending the Economic Opportunity Act as reported by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. The council also commented on the war on poverty legislation now before the House.

Since the arguments made by the AFL-CIO are well worthy of our consideration, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY THE AFL-CIO EXECUTIVE COUNCIL ON ANTIPOVERTY LEGISLATION, NEW YORK, N.Y., SEPTEMBER, 12, 1967

We must bring the millions living under conditions of privation and poverty into the mainstream of our national life.

The war on poverty being carried on under the Office of Economic Opportunity is an important step in this direction. It was intended and to a large degree has been successful in involving the poor in such community action programs as Head Start, neighborhood health centers, legal services, Neighborhood Youth Corps, and a host of other programs.

The war on poverty under the OEO is not the whole answer to the problem of the ghetto, but it is a good beginning. As such, it deserves the continued support of the American people and of the Congress; it deserves more adequate funding so that it can expand its various programs; it deserves to be retained as an entity as the central anti-poverty agency of the Federal government.

Earlier this year the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower and Poverty of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, under the leadership of Senator Joseph S. Clark of Pennsylvania, made an extensive survey of OEO's anti-poverty programs. The results of this study have largely been incorporated into the bill amending the Economic Opportunity Act and reported out by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. The legislation now before the Senate deserves the support of Congress and the American people. The AFL-CIO Executive Council endorses it and urges that it be adopted without amendment.

The present bill closely follows the original Act in concept and language. However, it does make some changes which may be regarded as strengthening the existing program. The bill provides for the continuation of the 90 percent Federal—10 percent local—funding ratio; it provides for a two-year authorization period instead of the current one-year period; it continues the local community action agencies as the spearhead of the local war on poverty and permits greater flexibility in their organization and operation; and it provides for continuation of the Job Corps, the In-and-Out-of-School Neighborhood Youth Corps, the Nelson Amendment (Operation Mainstream), the Scheuer Amendment (New Careers) and the Concentrated Employment Program.

An important innovation in this bill is a new Emergency Employment Act of 1967, which provides for a major employment program. The program would provide jobs in both the public and private sectors for the unemployed and disadvantaged in the slum areas in such fields as health, public safety, education, welfare recreation and also in municipal and neighborhood improvement, maintenance, reconstruction and beautification projects. The program is intended to provide meaningful jobs and socially-productive employment.

The bill calls for the expenditure of one billion dollars in the current fiscal year for the creation of an estimated 200,000 jobs.

The AFL-CIO called for a massive job creation program in its testimony before the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower and Poverty last March. While we believe that at least one million jobs are needed annually, the Emergency Employment Act as part of the omnibus OEO bill, is an important first step. We strongly urge the Senate to approve it.

The House Education and Labor Committee is scheduled to begin marking up the anti-poverty bill this week.

One proposal before the Committee would provide a direct 25% wage subsidy to private, profit-making companies employing unskilled youth. The AFL-CIO strongly opposes such a wage subsidy as an ill-advised incentive for short-term, substandard jobs when the emphasis should properly be placed on the training necessary for permanent employment of young people as gainful members of the work force.

The war on poverty cannot be regarded as a partisan effort. It is and, in fact, should be above partisan politics. It is a war from which there must be no retreat and the AFL-CIO intends to push steadfastly on to victory over poverty.

AUSTIN LIONS CLUB RECEIVES PERSUASIVE ADDRESS ON WAR ON POVERTY FROM SOUTHWEST REGIONAL DIRECTOR WALTER RICHTER

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on August 24, 1967, Mr. Walter Richter, director of the Southwest Regional Office of Economic Opportunity addressed the Austin, Tex., Lions Club on the questions which have recently arisen across the country about the effective operation of the war on poverty. This intelligent and encouraging speech will be, I am sure, a landmark in the progress of the Office of Economic Opportunity and its work in Texas. A clear and forthright statement of the needs of our country which this program meets, the speech presents clearly all the aspects of the war on poverty and its appeal for all the different political persuasions of this country.

Mr. Richter concludes that the war on poverty is liberal and conservative, and Christian, and that "it would be a great tragedy for all of America if it is not continued." He further notes:

I want the world to know that I am proud to be identified with a program that has a deep commitment to fight ignorance, intolerance, injustice, and—I believe worst of all—indifference.

I commend Mr. Richter on this outstanding presentation of the actual workings and purpose of OEO, and on his thoughtful service as director of their Southwest Regional Office.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that "Should the War on Poverty Be Continued?" a speech by Walter Richter, of Texas, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

SHOULD THE WAR ON POVERTY BE CONTINUED?

(Address before the Lions Club of Austin, Tex., by Walter Richter, director, Southwest Regional Office of Economic Opportunity, August 24, 1967)

The grapevine has it that there is a possibility that this Congress will kill the poverty program or at least substantially mutilate it. A few months ago, prior to the spate of riots in a couple dozen of our major cities, the picture looked different. Volumes of testimony had been produced in Senate and

House subcommittee hearings, most of it positive, including endorsements from almost every organization you can mention from the American Bar Association to the AFL-CIO. On the sidelines, no less a personage than the Reverend Billy Graham provided a resounding endorsement of the anti-poverty campaign. So did governors, mayors, social workers, housewives, butchers, bakers, and candlestick makers.

There was also dissent, of course, but the tide was definitely moving in favor of continuation of the OEO and the program. All of this was bolstered by a recent Harris poll which concluded that 60% of the American people wanted the poverty program continued at the present level or enlarged.

Then came the riots and reaction. Now the legislation is in trouble.

I should like to take this opportunity to share with you my personal assessment of this state of affairs and the implication for this community and, in fact, for America.

First, I should like to review some of the considerations which properly were a part of the judgments that led to the formal declaration of war on poverty by President Johnson and the subsequent enactment of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. Questions that were properly and logically asked included these: "Is poverty real in America? If so, is it really damaging our society? Are the poor salvageable and worth worrying with? If so, how do we go about it? Is this a proper concern of the federal government?"

Time does not permit me to elaborate at length on these questions but, briefly stated, these were and are the conclusions:

Is poverty real in America? The answer is definitely yes. Using the arbitrary poverty-level measure of a $3,000 annual 4-member family income, it was estimated that the United States had some 34 million such people in 1964. (A recent estimate indicates that this has now been reduced to something less than 30 million.)

Whatever the measuring device we use, the fact is inescapable that America has far too many citizens who are receiving insufficient and inadequate diets, medical and dental attention, housing, and other commonplace benefits of this affluent society. Few evidences of poverty are visable from main street or along the paths we normally travel in our daily routines, but they are there and can be shown to any doubter willing to seek them out.

Well then, the next question is—is poverty really damaging and costly to our society? The answer is again clearly yes. America spent some $30 billion on crime last year—and only the naive would deny that a great deal of criminal activity relates to slum environments and poverty. Disease breeds in the slum areas far out of proportion to other parts of a city, and its overall cost defies measure but is obviously enormous. Welfare costs, which the War on Poverty seeks to reduce, are a direct price we pay for poverty.

Our society suffers in many ways from the loss of productivity by the legions of unemployed and underemployed who cannot qualify for decent jobs which are available but which require special training and skills. It is interesting to note that the businessman with a cash register business has the most to lose from poverty in dollars and cents. For every $100 per year increase in the income of the poor in America (and you can depend on their spending every penny), our economy would be fattened by $3 billion—which, my economist friends who know about multiplier formulas tell me, would turn over five times.

There is, of course, the most important price—which is human misery and unhappiness, a cancer in any society. In these are rooted the breeding grounds for hatred and discontent which find expression in all types of overt, devious, and dangerous manifestations, including physical violence.

So we concede that poverty is costly, very costly, in many ways. The next logical question is: can the poor be helped or are they intrinsically worthless. A Gallup poll in 1965 indicated that 55% of all Americans believe that the poor are poor because they are lazy, and I honestly believe that this attitude on the part of large numbers of our people has been in large measure responsible for the difficulty we have experienced in obtaining public support for the anti-poverty program. Certainly they have been quick to accept and even applaud any and every indication of failure.

Let us examine briefly the validity of this generalization about the poor as an excuse to accept poverty as a way of life for countless numbers of our people and as a necessary evil in our society.

About 40% of the poor are children. They can hardly be written off as undeserving of our sympathetic attention. In fact, now while their work habits and attitudes are being formed is obviously the best time to try to achieve positive response to direction and training.

About one-third are the elderly who, whatever their past work experience, have their productivity pretty much behind them. Many of them have worked hard all their lives but now have to cope with reduced physical capabilities, increased vulnerability to disease, and an employment rationale which cruelly penalizes workers on the basis of age, starting as early as age 45.

Countless numbers are widows and divorcees with children, with debts, and without sufficient skills to earn a decent wage.

Roughly half of the adults among the poor are not unemployed at all—witness, for example the tens of thousands of migrants who live in the Texas Valley. They can hardly be accused of being lazy—and yet they are in poverty because of illiteracy and lack of occupational skills.

Even the assumption of the worthlessness of people on welfare which most of us indulge in can be effectively challenged. A recent survey of the 7.3 million Americans who are on welfare revealed that only 50,000 males have anything like the capability of getting off the rolls through job training that could make them self-sufficient.

Who then is on welfare? 2.1 million are 65 or older, average age 72; 700,000 are either blind or severely handicapped; 3.5 million are children whose parents cannot support them; the remaining one million are the parents of these children: about 900,000 mothers and 150,000 fathers. Two thirds of the 150,000 fathers on welfare are incapacitated, leaving 50,000 capable of receiving training. The OEO, incidentally, has a program specifically designed to provide training to such as these, and it has been very successful.

What I'm saying is that any American who assumes his poverty-stricken brother is deserving of his fate and could improve his lot if he only had the gumption is making a dangerous generalization from too small a sample of truly worthless indigents. These creatures do exist, and since lack of motivation is a symptom of poverty I'm not sure that we should give up on them. For the time being, however, I would be willing to yield to a critical public and concentrate on the hundreds of thousands of deprived Americans who earnestly and sincerely welcome a chance to help themselves. Maybe we can get to the others later.

I hope at this point you agree with me that poverty in America is real, that it is costly to our society, and that to assume that poor people are beyond salvage is to beg our responsibility. If so, then we are now at the point that Congress was when it passed the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 which presumed to suggest that Americans were strong enough, rich enough, resourceful enough, and wise enough to make a manly effort to eradicate poverty from the environs of this great country.

In his inaugural address, President Johnson declared, "In a land of wealth, families must not live in hopeless poverty. In a land rich in harvest, children must not go hungry. In a land of healing miracles, neighbors must not suffer and die unattended."

In the Economic Opportunity Act, Congress made a historic declaration of national policy. Upon the recommendation of the President, Congress declared it to be the policy of the United States "to eliminate the paradox of poverty in the midst of plenty in this Nation."

Pursuant to this national policy commitment, the fundamental goals of the OEO are simple but most important in terms of national objectives. As defined in the Economic Opportunity Act itself, those goals are to open up to every individual in this nation: the opportunity for education and training; the opportunity to work; and the opportunity to live in decency and dignity.

This noble statement of mission—with the accent on opportunity—is certainly in the American tradition and can hardly be decried. There are those, of course, who question the involvement of the federal government in this undertaking. I can only respond that the stakes for our society are sufficiently high that we can defend federal participation on the same basis as we support our defense establishment, interstate roads, and the postal service. Moreover, the primary thrust of the anti-poverty legislation is to support and encourage local communities in establishing, expanding, and properly utilizing local (and other) resources through the use of local initiative and local community action.

Other interesting new dimensions of the anti-poverty campaign rationale include a dedication to the concept of removing the causes of poverty rather than treating the symptoms; the establishment of a broad-based independent but responsible local administrative body widely representative of all elements and segments of a given community; and the "maximum feasible" participation of the poor themselves.

Emphasis has been on communication—especially on the development of important dialogues, between the poor and the representatives of the so-called power system and between the agencies, public and private, which have resources designed to serve the needs of the poor.

There has ensued a great ferment of ideas, and one might even say with some authority that among the War on Poverty's most significant accomplishments are side effects on established educational, training, and people-serving institutions.

The next part of my comments I shall omit because of lack of time. This would be a recitation of specific impressive accomplishments of the War on Poverty effort—despite many difficulties which you might correctly assume would be encountered in such a massive, complex and exceedingly difficult undertaking. The record is there and I believe any objective observer examining it will find it over-all indeed quite impressive.

I want to share with you briefly my concern about the anti anti-poverty campaign sentiment of today—a public attitude which seems to me to border on hysteria. I see the nobility of the mission being obscured by side issues and allegations which are either not germane or of little actual consequence.

Let me cite a few examples.

An OEO employee makes a questionable judgment about the purchase of some gun sights. One single employee—a respected man in the community. The incident made headlines—some of the banner variety—across the country and has triggered a congressional investigation, no less. The entire poverty program is discredited.

OEO establishes a summer work program

to ease tensions. Some OEO officials have the notion that the program might reach and rehabilitate some of the chronic trouble makers by employing a few youths with minor police records. More headlines. Reaction: let's kill OEO.

OEO funds a program in which one of the educational components is aborted by a staff person to teach very young pupils what might correctly be termed as "hate" materials. The scheme was discovered before any funds were expended. More headlines. OEO is an evil thing.

A community submits an application for the establishment of a newspaper to be delivered to the poor free of charge. OEO has received many such applications and has rejected them all. But the newspapers receive and reprint from coast to coast a story that OEO is putting the government into competition with the privately-owned journals. Headlines. Not many retractions. Damn OEO!

Thirteen OEO employees are among more than 12,000 people arrested in 27 cities experiencing riots this summer. While the record of OEO efforts to help prevent or cool down potential tension-filled situations is a thing of joy, the headlines stress OEO involvement in the riots, OEO gotta go, go, go.

If you wish to play this game further, search your memory for the negative things you have heard or read about the War on Poverty. Job Corps boys in trouble (they get in less trouble than all youth that age); the mayor's son shows up on the Neighborhood Youth Corps (it happened in the beginning before better controls were established but the stories go on and on).

Then there are such as these:

A mother of a poverty kid in a summer camp complaining because the food isn't good enough.

A Community Action program personnel committee hiring a guy for political reasons when obviously there are better qualified candidates.

A minority group being discriminated against in the staffing of a neighborhood center.

I could go on and on. And you, I'm sure, could contribute a few choice items yourself.

The significant point I want to make is that it is my judgment that 99% of the disenchantment with the OEO stems from deficiencies not of the program but of individual humans—usually in the form of personal transgression, immorality, or ineptness at the local level.

One of OEO's strengths—its dedication to local control and local initiative—becomes a serious weakness and could be its undoing. Already the local autonomy has been eroded by the earmarking process and by other forced priority judgments for local projects.

This is not to suggest for an instant that this operation has been free of mistakes at all levels. It hasn't. I can tell you, however, that we're working hard at building quality into every phase of the program and tremendous progress has been made operationally. Seems I recall a part of an old gentleman's prayer in which he observed: "I ain't what I ought to be. I ain't what I want to be. I ain't what I'm gonna be. But thank God, I ain't what I wuz!" That's OEO!

My plea to Congress, to use an earthy expression, is simply this: please don't burn down the house to kill the cockroaches. The poverty program is too right, too necessary, and the stakes too high to scuttle it for reasons which in the final analysis are superficial.

To eliminate the OEO on the basis of the type of criticisms and charges floating around this summer would be like abolishing banking because a teller got off with some cash or closing our public schools because a teacher was discovered at a pot party. It's almost like denying Christianity because a preacher takes a shine to the organist.

OEO in my book *is* Christianity in practice because it decries evil and supports the innate nobility of the individual person. OEO is liberal because it seeks change where, heaven knows, we need change. OEO is conservative because its operational emphasis is on self-help, on local initiative and on honest effort.

Should the War on Poverty be continued? I am convinced it would be a great tragedy for all of America if it is not continued. Can we afford it financially? The OEO costs per year about what the war in Vietnam costs in a month. And unlike in that war, this expenditure has all the earmarks of money invested with a guranteed return.

In closing, I want to testify that I have never been so excited or so challenged by an assignment.

I want the world to know that I am proud to be identified with a program that has a deep commitment to fight ignorance, intolerance, injustice, and—I believe worst of all—indifference. You know Dante wrote that "the hottest places in Hell are reserved for those who in a period of moral crisis maintain their neutrality." You better believe that we're in a period of moral crisis in this country right now. And if too many of us respond by maintaining a posture of neutrality and indifference, we may not only go to Hell—we may go a bit sooner than we expected.

VIETNAM

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, yesterday before the General Assembly of the United Nations our distinguished Ambassador, the Honorable Arthur Goldberg, asked the Hanoi government for assurance that if our Government would cease bombing in the north, the Hanoi government would begin negotiations for peace in Vietnam.

The Ambassador suggested two possible means by which talks could be initiated. The Geneva Conference could be convened, or there could be private talks leading to a political settlement in Vietnam. He further said that once peace had been achieved, the United States would undertake a major commitment to the development of all of Southeast Asia.

I applaud this conciliatory address by the Ambassador to the United Nations. I think that it represents a forward step on the part of our Government toward bringing about peace in Vietnam, and I am very hopeful that the Hanoi government will accede to the request, and affirm its willingness to negotiate upon cessation of bombing of the north.

Mr. President, also yesterday, the President of the United States was asked whether our commitment in Vietnam was worth the loss in lives and materiel that we have endured there. In essence, the President said that in his opinion it was.

I would support his assessment. This certainly is no time for second guessing as to whether our commitment is worthy. Questions of this sort are no consolation to the more than 100,000 casualties that we have suffered there, nor to the mothers and widows of our more than 13,000 servicemen whose lives have been lost in Vietnam, nor to the American people, who have spent billions and billions of dollars in that far-off Southeast Asian land.

Our Government has steadfastly said that we are in Vietnam for the purpose of giving the South Vietnamese people an opportunity to choose their form of government in freedom and in security. We are also there because we wish to prevent the spread of Communist regimes by force and by terror.

I think it cannot be questioned that both of those objectives are worthy. The more than 13,000 men who have lost their lives in Vietnam have not died in vain, nor have the 100,000 other casualties been injured in vain. We have prevented the spread of an unpopular regime by force and by terror.

But the other purpose for being in Vietnam—namely, that of permitting the Vietnamese people to choose their own form of government—is of extreme importance to us today and even though I am very hopeful that the Hanoi government will give us an assurance, so that negotiations for peace can begin, nevertheless, we cannot count on them to do so. We are still at war, and we must take those steps, militarily, and politically, which will begin to move us toward an honorable and final conclusion.

I suggest, Mr. President, that the political purpose for which we are in Vietnam to some degree has already been realized. The elections in Vietnam are history. A government has been chosen by the people of Vietnam. There have been criticisms of that election—some of them very valid criticisms. But there have been valid criticisms of some of our elections here in the United States of America. We cannot expect a nation of people who have never had the opportunity to choose their own form of government, who have had little or no exposure to real democracy, to carry on a perfect election. I, too, have been critical of many of the things that have taken place in regard to the Vietnam elections. I deplore the fact that there has been censorship of the press in Vietnam by the government, and that the candidates were not always permitted to campaign according to the rules that had been adopted. I deplore the fact that the military ticket itself frequently violated the established rules of procedure. And am greatly disturbed at the fact that the government has seen fit to arrest a number of its political opponents since the elections.

Yet, Mr. President, the election has been described by persons who were on the scene as being as fair and as impartial an election as could be expected under the circumstances. Some have gone so far as to say that it was as fair as any election held in the United States of America. Though I do not believe that, at least there is evidence that the election, to a large degree, was fairly and freely conducted. A variety of opinions were aired, some surprising results were achieved. And it can safely be said that South Vietnam will never be quite the same again.

Eighty-three percent of the people voted, which is important and extremely significant. And, though the present government received only 34.8 percent of the votes, nevertheless it does reflect the first time that the people of Vietnam have had a say in the choice of a national government.

We could have hoped for better. We could have hoped that there would have

been a civilian government elected, persons who were not identified with the military junta. We could perhaps have hoped that there would have been wider representation of other groups. Of the six tickets that were elected, three of them were Catholic. It is unfortunate that this occurred in a country where the great majority of the people, 90 percent, are Buddhists.

These things can be corrected, however. The government can appoint Buddhists to administrative office, especially cabinet positions, in the new government.

There is still an election to be held, on October 22, for the lower house. And the wrongs that were perpetrated in the Senate election can be righted. We must not ignore the importance of the election to be held on October 22. They must not be open to criticism.

I am hopeful that censorship of the press, which was removed for a time, and now seems to have been reimposed, will be lifted permanently. Freedom of the press, indeed any freedom, cannot be intermittent. It must be constant and continuous.

I am hopeful that the procedure of arresting political opponents will also stop and that this government will instead begin to invite these former opponents to form a truly national, coalition government.

A plurality government such as we now have in South Vietnam is not unusual. We have had plurality Presidents in the United States of America. After World War II, the French and German governments were plurality governments, and they did well.

It is now up to the South Vietnamese Government to begin to form this coalition, and to unite the people of South Vietnam behind its purposes.

Mr. President, much must be done by this government. They are constantly getting advice from us, and I think it is important that Members of the U.S. Senate continually let the South Vietnamese Government know what we think, because we do have a very grave commitment in South Vietnam.

The South Vietnamese Government has promised land reform. And if they are to ever win over the peasants in Vietnam, or win the war, they must get on with land reform.

However, the thing that disturbs me most is that it still appears that the South Vietnamese Government and its people have not made a total commitment to this war.

Mr. President, this is not our war. Vietnam is not our country. We are sending Americans to die there, and they are dying and being injured there daily.

I think that certainly the South Vietnamese should begin to assume more responsibility for this war.

The government has now been elected. It would seem to me that they should begin to increase their areas of responsibility both in the field of combat and in economic and political matters. And as they begin to increase their responsibility, it would seem to me that we could begin to decrease our responsibility and our commitment of manpower and materiel to South Vietnam.

I think that the South Vietnamese Government should forthwith institute an effective program for military conscription. They are still only taking men who are 20 years of age. Let us compare this with North Vietnam.

In North Vietnam, every able-bodied man is fighting in the armed forces. In North Vietnam young women are performing military duty. In North Vietnam, older men and women are carrying 600 pounds of supplies on bicycles and doing all that they can to assist their government in its efforts.

Surely the South Vietnamese people have as great a stake in the future of their country. It would seem to me that they too should make an all-out commitment, and that they should begin to take on more and more of this responsibility. It is their war, and it must always be considered their war.

Mr. President, I do not believe that our Government should send one more soldier or one more marine to fight and to die in Vietnam until the South Vietnamese Government begins to stand up to its responsibility and utilize its manpower to successfully conclude that war.

I know that they will have problems. I know that they have been plagued with corruption in the military. I know that their officers have not had the best training and that their salaries are very low. And I do not want anything I say here tonight to be construed as not living up to our commitment in Vietnam.

I do not believe that our job is finished. And I do not believe that we should get out of Vietnam until we finish our job.

I am merely saying that the responsibility of the South Vietnamese should be increasing constantly so that our responsibility can decrease constantly.

I am very hopeful that our Government will do more to urge the Vietnamese Government to move in this direction. I think it can be done. I think that it should be done.

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

Mr. BROOKE. I yield to the distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts has been making a very great contribution. His general thesis is one which I myself have felt for a long time was very close to the truth concerning Vietnam.

As he did, I, too, visited Vietnam earlier this year, in May. I came back convinced that the commitment we had made by our presence there in such great force was one that could not be lightly walked away from.

I felt equally that it was a matter which we could not deal with effectively by heavy escalation or bombing in North Vietnam, that the war must be fought and won in South Vietnam, that in general our present policy was the correct one, but that the great failure of the effort that this administration was attempting to make lay in the fact that we had not succeeded in getting the South Vietnamese Government to do the job which only it could do.

I said that in June and in July and in August and in September. I am glad to have this opportunity to repeat it now in support of what I believe to be the main thesis of the Senator from Massachusetts.

I have the greatest admiration for our military, and I believe that no one could fault in any way the job they have done on the military side. We have many good men on the civilian side of this effort, also in Vietnam.

But our great failure has been—and it is a failure on our part, one for which this administration bears responsibility, and it must—that we have not accomplished the reform of the South Vietnamese Government so that the people of South Vietnam have any feeling of loyalty to it, in the main, or have any feeling of nationality based upon the leadership of that Government; or that the South Vietnamese Army—the Arvin, so-called—has any feeling that it has any reason to fight.

This is the reason we are asked to send over another 45,000 men in addition to those already committed.

I was deeply distressed by a statement, in the form of a quotation, attributed to General Johnson, in a recent article in U.S. News & World Report, that the reason for asking for additional U.S. troops was so that we could get more heavily into the pacification program in South Vietnam.

Mr. President, if there is anything in the world that the United States should not do, it is to use its military in the pacification program in South Vietnam. On the contrary, the South Vietnamese military should be taking over from us some of the main force unit fighting that we have assumed for ourselves, in which, in practice, we are the only ones engaged, except for very small numbers of other allies. I was glad to see Thailand's small contingent arrive in South Vietnam. The Koreans have a substantial force, the Australians a token force, and some other countries have certain auxiliary support efforts.

The Senator from Massachusetts is absolutely correct: We must get the South Vietnamese Government to do what only it can do in creating a national morale, in creating support for itself among its own people, by giving the people of that area something to believe in and work for. The same applies to the South Vietnamese military: a motivation, a morale, good training, and a correction of the shocking corruption which now permeates the life of that entire area.

And here is the failure of this administration: It has not done this. I have defended this administration against the charge that it got us into the mess in South Vietnam. It did not, Mr. President. Former administrations were far more responsible for this than the Johnson administration. When the President took office, we were already deeply involved. I believe it is a fair statement that this administration and President Johnson had far fewer options in regard to Vietnam than any of its predecessors, back to and including President Truman; and I believe that President Johnson has been unfairly criticized. But for him to protest against that unfair criticism, and to say that such criticism is unfair, is no answer to the charge that he is not meeting his proper responsibility for conduct-

ing, in the best and wisest and most effective way, the operation in which we are involved.

The core of our failure in South Vietnam is not our inability to recognize a particular wink of the eye or some other kind of signal from Hanoi, or being unwilling to negotiate. We have failed primarily because we have not done the job that the Senator from Massachusetts has pointed out is the core of our job, and that is to get the South Vietnamese to do their job.

We have more than 500,000 military in that part of the world in this effort. The South Vietnamese have between 600,000 and 700,000. It is time that those 600,000 or 700,000 began to do their job.

I should like to make one other point—and I am sorry to have taken so much time from the Senator from Massachusetts and from the Senate at this late hour on a Friday evening.

The reason often given in high places in our Government for our failure to accomplish the reform of the South Vietnamese Government is this: we are so deeply involved, and our prestige is so deeply committed, that the South Vietnamese Government feels that it can get away with anything in leaving the burden on us, and that we will not withdraw.

Mr. President, I am not for withdrawal, except under circumstances involving the accomplishment, in the main, of our objective. But I say that if we are not going to succeed in the end, I am for withdrawal now and letting the South Vietnamese Government know that we will withdraw. And we will not succeed in the end if the South Vietnamese Government does not reform itself.

So I would make very clear to the South Vietnamese Government that, disastrous as withdrawal would be in my opinion, we will withdraw unless the South Vietnamese Government does what they must do, or face certain disaster later. It seems very clear that if we are going to face disaster in the long run, we had better accept our loss now. I am not for withdrawal, but in considering the choice between withdrawing now or at some time years later, after we have killed tens and hundreds of thousands of American soldiers, it is better to do it now—to let the South Vietnamese know that we are willing to do it, if we have to, if they will not do what they must.

I thank the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. To a certain extent I am sympathetic toward the viewpoint that has been expressed by the Senator from New Jersey. But suppose we do withdraw. Suppose we were to withdraw. Then, under the conditions which have been stated by the Senator from New Jersey, where would we go?

Mr. CASE. If the Senator will permit me to do so, I wish to make it very clear that I am not advocating withdrawal.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I understand that.

Mr. CASE. I am advocating that we break out of this dilemma into which the South Vietnamese Government has been allowed to draw the United States.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I understood the Senator from New Jersey to say that we should let the South Vietnamese Government know that if it did not do certain things, we would withdraw.

Mr. CASE. That is correct.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Where would we go then?

Mr. CASE. I do not know. We could come home.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Should we take a stand on a new line somewhere else?

Mr. CASE. I am not now trying to outline the strategy of our foreign policy in that part of the world. We are talking about doing a job which has to be done in South Vietnam. I am for doing that.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. So am I.

Mr. CASE. I am not for accepting the situation in which we now find ourselves, in which the South Vietnamese Government is not making the effort to do the job which it must do; namely, getting the support of its own people, both civilian and military. This is essential.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I feel, as does the Senator from New Jersey, that the South Vietnamese Government must do more.

Mr. CASE. It must do more if it is to win.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. My question is: Suppose it does not. Should we then withdraw?

Mr. CASE. Then, I think, the question of deciding what is the best way to proceed is one for consideration by the highest councils. I am not attempting to dictate policy as to the day-to-day operations.

We can, however, for the longer period, decide broad policy and at least participate equally in the making of broad policy, which must be on a cooperative basis, of course.

I am not trying, as I have said, to run the war, which a committee cannot do. But as one American and as one Senator, I am no longer prepared indefinitely to support our Government in the dilemma in which it appears to find itself, in the opinion of some in our Government—and I have seen official statements to that effect—namely that there is nothing we can do about this or that failure of the South Vietnamese Government, because we are too deeply involved to withdraw. That might be fine if it meant nothing more than spending money indefinitely; but I will not see American boys killed indefinitely if the South Vietnamese will not correct their operations in what is becoming a hopeless cause in the end. We must make the South Vietnamese Government realize this. We must cause them to discard the happy feeling which they apparently are indulging in that they can do anything they please, for example, in regard to tolerating corruption or even participating in it, in regard to letting the American Army carry the military burden, both in pacification and also in large unit fighting, and in a kind of money making for a favored few, which is disgusting, as the Senator knows.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Of course, it is.

Mr. CASE. We are not trying to establish some idea of morality of our own. This is not the point.

The point is that this whole effort cannot succeed, and the consequences would be dire, indeed, unless the things which we have been discussing, and I think all of us understand, can be accomplished, are accomplished in fact.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. If the Senator will kindly yield to me briefly, I would not want the Senator from New Jersey to assume from what I have said, or rather from the question I asked, that I disagree with his premise that we should expect the South Vietnamese to do more. I think we should. I do not think it can be gainsaid that the South Vietnamese have not already sacrificed a great deal in the cause for which we are fighting there.

Mr. CASE. Yes. But the question has been properly asked: How many South Vietnamese generals have been killed in South Vietnam? This is the point.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The two things that concerned me about what the Senator was saying are these: one, that our Government is at fault for not having motivated the South Vietnamese to do more. I cannot quite agree with that statement. I do no know what one does to motivate a people who are not already motivated. If the people are not motivated properly to defend themselves and lay down their lives in a sacrifice for their country, I do not know what our Government can do to motivate them further.

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on the question of motivation?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. BROOKE. The Senator asked what our Government can do to motivate the people. I think it is clear that if our Government had not sent billions of dollars in materials and hundreds of thousands of troops to Vietnam, the South Vietnamese Government could not exist. Our Government does have a leverage in South Vietnam. I do not think we ever wanted to run that country and I do not think we should. I do not think we should tell them what they should do. However, I do believe if we are sending American boys to die in Vietnam and sending billions of dollars in material, and if we are going to have to take on a surtax to continue this commitment in Vietnam, then certainly we must be assured that the South Vietnamese Government and the South Vietnamese people are going to put everything they can into this war effort themselves. This has not yet been done, and that is exactly the point.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROOKE. I shall yield in a moment, if I may continue. The Government of South Vietnam has promised it would prosecute those officers who have been known to be guilty of corruption in the army. The Government has not done this, nor has it made any effort to increase the size of its army over the 700,000 troops which it now has under arms. Certainly, if they want us to send more American troops—45,000 more now and we do not know how many in the future—if they want us to continue to send planes, if they want us to continue to send bombs, if they want us to continue to send food and everything we

send there, certainly it is not unreasonable for us to not only ask, but also to demand that they commit themselves to the full degree that they can in return.

We know they do not have all of the equipment they need. We knew that when we went into Vietnam. We knew their army was not well trained, we were aware of the problem of corruption, and we knew they did not have the resources on which to draw.

On the other hand, we expect them to give all they can. That is not unreasonable.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROOKE. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Does the Senator have reason to believe the administration has not asked the Vietnamese to do just this?

Mr. BROOKE. No, I do not say that. I say that now that the elections are over, they have a government. Before, they had a military junta. Presumably this new government can do more than a military junta could have done to rally the people to the cause and to take positive steps for creating a capable military fighting unit in Vietnam, and for getting the support of the South Vietnamese people totally behind their effort. This is what we are saying.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROOKE. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. There is no disagreement on this point. I think the administration feels the same way about it. I am confident the administration has sought in every way it could to elicit the support, the utmost support, of the people of South Vietnam in their own cause.

However, the two questions I raised were: one, what do we do that we already have not done to motivate the people of South Vietnam to give more?

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

Mr. BROOKE. I yield.

Mr. CASE. This, I think, represents the kind of way in which the administration has been ducking responsibility for failure by asking every critic: "What would you do?"

I am not the President of the United States, nor is the Senator, nor is the Senate. The operation of this policy is the job of the President. When one asks a taxicab driver to drive him from here to the station, he does not take the wheel and drive for the taxicab driver. One tells the driver what he wants done and the objective, and it is the driver's job to get you there.

In broad policy we are in agreement. The President wants this war ended and the objective accomplished. It has not been accomplished and he is the President. This adds up to responsibility which cannot be ducked by asking, "What would you do?"

I would get this job done my making the South Vietnamese reform itself and not by asking it to, as the Senator suggests this administration has done.

We are getting the blame all over the world for the conduct of the Vietnamese war. We had better see that what we are being blamed for is what we actually deserve.

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

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. BROOKE. The distinguished Senator from West Virginia asks what can our Government do.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Yes, and I have not received the answer.

Mr. CASE. Admit it has not the capacity, and this is the question that it is going to be faced with next year.

Mr. BROOKE. I have answered that our Government has leverage, and the distinguished Senator admits that leverage is there.

I have not said our Government has not tried to urge the South Vietnamese Government to move in this direction. However, the distinguished Senator from West Virginia very well knows that our Government is handicapped in so far as much of the decisionmaking is concerned in Vietnam.

We have been on the sidelines in many instances, acting as advisers; we counsel, we advise. To some degree I am sure that the South Vietnamese Government and the South Vietnamese military accept our advice.

I am sure that in some areas, they do not accept that advice, that they feel their decisions and their opinions are better and superior to ours.

If this new government wants to be a viable government, if it wants to make decisions, then it will have to make those decisions and get results. If it is not willing or able to do so, then why should we be sending more American troops to die and be committing ourselves to more billions of dollars in Vietnam?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I ask the same questions. I am not arguing with the Senator from Massachusetts. I am not disagreeing with his premise at all. I merely seek to know, how do we go about motivating these people?

Mr. CASE. Well, if the Senator will yield to me once more——

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Second—if I may finish my statement—failing to so motivate, if we follow the suggestion of the Senator from New Jersey to withdraw, then what? Where do we go next? Where do we draw the next line on which to make a stand?

Mr. CASE. Now will the distinguished Senator yield?

Mr. BROOKE. I yield.

Mr. CASE. The Senator has asked those questions several times. I think the answer has been given several times. The latter question; namely, where do we withdraw to, involves questions of strategy that can be dealt with only after the most careful consideration.

I am not prepared to answer these questions now. I think it would be irresponsible for me now to attempt to lay out a line for dealing with them. There are many alternatives which should be canvassed, but that is not the point——

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, that is the answer that the Senator——

Mr. CASE. No, no——

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. No—the Senator has given several times, but it does not answer the question.

Mr. CASE. I will not even, for the moment, admit that the Senator is embarrassing the position that I hold by saying that I have not answered the question, one which it is not proper to answer in this fashion.

There are undoubtedly studies which have been made about what could be done as alternatives, and all the rest of it. I would expect to get the best advice I could on this before I chose, just off the cuff, the way some of our colleagues have been inclined to do, the next strategic steps.

This point is this: We want to succeed here. We can succeed here but only——

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I trust that the Senator is not including me among those colleagues.

Mr. CASE. I am not, of course, except to the slight extent that the Senator's pro tempore duties seem now to require him to press questions which he knows are really not to be answered on the Senate floor in a session of this kind.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Well, the Senator has made certain statements on the Senate floor.

Mr. CASE. I have made this statement and repeat it now, that the job of getting the South Vietnamese Government to do its job is an operating job. The job of operations—the Executive's job—our Executive's job—involves conducting business with South Vietnam with a number of people—ambassadors, military leaders, and people who go over there from time to time on shorter missions. Through these agents, and any direct contacts he may want to have himself, he must persuade South Vietnam to do what only it can do if we are to succeed.

If he fails in this, he has failed here. I am satisfied that the South Vietnamese Government will not permit iself to be so reformed unless it is faced with an absolute ultimatum of this sort.

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, the leverage which has been applied by our Government, and the urging by our Government to bring about motivation on the part of the South Vietnamese people to do the things that all of us agree should be done in Vietnam, has heretofore been directed to the military junta, because the military junta was running South Vietnam. Now we have a different political situation. For the first time, we have a political government, so to speak, even though it is comprised of military men at its head. It was elected through a political process.

Now what I am suggesting on the floor of the Senate today, and I think the distinguished Senator from New Jersey joins me in this suggestion, is that our Government direct its attentions to the President and Vice President of South Vietnam, who have been elected by the people, and to the Senate of South Vietnam as elected by the people, and to the House of Representatives of South Vietnam to be elected by the people on October 22. This government, in my opinion, is certainly much more of an entity than was the military junta in the past. It should be more responsive to its own people, and more responsible to them. We must use what leverage we have to make them meet their responsibilities, and to earn the loyalty and support of their people in return.

These men are now representatives of the people of South Vietnam. They will serve as a representative government. It occurs to me that they are in a much better position to motivate the people of South Vietnam, to earn their loyalty and respect, than was the military junta which was holding power only through military might.

That is the purpose of the discussion on the floor of the Senate today. Thus, when the distinguished Senator from West Virginia asked what have we not done in the past that we can do now, I can say that we can step up our drive and redirect it, make it very emphatic and let President Thieu and Vice President Ky know that we insist they take more responsibility, that we are hopeful of decreasing or de-escalating our areas of responsibility, that we want to begin to bring our men back home.

I am sure that the distinguished Senator from West Virginia does not disagree with that objective.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Not at all, Mr. President. I feel that this should be a laudable purpose of ours. I am confident that the President has every intention of seeking to impress upon the new Government in South Vietnam its responsibilities. A different set of circumstances may hereafter exist than what have heretofore prevailed.

I would not want the RECORD to leave the impression that I am in disagreement with the premise of the Senator from Massachusetts at all.

Under a new set of circumstances, perhaps there is new hope that the people of South Vietnam will put forth a greater effort.

Mr. BROOKE. If the Senator from West Virginia will yield at that point, he states, "There is new hope," but unfortunately, Senator, there are also some areas of discouragement and, therefore, a need to restate the American position.

The areas of discouragement are the arrest and jailing of political enemies, the reimposed censorship of the press. Such measures certainly are not designed to motivate the people of South Vietnam to get behind their Government and get behind the war effort.

As previously stated, the new Government received only 34.8 percent of the vote. The other candidates, the civilian candidates together, received nearly two-thirds of the total vote. The peace candidate, Truong Dinh Dzu, was a surprising runner-up.

I think this is most significant, and I think it should put us and our Government on notice that everything possible must now be done to bring the people of South Vietnam into a common purpose. I fear that a start in the wrong direction has been made by the arrest of political opponents, including Presidential Candidate Dzu, who was arrested for crimes allegedly committed 3 years ago.

If the new Government continues this, very obviously it is not going to win over the peasants and the others, and persuade them to back their Government and back the common purpose in Vietnam.

To me this is a very clear and present danger, for if this continues, we may see civil war in Vietnam. I cannot think of a more disastrous thing to happen at this time than to have a civil war in Vietnam. But if the Government of South Vietnam continues in this way, it may very well come to that.

Therefore, it is my purpose on the Senate floor today to again restate our position, and to urge our Government to move with all deliberate speed in again impressing upon the new Government of South Vietnam that everything possible must be done to unite South Vietnam in a common purpose.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROOKE. Yes; I am happy to yield.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I make no argument against that expressed desire on the part of the Senator from Massachusetts, and I think this would be a commonly accepted purpose. I would assume that it is.

I think our Government has sought all along to do whatever it could to encourage the people of South Vietnam to do everything they could do in behalf of their own defense.

Perhaps under the new set of circumstances we can do more. Perhaps they can do more. Perhaps they will be better motivated to do more.

I simply sought to question the statement that this administration was at fault in not having motivated the South Vietnamese people to do more.

I do not care to carry this argument on ad infinitum——

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I realize that I do not have the floor and I cannot control the argument.

Mr. CASE. I thought the Senator had the floor.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. No.

Mr. BROOKE. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. As I said, I do not seek to carry the argument on. I raised a question. The Senator feels, in his own mind, that he has answered it.

But where do we go if we fail in so motivating the Vietnamese people to act in their own behalf as we would want them to or as we feel they have the capacity to do? Where do we then go? The Senator has answered. He has said he is not prepared to say where we will go. Neither am I. But this is a question which, it seems to me, is a logical one. If we do at some future time withdraw, where do we go? Do we have to fight this battle all over again on some other battleline somewhere else?

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, has the Senator completed his remarks?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Yes.

Mr. CASE. I think the Senator understands that if we have to make that decision, the Senator from New Jersey will do his best to do his share in the future to arrive at a wise decision as to what alternatives are taken. But that is not the question before us now.

I would say, on the other matter, that I have not any partisan purpose in this except to stimulate this administration to do what it has not yet done. I would only say I am not trying to tell the driver how to drive the car. If he does not know, then he should not be driving it.

The answer to the Senator's question is really this: That you are not paid off for making a good effort or having good intentions; you are paid off, one way or the other, by success or failure. And that is the test that is properly to be applied here.

The Senate of the United States is in the general position of a board of directors, not the executive. It shares in policy decisions. I am not one to try to suggest, and I am not now suggesting, an argument on the Tonkin Gulf resolution or anything of that sort. I am just trying to get this administration to do what I think it must do and has not yet succeeded in doing, and that is to get the South Vietnamese regime so to reform itself and the society in that area that our joint effort, in whose success the Senator from West Virginia and I are deeply concerned, because it means so much to the world and the United States, will be successful.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I share the hope of the Senator that this can be done.

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, the evening is late, and I am indeed very grateful to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia and the distinguished Senator from New Jersey for making their rich contributions to this discussion. My purpose here today was to stimulate the South Vietnamese Government and the South Vietnamese people into action. Circumstances are different now in South Vietnam. We have an elected Government there, and I for one have high hopes that the people of South Vietnam and their Government can and will be motivated. I do not think we need to give up hope at this time.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROOKE. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I hope that that motivation will be there, and I hope that we can all join together, somehow, in finding a solution to our problem there, from which it has been so difficult to extricate ourselves. But when reference is made to withdrawing—and this may someday prove to be the proper course for us to take, who can tell? But, in any event, I think we cannot eschew the statement of General Giap to the effect that if the United States can be defeated in South Vietnam, it can be defeated anywhere else in the world. Nor can we fail to carefully recall and give full credit to a statement that was made by the Peiping People's Daily, the foremost Communist newspaper, to the effect that the South Vietnamese conflict is the focal point of the international class struggle and that it is the "acid test" for all of the political forces of the world.

We have to take these statements at their face value, and then weigh the consequences if we at some future time were to choose to withdraw from South Vietnam.

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, again I thank the distinguished Senator from West Virginia, and I yield the floor.

PROGRAM

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, as a reminder to Senators, the Senate will convene at noon on Monday next.

Following the transaction of routine morning business, the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania will again take the floor to continue work on the antipoverty bill.

Under the previous agreement there will be a rollcall vote at 3 o'clock Monday afternoon on final passage of the military construction authorization bill, after which the Senate will resume consideration of the antipoverty legislation.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the order of yesterday, September 21, 1967, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, September 25, 1967, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate September 22, 1967:

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ARKANSAS

Edward B. Gilbert, Bearden, Ark., R. L. Burleson, retired.

Merlin R. Walters, Hartman, Ark., Emma Hurst, retired.

CALIFORNIA

Richard K. Kintzel, Solvang, Calif., A. M. Madsen, retired.

Kenneth W. Stoneburner, Twin Peaks, Calif., R. A. Stubbs, retired.

COLORADO

Sheldon D. Brooks, Greeley, Colo., R. E. Wilkinson, deceased.

FLORIDA

Merio Claudio, Opa Locka, Fla., E. G. Krigline, resigned.

Catherine R. Collins, Plymouth, Fla., W. M. Brown, retired.

GEORGIA

John W. Callaway, Ringgold, Ga., W. W. Ware, declined.

ILLINOIS

Hazel N. Prince, Broughton, Ill., J. F. Wooldridge, transferred.

Myrtle L. Hasenauer, Melvin, Ill., C. E. Wilson, retired.

Robert L. Seelbach, Morrisonville, Ill., L. E. Kinney, retired.

INDIANA

Ruby M. Sherrick, Beverly Shores, Ind., G. W. Irvin, retired.

KENTUCKY

Paul W. Baker, Greenup, Ky., F. L. Coldiron, retired.

William H. Marksberry, Philpot, Ky., R. R. Bell, retired.

MARYLAND

J. Hopkins Kolb, Harwood, Md., C. D. Kolb, retired.

MICHIGAN

Lawrence D. Dugan, Flat Rock, Mich., C. F. Collins, resigned.

MINNESOTA

Benjamin C. Smith, Saint Francis, Minn., D. J. Osterloh, transferred.

MISSISSIPPI

Johnnie J. Jones, McCool, Miss., B. B. Boyd, retired.

MISSOURI

Robert L. Jackson, Macks Creek, Mo., Wayne Osborn, retired.

NEBRASKA

Douglas R. Graul, Carleton, Nebr., R. A. Frank, transferred.

NORTH CAROLINA

Ross L. Edwards, Jr., Roanoke Rapids, N.C., A. D. Waters, Jr., transferred.

John F. Wells, Teachey, N.C., J. B. Kilpatrick, retired.

PENNSYLVANIA

Andy F. Sabo, Jefferson, Pa., M. C. Schandel, retired.

Wilford C. Park, Saltillo, Pa., Beaver Cornelius, deceased.

TENNESSEE

Kenneth W. Overstreet, Celina, Tenn., J. B. Overstreet, retired.

WASHINGTON

Dorothy L. Bluhm, Edison, Wash., B. R. Bluhm, retired.

Thomas J. O'Connell, Kent, Wash., H. S. Long, retired.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate, September 22, 1967:

UNITED NATIONS

The following-named persons to be representatives of the United States of America to the 22d session of the General Assembly of the United Nations:

Arthur J. Goldberg, of Illinois.

William B. Buffum, of Maryland.

L. H. FOUNTAIN, U.S. Representative from the State of North Carolina.

WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD, U.S. Representative from the State of Michigan.

Adrian S. Fisher, of the District of Columbia..

The following-named persons to be alternate representatives of the United States of America to the 22d session of the General Assembly of the United Nations:

I. W. Abel, of Pennsylvania.

Robert S. Benjamin, of New York.

Hector P. Garcia, of Texas.

Mrs. Patricia Roberts Harris, of the District of Columbia.

Herbert R. O'Conor, Jr., of Maryland.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

Thomas H. Nielsen, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

U.S. ARMY

The following-named officer for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grade indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3442 and 3447:

To be brigadier general

Chaplain (Col.) Ned Ralston Graves O43164, U.S. Army.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The nominations beginning Richard N. Aloy, to be major, and ending Edward W. Zwack, to be captain, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on August 14, 1967; and

The nominations beginning Paul J. Abeln, to be captain, and ending Mary A. Zavatson, to be captain, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on August 30, 1967.

IN THE ARMY

The nominations beginning Robert E. Hall, to be colonel, and ending Charles L. Zitnick, Jr., to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on August 24, 1967; and

The nominations beginning Marcelino C. Guiang, to be lieutenant colonel, and ending Jane F. Sager, to be captain, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on September 11, 1967.

IN THE NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

The nominations beginning Hal C. Castle, Jr., to be ensign in the Navy, and ending William J. Sandusky, to be a permanent lieutenant (j.g.) and a temporary lieutenant in the Navy, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on September 11, 1967.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The nominations beginning Paul R. Aadnesen, to be captain, and ending Roger D. Zorens, to be captain, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on September 12, 1967.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate September 22, 1967:

The nomination sent to the Senate on February 2, 1967, of Kenneth V. Petro to be postmaster at Lakeport, in the State of California.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Day of Recognition for Firefighters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 22, 1967

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, on January 25, 1967, I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 24 which would have authorized the President to proclaim May 4, 1967, as a "Day of Recognition" for firefighters. The senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] has introduced a similar resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 77, except that it would authorize the President to proclaim the first Wednesday in May of each year as a "Day of Recognition" for firefighters; and H.R. 2156, introduced by Representative WALDIE, of California, would authorize the "Day of Recognition" to be the first Saturday in May of each year.

A proclamation honoring the dedication and heroism of the Nation's firemen is particularly appropriate during these difficult times.

Recently, Mr. C. Wilson Harder, president of the National Federation of Independent Business, the largest business organization in the United States, having more than 239,000 small business members, addressed a letter to the Presi-