

high interest rates and further inflation. The cost of living increased by 3.7% during 1966, and the increase during 1967 is likely to be at least this large. There is also a danger of having inflation contemporaneous with a serious slump in those sectors of the economy that are most sensitive to interest rate increases, which would decrease the Federal tax revenues. There is no question that marketing \$30 billion worth of government securities at a time when private demand for savings is growing will drive interest rates up throughout the economy. Interest rates are now back up to the peak levels achieved last summer, and the homebuilding industry, as well as others, are again starting to feel the pinch. The Federal Reserve Board will have to tighten credit to keep inflation under some control when the Treasury itself is adding to the inflationary forces in the economy by refinancing its old deficits and financing the new one.

Upward pressure on interest rates coupled with a statutory interest rate ceiling of 4 1/4% on long-term Treasury obligations raises severe problems of debt management for the Treasury. When the market rate of interest is higher than the 4 1/4% ceiling, the Treasury must move into the short-term capital market for funds. All borrowing has to be in issues of less than 7 years maturity (defined by law as short-term). As a result, the average length of the marketable interest-bearing public debt has declined from 5 years, 4 months in 1965 to 4 years, 5 months in April 1967, with further decline likely. In April 1967, almost 50 percent (\$99.7 billion) of the marketable, interest-bearing public debt was due in one year or less, up from \$75.3 billion in December, 1960. Last year, the Treasury had to move completely into the short-term money market to refinance the \$175 billion of the debt that became due. Increases in this class of Federal obligation (which approaches the liquidity of money) are highly dangerous in a time of inflationary pressure.

The inflation likely to be caused by these deficits would mean a further deterioration in our balance of payments position and an increased gold outflow. Inflation raises the prices which foreigners must pay for U.S. goods, while making foreign goods more competitive and attractive to U.S. customers. Partially as a result of our inflation, the surplus of exports over imports of goods and services declined from \$8.5 billion in 1964 to an estimated annual rate of \$4.5 billion in the last quarter of 1966. We were barely able to halt a worsening of our overall balance of payments in 1966 by two economically-costly policies: (1) restrictions on U.S. private investment in other countries (which will cut down on our future earnings from foreign investment, a major credit item in our balance of payments); and (2) high interest rates (which encourage a temporary inflow of

short-term capital). The balance of payments deficit on the official settlements basis of \$7.328 billion in the first quarter of 1967 shows how temporary this inflow was. Even with these damaging policies, the gold stock still declined by \$571 million in 1966.

The reason why businessmen should be concerned about Federal deficits is more than the economic ills they cause (which are serious enough). The real danger lies in the remedies proposed by the Administration to cure the economic ills fostered by its own expenditure policy. Invariably, the Administration attempts to restrict or control the private sector through devices like the recently discarded guidelines on wages and prices, the guidelines on private foreign investment, and the Interest Equalization Tax. An Administration which refuses to face up to the economic damage its spending policies are causing is unlikely to avoid stronger, stricter controls on private economic activity if its existing controls prove unsuccessful. This is the danger to businessmen (and indeed to our whole society) posed by unrestricted deficit financing—the danger of increasing governmental control over private economic decisions of all kinds.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Sept. 12, 1967]

THE INEXCUSABLE INFLATION

Several things need to be said about the current, rapidly developing price inflation—which comes on top of considerable inflation in the past couple of years and a great deal of it over the past generation.

First and foremost, it is wholly unnecessary and inexcusable, being manufactured out of indiscipline in Washington. Gardner Ackley, the President's chief economic adviser, may find certain steel price rises distressing; he ought also to admit the Johnson Administration's heavy culpability in creating the conditions that make those and hundreds of other increases inevitable.

Unquestionably the Vietnam war has added a lot to Federal spending and hence to the enormous prospective deficits. The deep intervention in that war may have been the Johnson Administration's paramount mistake, but whether it was or was not, financial responsibility plainly required offsetting reductions in other spending. Instead the Administration recklessly increases spending on a host of domestic welfare programs.

To add to the taxpayer's bitterness, the programs are largely wasteful and ineffective; the problems they are aimed at grow worse, not better. Even so extreme a liberal as Senator Robert Kennedy perceives as much. Suddenly he and other liberals are talking of the need to involve private enterprise in the attack on poverty on a much bigger scale than at present, because the Government manifestly is unequal to the task.

Not all liberals, however. Vice President

Humphrey, lambasting the "tired people" who oppose "Great Society" programs, insists that the Government can and must carry on the Vietnam war and all the welfare projects. This refusal to face the fact of failure, this determination to perpetuate error, ill become the holder of such high office.

Secondly, inflation is not necessarily proof of a boom. The Government economic planners doggedly maintain that a new boom is under way after a mostly stagnant year, and they could be correct. Yet a number of other economists don't see the evidence for their optimism. In any case, inflation itself can easily become a depressant; consumers bombarded by price boosts on all sides may stop buying on the grand scale to which they have become accustomed.

Finally, the proposed tax increase is no answer to inflation, given the Administration's adamant resistance to any kind of restraint at all. Congress may end up enacting it, simply out of fear of the vast deficits in prospect, but to do so is to skip the relevant questions.

There is every reason to believe that if the Administration gets its tax "surcharge" it will boost its outlays that much more than it would otherwise have done. In that event the impact on the deficits will be minimal. Is Congress going to see to it that the surcharge is accompanied by substantial cuts in spending? Not likely.

And what about monetary policy? The Federal Reserve Board, presently an amiable handmaiden at the White House, has been inflating the money supply like crazy. This even more than the deficits (which to a degree can be financed in noninflationary ways) is generating the scourge of price rises. If Congress hikes taxes, is it also going to demand a cessation of that policy? Not likely. If not, the inflation will roll right along.

In the circumstances a tax increase is a gratuitous insult to the public. The Government waters your money by decreasing your purchasing power via inflation and then it confiscates more by the direct route of taxation. We hate to talk about morality in connection with supposedly hard, practical economic matters, but a Government so delinquent in its most fundamental obligations to the people is bound to raise questions of that nature.

The dismaying thing is that so far there is no really loud outcry; hardly anybody utters an audible Stop thief! Even sophisticated bankers and businessmen seem to throw up their hands and figure that that's the way it is—nothing is going to change the Government's wild habits no matter what anybody says.

Perhaps so. But to the extent we the people are silent we too are guilty, guilty of conniving in the undermining of the very financial foundations on which all else is built.

SENATE

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 28, 1967

The Senate met at 12 noon, and was called to order by Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD, a Senator from the State of West Virginia.

Rev. Charles P. Robertson, associate minister, Washington Street Methodist Church, Alexandria, Va., offered the following prayer:

God our Father: We pray that You will prevent this prayer from being just a superficial form to which we ascribe a cool respectability that we believe is proper.

We offer to You thanks for the love

ethic You have given us and especially for all signs of its effect upon people and governments in areas of tension in our land. May Your love neutralize all evidences of hatred and injustice.

We ask Your judgment upon all that is immoral in our laws and our system of government. Purge from areas of responsibility those who would pervert the law to serve their own unjust ends.

We ask for Your mercy. Unite the men and women of this Congress to a cause greater than political affiliation; set before them the common goal of justice and peace. Grant to them Your guidance, as they have within their hands the ability to accomplish good and alter history.

We ask for Your peace in the midst of

the struggle in which we are engaged on earth for the freedom and dignity of man. In Jesus' name. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,

Washington, D.C., September 28, 1967.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate I appoint Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD, a Senator from the State of West Virginia, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on September 27, 1967, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 477. An act for the relief of the widow of Albert M. Pepono;

S. 953. An act to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964;

S. 1165. An act to provide for the disposition of judgment funds now on deposit to the credit of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe of Indians on behalf of the Mississippi Bands and the Pillager and Lake Winnibigoshish Bands of Chippewa Indians;

S. 1465. An act to provide for holding terms of the District Court of the United States for the Eastern Division of the Northern District of Mississippi in Ackerman, Miss.; and

S. 1972. An act to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Emigrant New York Indians in Indian Claims Commission Docket No. 75, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

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

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 13026) to extend through March 1968 the first general enrollment period under part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act (relating to supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged), and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, September 27, 1967, be dispensed with.

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

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Price Daniel, of Texas, to be Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REPORTS OF ORGANIZATIONS OWNING PROPERTY EXEMPT UNDER DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA LAWS

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, two reports on organizations owning property exempt from the District of Columbia laws, for the calendar year 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON INTERNATIONAL MONETARY AND FINANCIAL POLICIES

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, Acting Chairman, and members of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Policies, transmitting, a special report of the Council on U.S. participation in proposed special funds of the Asian Development Bank (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT OF CLAIMS PAID UNDER MILITARY PER- SONNEL AND CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES' CLAIMS ACT OF 1964

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report listing claims settled in fiscal year 1967, setting forth the name of each claimant, the amount claimed, and the amount paid (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS— WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the name of Ryzard Wolfart aka Richard Zukowski from a report relating to aliens whose deportation has been suspended, transmitted to the Senate on February 1, 1967 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

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

H.R. 11456. An act making appropriations for the Department of Transportation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 572).

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

H.R. 11641. An act making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama

Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Atlantic-Pacific Interoceanic Canal Study Commission, the Delaware River Basin Commission, Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Water Resources Council, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 574).

SECURITY OF CAPITOL BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 573)

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], from the Committee on Public Works, I report favorably with amendments, the bill (S. 2310) to provide more effectively for the regulation of the use of, and for the preservation of safety and order within, the U.S. Capitol buildings and the U.S. Capitol Grounds. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed together with the separate views of Senators GRUENING, YOUNG of Ohio, and COOPER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the report will be printed together with the separate views, as requested by the Senator from West Virginia.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. NELSON (for himself and Mr. MONDALE):

S. 2482. A bill to provide for an annual conference between representatives of the dairy industry, the Secretary of Agriculture, and representatives of other departments and agencies of the Federal Government to consider problems relating to the import and export of dairy products to and from the United States, to interstate commerce in dairy products within the United States and related problems in international trade and interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

By Mr. BARTLETT (for himself and Mr. GRUENING):

S. 2483. A bill to vacate and relinquish the reservation of rights-of-way for certain purposes made pursuant to section 321(d) of title 48, United States Code; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina (for himself and Mr. RANDOLPH):

S. 2484. A bill to authorize the extension of the additional Senate Office Building site; to the Committee on Public Works.

ANNUAL MEETING PROPOSED TO EXPAND INTERNATIONAL AND DOMESTIC DAIRY MARKETS

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, in recent years, foreign dairy imports have become a sharp thorn in the side of the American dairy industry.

They have arrived at our ports in unprecedented numbers to depress and un-

dermine the markets of our own dairymen, driving thousands of American farmers out of dairying. Many imported dairy products have been so unsanitary that they have been immediately refused entry to the country.

The great flood of foreign dairy products began in 1965, when 900 million pounds were imported to the United States. Last year, the amount shot up to 2 billion 700 million pounds. Now, it is estimated that some 4 billion pounds will arrive in our country before this year is up.

However, the drastic decline in the volume of dairy exports over the past 2 years has been as damaging to our dairy farmers as the explosive increase in foreign dairy imports.

Total exports of American dairy prod-

ucts fell from 7.4 billion pounds in 1964 to less than one billion pounds last year. Commercial exports tumbled from 4.1 billion pounds to 776 million while donation shipments dropped from 3.3 billion pounds to 194 million pounds.

This constitutes a loss in sales of more than \$150 million in 2 short years for our dairy industry.

In the August 1967, edition of the Foreign Agriculture Circular, published by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, American dairy exports are listed, product by product, for the years 1964-66. I ask unanimous consent that that table be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this time.

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

DAIRY PRODUCTS—U.S. EXPORTS BY CATEGORY, QUANTITY, AND VALUE, 1964-66

	Quantity			Value ¹		
	1964 Thousands of pounds	1965 Thousands of pounds	1966 ² Thousands of pounds	1964 Thousands of dollars	1965 Thousands of dollars	1966 ² Thousands of dollars
Milk and cream, fresh.....	10,159	9,021	9,847	1,404	1,429	1,764
Butter ³	297,283	65,754	13,693	116,191	29,691	7,894
Cheese, all types.....	9,086	6,831	6,002	4,043	3,399	3,649
Milk, processed:						
Condensed sweetened.....	62,837	65,252	92,885	15,247	15,619	22,767
Evaporated.....	37,713	25,248	39,779	5,636	4,164	5,865
Dried whole milk.....	13,898	18,497	15,584	5,532	8,123	4,869
Nonfat dried milk.....	1,311,622	863,074	387,683	112,678	117,697	63,272
Milk products, processed:						
Infants' and dietetics, chiefly milk base.....	18,552	16,002	17,014	10,808	11,124	11,292
Malted milk compounds and mixtures.....	2,551	2,675	2,471	1,313	1,428	1,081
Dry cream.....	(⁴)	1,209	933	(⁵)	500	(⁶)
Ice cream powder mixes.....	497	(⁷)	(⁸)	270	(⁹)	(⁹)
Casein (inedible).....	270	(⁷)	(⁷)	138	(⁷)	(⁷)
Dairy products, n.e.c.....	27,658	(⁷)	(⁷)	2,828	(⁷)	(⁷)
Total value.....				276,088	193,174	122,453
Whole milk equivalent of total exports.....	Millions of pounds 7,409	Millions of pounds 2,149	Millions of pounds 970			

¹ Based on unit values reported by Bureau of Census, U.S. Department of Commerce.
² Preliminary.
³ Includes butter equivalent of anhydrous milk fat, butter oil, and ghee.
⁴ Includes \$52,500,000 estimated export value of approximately 135,000,000 pounds of butter products shipped for relief and charity not reported by Commerce.
⁵ Not reported separately prior to 1965.
⁶ As of Jan. 1, 1965, is not listed separately in Bureau of Census Trade Statistics; now included with other food preparations, not specified.
⁷ As of Jan. 1, 1965, includes albumens, peptones, and dextrins.
⁸ Adjusted to represent whole milk equivalent averaging 3.7 percent fat content. Formerly reported on a 4 percent fat content basis.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I believe that we should take some bold, new steps to reverse this alarming decline in export trade for the American dairy industry.

Today, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE] and I are introducing legislation to establish an annual Dairy Industry Trade and Marketing Conference. Under the provisions of this bill, Government trade specialists would meet with dairy industry representatives to explore ways to expand international dairy trade as well as to increase the marketing of dairy products domestically.

Participating in this annual conference will be delegates from the dairy industry and officials from the Department of Agriculture, the Department of State, the office of the President's Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, the Department of Commerce, the Export-Import Bank, the Federal Trade Commission, the Food and Drug Administration, the Public Health Service, the Tariff Commission, and other Government agencies.

The conference will be open for the discussion of problems relating to mar-

ket survey information, market development, differences in preferences and standards of other nations, political barriers, veterinary and sanitary regulations, domestic regulations and barriers, transportation costs and methods, unfamiliarity with foreign markets, and structural problems of the dairy industry in the United States.

As I noted, the increase in foreign dairy imports has caused great concern recently, and rightly so as long as foreign countries continue to flood American markets with their surpluses without allowing us comparable access to their markets.

If we can gain some assurances that foreign markets will be opened to our dairy products, then we can consider liberalizing our own import restrictions.

Expansion of export markets will mean far more money in the pockets of our family farmers than restrictions on incoming imports.

This dairy trade conference will seek new ways to increase international trade in dairy products by finding new foreign markets and expanding business in existing ones.

The potential for opening new over-

seas markets for American dairy products has never been brighter. But, it is up to us to take advantage of it. We must start to make international dairy trade a full-time, not a part-time, concern.

Prof. Truman Graf, the highly respected agricultural economist from the University of Wisconsin, has offered the following observation on foreign dairy trade:

The dairy export market looks very bright and dairy product exports promise to become very increasingly important for Wisconsin dairymen in the future. The population of Western Europe is expected to increase by about 150 million people in the next 20 years. Western Europe may not be able to supply enough milk for its people. This will help U.S. commercial export markets there.

The world commercial demand for non-fat dry milk is expected to continue to expand. The growth of the animal feed milk replacer market in Western Europe is a good example of large new uses. Japan's sharp increase in the purchases of non-fat dry milk and other dairy products is another example of increased demand for dairy products which can occur. The world is experiencing a growing appetite for animal products such as meat, eggs and dairy products.

Although we frequently complain about the unfavorable impact of both dairy and total agricultural imports on our agricultural and dairy industry, we gain far more from exports than we lose from imports. From an economic standpoint, we are far better off working on programs to expand exports than on programs to restrict imports.

The future international dairy trade situation has important implications to the Wisconsin dairy industry. Greater effort in analyzing and disseminating information on import and export regulations in potential markets throughout the world will be needed, so as to encourage the greatest possible sales abroad. U.S. rules and regulations governing imports and exports should also be constantly scrutinized and analyzed to assure the most favorable export situation.

The criticism now being voiced about the short term nature of U.S. dairy export subsidy rates has considerable merit. Longer term information on the dairy trades competitive position on the world market would encourage more private effort in attempting to increase dairy export sales.

More work also needs to be done in the development of foreign markets. This can involve merchandising, advertising, promotional, and feasibility studies. Research study and dissemination of information on technical processing and packaging requirement for exports is also needed. This should involve going to the countries and finding out what makes them tick, and how to develop marketing programs there. Markets cannot be developed by merely looking at reports, but instead, research, and marketing programs in the countries are important.

On the domestic scene, many barriers still exist to disrupt the interstate marketing of dairy products right here in the United States. These barriers are one of the reasons why imitation products, including filled milk made with vegetable fat—not butterfat—are getting such a strong foothold in the Southwest and Far West. Reports indicated that artificial milk has already captured a share of the regular milk market in several States.

With the public and private expertise available at these dairy trade conferences, our American dairy industry should be able to resolve some of the difficulties presently disrupting the in-

ternational and domestic marketing of American dairy products.

At this time, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill establishing an annual Dairy Industry Trade and Marketing Conference be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 2482) to provide for an annual conference between representatives of the dairy industry, the Secretary of Agriculture, and representatives of other departments and agencies of the Federal Government to consider problems relating to the import and export of dairy products to and from the United States, to interstate commerce in dairy products within the United States and related problems in international trade and interstate commerce, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. NELSON (for himself and Mr. MONDALE), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2482

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Dairy Industry Trade and Marketing Conference Act".

STATEMENT OF POLICY

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby declares that the production of dairy products is of vital importance to the economy of the Nation and that the Secretary of Agriculture and other officials of the Government concerned with international trade and interstate commerce in dairy products should exercise the authority vested in them by law to encourage development of overseas and domestic markets for these commodities by groups and individual United States businessmen interested in such markets (without regard to their size or previous experience in international trade); and in order that the Secretary of Agriculture and other appropriate Federal officials and the business community may be kept currently informed of conditions in world and domestic markets and of the specific kinds of assistance which may be needed by the industry of this country, the Secretary of Agriculture should sponsor an annual conference, to be attended by representatives of the dairy industry and all departments and agencies of the Federal Government concerned with the exports and imports of and interstate commerce in dairy products, to consider such conditions and to attempt to find practical solutions to the problems that are involved.

ANNUAL DAIRY INDUSTRY TRADE AND MARKETING CONFERENCE

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized and directed to call a dairy industry trade and marketing conference each year. Each such conference shall be composed of representatives from the Department of Agriculture, designated by the Secretary, and delegates from the dairy industry, selected in such manner as may be approved by the industry. There shall also be in attendance at each such conference representatives from the Department of State, the Agency for International Development, the office of the President's Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, the Department of Commerce, the Export-Import Bank, Federal Trade Commission, Food and Drug Administration, Public Health Service, and the Tariff Commission, and other pertinent Government

agencies to be designated by the chief executive officers thereof.

(b) The Secretary and a person selected by the dairy industry shall serve as cochairmen of conferences held pursuant to this section; and such conferences shall be planned, organized, and conducted in accordance with rules of procedure mutually agreed upon by the cochairmen. The conference shall be held each year at a time and place convenient to delegates of the dairy industry and the Secretary.

(c) Delegates to any conference held pursuant to this section shall receive no compensation for their services, but while attending meetings of the annual conference at places away from their homes or regular places of business they shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem allowance in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law for persons in the government service intermittently.

(d) Except as otherwise provided in this section, the Secretary shall be responsible for the conduct of each annual dairy industry trade and marketing conference held pursuant to this section.

(e) It shall be the function of each annual conference to review, discuss, analyze, and recommend solutions to problems of the dairy industry relating to exports, imports, trade, and marketing of dairy products. Each such conference shall specifically consider, but shall not be limited to, problems relating to—

- (A) trade and market survey information;
- (B) organizational and structural problems of the dairy industry in the United States;
- (C) market development;
- (D) background information on differences in preferences and standards of other nations;
- (E) economic and political barriers;
- (F) necessary veterinary and sanitary regulations;
- (G) national and state regulations and barriers;
- (H) educating foreign and domestic consumers;
- (I) transportation costs and methods; and
- (J) types of products with export potential.

(f) In carrying out the provisions of this section, the Secretary shall—

(1) request the cooperation and assistance of other Federal departments and agencies concerned with the export and imports of dairy products;

(2) compile, prepare, and make available for the use of the delegates to each conference such background information and material as he may deem necessary or appropriate.

(g) Any conference held pursuant to this section is authorized to secure information directly from any department, agency, or establishment of the executive branch of the Government with the consent of the head thereof, and each such department, agency, or establishment to the greatest practical extent shall furnish such information upon request of either cochairman of the conference. Such personnel of such departments, agencies, or establishments as may be required to assist any conference held pursuant to this section in carrying out its functions may be utilized upon request of the Secretary. Any such department, agency, or establishment furnishing the services of personnel shall be entitled to reimbursement therefor out of any funds appropriated under subsection (i) of this section.

(h) The Secretary shall maintain a record of the proceedings of each such conference and shall submit a written report to the Congress with respect to any problem presented for consideration at any such conference, within thirty days after the end of such conference, whenever the same or substantially the same problem was presented for consideration at the previous annual conference. He shall set forth the problem so presented and

specify what action has been taken by the appropriate department or agency to alleviate it. Whenever any problem being reported upon is outside the competence or jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture, representatives of the department or agency concerned shall cooperate with an assist the Secretary in the preparation of the report regarding such problem. Such report shall also contain such recommendations as may be necessary or appropriate to correct such problem.

(i) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

PROTECTION FOR ALASKA HOMESTEADERS

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, in 1947 Congress enacted a law—48, United States Code, 321d—which reserved an undefined highway right-of-way in all patents for Federal public lands in Alaska. This law, commonly referred as the 1947 act, has become notorious in Alaska. While seemingly innocuous, the 1947 act has worked inequities beyond belief as homesteads and other patented lands fall in the paths of urban development and highway improvement projects.

Although the 1947 act was repealed in 1959, all of those persons who received patent to Federal lands between 1947 and 1959 still live under the threat that a portion of their land might be taken for highway right-of-way purposes at any time without compensation. As a matter of fact, a substantial number of rights-of-way have already been acquired under the 1947 act without compensation to the landowners and many rights-of-way over such lands will undoubtedly be acquired in the foreseeable future.

The State of Alaska has found a way to compensate patentees for takings under the right-of-way provision but the Federal highway administration refuses on legal grounds to pay the Federal share of such compensation.

Mr. President, it is my firm belief that no one could have foreseen the inequities inherent in passage of the 1947 act. It is also my belief that corrective action is overdue. Therefore, I introduce today for appropriate reference a bill which would vacate and relinquish the reservation of rights-of-way authorized by the 1947 act—61 Stat. 418, 48 United States Code, 321(d).

Mr. President, in conclusion, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 2483) to vacate and relinquish the reservation of rights-of-way for certain purposes made pursuant to section 321(d) of title 48, United States Code, introduced by Mr. BARTLETT (for himself and Mr. GRUENING), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2483

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

right-of-way for roads, roadways, highways, tramways, trails, bridges, and appurtenant structures reserved by section 321(d) of title 48, United States Code (61 Stat. 418, 1947), not utilized by the United States or by the State or territory of Alaska prior to the date of enactment hereof, shall be and hereby is vacated and relinquished by the United States to the end and intent that such reservation shall merge with the fee and be forever extinguished.

AMENDMENT TO FIREARMS BILL

AMENDMENT NO. 361

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I take the floor today for the purpose of submitting an amendment to amendment No. 90 to S. 1, the firearms bill that I introduced earlier this year.

We all know of the violence that has ripped many of our major cities this summer.

We know of the deadly sniper fire that took the lives of innocent victims and frustrated the efforts of law enforcement officers in combating what amounted to guerrilla warfare on the streets of our great cities.

We know that the rifle and shotgun are the tools of the sniper and that these weapons were misused during the height of the fury in the riot torn areas.

Yet there are those who doggedly maintain, with a total disregard for the facts, that the rifle and shotgun are strictly the instruments of sportsmen and hunters, and that such weapons are not abused by our criminal elements.

It is becoming increasingly clear that their view is shortsighted based on what is currently happening in this country.

It has been apparent for some time, however, that the inclusion of rifles and shotguns in the legislation that I have proposed has been the major stumbling block to its enactment.

Today, I offer an amendment to S. 1, amendment No. 90, which should remove the opposition of the sportsmen of our less populated Midwestern States.

The amendment is brief. It is not complex. It is predicated on the major criticism that has been leveled against the bill.

It incorporates the basic philosophy of the bill that it will amend.

S. 1, amendment No. 90, was designed to aid the States by regulating the interstate commerce in firearms so that they may implement and enforce their own laws. This amendment maintains this principle.

Briefly, it would allow a State legislature to enact a statute to relieve its citizens from the outright prohibition on mail order acquisitions of rifles and shotguns, as proscribed by S. 1, amendment No. 90.

If applied to amendment No. 90, States could let their citizens purchase rifles and shotguns by mail order.

This amendment permits a State legislature to decree that its citizens may have the right to purchase a mail order rifle or shotgun without any restriction.

The amendment, in adhering to the principle of assistance to the States, would not, in my opinion, greatly reduce the overall effectiveness of this legislation. It would be applicable only in those States which feel that they do not

need the help of the Federal Government in enforcing their own laws.

There is no constitutional bar to this legislative approach. There is ample precedent in principle for its adoption.

I urge that this amendment be given favorable consideration by the Judiciary Committee and the Senate.

I offer it in an effort to loosen the logjam that has impeded the progress of firearms legislation in this Senate over the years.

I am hopeful that it will meet the objections that have been raised by our citizens in the rural and Western States.

The record that the subcommittee compiled this year demonstrates that some of our States do not want and do not feel the need for Federal assistance in controlling the acquisition of firearms.

Witnesses from these States have indicated that a mail order ban or stringent controls on mail order rifles and shotguns would effect a hardship on sportsmen, ranchers and farmers whose primary access to sporting rifles and shotguns is through the mail order route.

Senator FRANK CHURCH, for example presented to the subcommittee a petition of some 44,000 signators from the State of Idaho who categorically oppose any Federal firearms legislation.

Eight of our western States have memorialized the Congress to oppose this gun bill mainly because of the inclusion of long arms.

I believe that this amendment will dissipate such opposition. If the bill does not apply to these States, they should have no objection to it.

As a result of the objections voiced at the hearings by many Senators and witnesses from States whose citizens objected to S. 1, amendment No. 90, on August 30, 1967, I wrote to members of the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee asking that they consider the amendment I introduce today as a possible solution to such objections. I have attached a copy of this letter to my statement today.

In urging adoption of this amendment and the enactment of S. 1, amendment No. 90, I am also aware of those responsible State and local officials who have pleaded with the Congress to act affirmatively and to enact meaningful Federal gun control legislation.

Their plea should not go unheeded. I, for one, do not intend to ignore them. I hope my colleagues who object to this legislation because of opposition by their constituents will not ignore them either.

The record that this subcommittee has compiled over the last 6 years conclusive demonstrates the existence of a serious firearms problem in the United States. Long arms, rifles, and shotguns, contribute significantly to this problem. And, their contribution to lawlessness and loss of life is increasing every year.

The annual FBI report released just this August, shows that in 1966, 60 percent of our murders were committed by persons armed with firearms. Not only did the gun prove again to be increasingly the favorite weapon of the killer, but the total number of gun deaths was 16 percent higher than in 1965. The toll of human life mounts with each passing day.

The report also shows that robberies and aggravated assaults by gun increased dramatically in 1966. Armed robbery was up 14 percent. Aggravated assault was up 25 percent.

I feel confident in predicting that the riots of 1967 will make this year the highest ever in firearms crimes, and unless this Congress moves swiftly, these crimes will continue to mount in the years to come.

In the face of this rampaging criminal behavior, the gunrunners still argue their same feeble arguments.

Our critics still claim that criminals, persons bent on murder, assassination, or starting a riot, do not buy firearms with which to commit their disastrous acts.

The gunrunners still insist that the criminals steal their guns for such illicit purposes. Yet, the record compiled by the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee conclusively disproved this in 1965.

Our recent hearings in July and August proved our earlier findings beyond a doubt.

The gunrunners insist that firearms laws are ineffective and that they do not prevent gun crimes. Yet, our record conclusively contradicts this charge.

We are told that the rifles and shotguns are strictly sportsmen's weapons. Yet, in 1966, 1,747 persons were murdered with rifles and shotguns, not to mention the major role long arms played in our summer riots.

Much of what I have just said has been said before. Only the dates and numbers have changed. And the countless names of the tragically dead and wounded. The arguments on both sides have been exhaustive and almost interminable.

Perhaps this is what prompted FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover to say in the September 1967 Law Enforcement Bulletin:

We have reached the point where the time for debate is past; the time for action is here.

I think mail-order firearm purchases should be banned, interstate transportation of firearms controlled, and local registration of weapons required and enforced.

Mr. President, Mr. Hoover's sentiments on this issue could not be more clear and certainly should not go unheard by the Congress. The gun control issue has been before the Senate for 5 years. The problem of firearms misuse has increased substantially in each of those 6 years. We simply cannot afford to delay any longer.

We must enact legislation this year that will do the job of allowing the States to control the firearms traffic across their borders.

We have such legislation in S. 1, amendment No. 90, and with the amendment to it that I offer today, I believe that we can get on with the task of affording protection to our highly populated States from the virtually uncontrolled interstate commerce in illicit firearms that today threatens our great cities with vast destruction.

I commend the adoption of this amendment to my colleagues and urge that we act on this legislation without further delay.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of the letter which I sent to various members of the Judiciary Committee on August 30, 1967.

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

AUGUST 30, 1967.

DEAR SENATOR: I understand and sympathize with the problem you have in your state concerning legislation to control the interstate sale of rifles and shotguns.

For this reason, I would be very much interested in your reaction to the amendment I have enclosed, one copy drafted to fit into S. 1 and the other to fit into the Administration gun bill.

As you know, the Administration bill prohibits all interstate sales of rifles and shotguns except among licensed manufacturers, distributors and dealers.

My amendment would permit an individual state legislature to exempt its residents from this prohibition, to the extent that they would be able to order and receive rifles or shotguns through the interstate mails.

Under S. 1, which requires an affidavit for the purchase of a rifle or shotgun through the interstate mails, the residents of an exempting state would be able to order such a weapon without filling out the affidavit.

Simply stated, this amendment would allow the states themselves to decide whether or not they want the assistance of the Federal government in curbing the purchase of rifles and shotguns through the interstate mails.

Though states would be allowed to exempt residents who wish to purchase a long arm through the interstate mails, the legislatures would not be permitted to exempt dealers.

The only way a dealer would be exempted would be indirectly, in filling a mail order for a rifle or shotgun from a resident of a state that chooses this course of action. In the case of a mail order from a state that has not chosen to exempt its residents, the dealer would have to comply with the Federal statute, whether it be the Administration bill or S. 1.

This amendment will, I feel, go a long way toward meeting the objections made by hunters and other sportsmen, without seriously detracting from the effectiveness of the law for states that want help.

I would like to talk to you about this legislation in a few days. If you find this new suggestion helpful, perhaps I will take the steps to include it in the pending legislation.

With best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS J. DOBB.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The amendment (No. 361) was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENT TO DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION APPROPRIATION BILL

AMENDMENT NO. 362

Mr. STENNIS submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H.R. 11456) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, the

following amendment, namely, on page 9, after line 22, insert the following:

"SEC. 303. Funds heretofore appropriated to the Department of the Army for the Libby Dam and Reservoir Project in Montana may be used in an amount not to exceed \$140,000 in participation with local interests and the Federal Aviation Administration for the construction of an airport facility at Kelley Flats, Montana, in a manner deemed appropriate by the Chief of Engineers."

Mr. STENNIS also submitted an amendment (No. 362) intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 11456, making appropriations for the Department of Transportation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

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

NOTICES OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENTS TO PUBLIC WORKS AND ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION APPROPRIATION BILL

AMENDMENT NO. 363

Mr. HAYDEN submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H.R. 11641) making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Atlantic-Pacific Inter-oceanic Canal Study Commission, the Delaware River Basin Commission, Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Water Resources Council, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: On page 33, after line 12, insert:

"TITLE VI—CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT

"SEC. 601. This title may be cited as the 'Central Arizona Project Act'.

"SEC. 602. (a) For the purposes of furnishing irrigation water and municipal water supplies to the water-deficient areas of Arizona and western New Mexico through direct diversion or exchange of water, generation of electric power and energy, control of floods, conservation and development of fish and wildlife resources, enhancement of recreation opportunities, and for other purposes, the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the 'Secretary') shall construct, operate, and maintain the Central Arizona Project, consisting of the following principal works: (1) a system of main conduits and canals, including a main canal and pumping plants (Granite Reef aqueduct and pumping plants), for diverting and carrying water from Lake Havasu to Orme Dam or suitable alternative, which system shall have a capacity of not less than three thousand cubic feet per second; (2) Orme Dam and Reservoir and power-pumping plant or suitable alternative; (3) Buttes Dam and Reservoir, which shall be so operated as to not prejudice the rights of any user in and to the waters of the Gila River as those rights are set forth in the decree entered by the United States District Court for the District of Arizona on June 29, 1935, in United States against Gila Valley Irrigation District and others (Globe Equity Numbered 59); (4) Hooker Dam and Reservoir, which shall be constructed in such a manner as to give effect to the provisions of subsections (f),

(g), and (h) of this section; (5) Charleston Dam and Reservoir; (6) Tucson aqueducts and pumping plants; (7) Salt-Gila aqueduct; (8) canals, regulating facilities, hydroelectric powerplants, and electrical transmission facilities; (9) related water distribution and drainage works; and (10) appurtenant works: *Provided*, That for a period of 27 years from the effective date of this Act, in any year in which, as determined by the Secretary, there will be insufficient main stream Colorado River water to satisfy the consumptive uses of two million eight hundred thousand, four million four hundred thousand, and three hundred thousand acre-feet in Arizona, California, and Nevada, respectively, diversions for the said purposes of the Central Arizona Project shall be so limited as to assure the availability of water in quantities sufficient to provide for the aggregate annual consumptive use of four million four hundred thousand acre-feet in the State of California. Except as to the terms and provisions of this priority, the rights of Arizona under the decision in Arizona against California (373 U.S. 546) are not affected, abridged, or impaired. The terms "consumptive use" and "main stream" as used in this Act shall have the meanings assigned to those terms in the decree in Arizona against California, dated March 9, 1964 (376 U.S. 340).

"(b) (1) The Secretary may enter into an agreement with non-Federal interests proposing to construct a thermal generating powerplant whereby the United States shall acquire the right to such portion of the capacity of such plant, including delivery of power and energy over appurtenant transmission facilities to mutually agreed upon delivery points, as he determines is required in connection with the Central Arizona Project. Power and energy acquired thereunder may be disposed of intermittently by the Secretary when not required in connection with the Central Arizona Project. The agreement shall provide, among other things, that—

"(1) The United States shall pay not more than that portion of the total construction cost, exclusive of interest during construction, of the powerplant, and of any switchyards and transmission facilities serving the United States, as is represented by the ratios of the respective capacities to be provided for the United States therein to the total capacities of such facilities. The Secretary shall make the Federal portion of such costs available to the non-Federal interests during the construction period, including the period of preparation of designs and specifications, in such installments as will facilitate a timely construction schedule, but no funds other than for preconstruction activities shall be made available by the Secretary until he determines that adequate contractual arrangements are in effect covering water and fuel supplies for the thermal generating powerplant;

"(ii) Annual operation and maintenance costs, including provisions for depreciation (except as to depreciation on the pro rata share of construction cost borne by the United States in accordance with the foregoing subdivision (1)) shall be apportioned between the United States and the non-Federal interests on an equitable basis taking into account the ratios determined in accordance with the foregoing subdivision (1);

"(iii) The United States shall be given appropriate credit for any interests in Federal lands administered by the Department of the Interior that are made available for the powerplant and appurtenances;

"(iv) Costs to be borne by the United States under subdivisions (1) and (ii) shall not include (a) interest and interest during construction, (b) financing charges, (c) franchise fees, and (d) such other costs as shall be specified in the agreement.

"(2) The thermal generating plant re-

ferred to in subparagraph (1) of this subsection shall be located in Arizona, and if it is served by water diverted from the drainage area of the Colorado River system above Lee Ferry, consumptive use of water in connection therewith shall be charged against the apportionment to Arizona made by article III(a) of the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact (63 Stat. 31) and such use shall not increase Arizona's entitlement to consumptive use under said compact.

"(c) Unless and until otherwise provided by Congress, water from the Central Arizona Project shall not be made available directly or indirectly for the irrigation of lands not having a recent irrigation history as determined by the Secretary, except in the case of Indian lands, national wildlife refuges, and, with the approval of the Secretary, State-administered wildlife management areas.

"(d) (1) Irrigation and municipal and industrial water supply under the Central Arizona Project within the Senate of Arizona may, in the event the Secretary determines that it is necessary to effect repayment, be pursuant to master contracts with organizations which have power to levy assessments against all taxable real property within their boundaries. The terms and conditions of contracts or other arrangements whereby each such organization makes water from the Central Arizona Project available to users within its boundaries shall be subject to the Secretary's approval and the United States shall, if the Secretary determines such action is desirable to facilitate carrying out the provisions of this Act, have the right to require that it be a party to such contracts or that contracts subsidiary to the master contracts be entered into between the United States and any user. The provisions of this subparagraph (1) shall not apply to the supplying of water to an Indian tribe for use within the boundaries of an Indian reservation.

"(2) Any obligation assumed pursuant to section 9(d) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (43 U.S.C. 485h(d)) with respect to any project contract unit or irrigation block shall be repaid over a basic period of not more than fifty years; any water service provided pursuant to section 9(e) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (43 U.S.C. 485h(e)) may be on the basis of delivery of water for a period of fifty years and for the delivery of such water at an identical price per acre-foot for water of the same class at the several points of delivery from the main canals and conduits and from such other points of delivery as the Secretary may designate; and long-term contracts relating to irrigation water supply shall provide that water made available thereunder may be made available by the Secretary for municipal or industrial purposes if and to the extent that such water is not required by the contractor for irrigation purposes.

"(3) Contracts relating to municipal and industrial water supply under the Central Arizona Project may be made without regard to the limitations of the last sentence of section 9(e) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (43 U.S.C. 485h(e)); may provide for the delivery of such water at an identical price per acre-foot for water of the same class at the several points of delivery from the main canals and conduits; and may provide for repayment over a period of fifty years if made pursuant to clause (1) of said section and for the delivery of water over a period of fifty years if made pursuant to clause (2) thereof.

"(e) Each contract under which water is provided under the Central Arizona Project shall require that (1) there be in effect measures, adequate in the judgment of the Secretary, to control expansion of irrigation from aquifers affected by irrigation in the contract service area; (2) the canals and distribution systems through which water is conveyed

after its delivery by the United States to the contractors shall be provided and maintained with linings, adequate in his judgment to prevent excessive conveyance losses; and (3) neither the contractor nor the Secretary shall pump or permit others to pump ground water from within the exterior boundaries of the service area of a contractor receiving water from the Central Arizona Project for any use outside said contractor's service area unless the Secretary and such contractor shall agree, or shall have previously agreed, that a surplus of ground water exists and that drainage is or was required. Such contracts shall be subordinate at all times to the satisfaction of all existing contracts between the Secretary and users in Arizona heretofore made pursuant to the Boulder Canyon Project Act (45 Stat. 1057).

"(f) The Secretary may require in any contract under which water is provided from the Central Arizona Project that the contractor agree to accept main stream water in exchange for or in replacement of existing supplies from sources other than the main stream. The Secretary shall so require in the case of users in Arizona who also use water from the Gila River system, to the extent necessary to make available to users of water from the Gila River system in New Mexico additional quantities of water as provided in and under the conditions specified in subsection (h) of this section: *Provided*, That such exchanges and replacements shall be accomplished without economic injury or cost to such Arizona contractors.

"(g) In times of shortage or reduction of main stream Colorado River water for the Central Arizona Project, as determined by the Secretary, users which have yielded water from other sources in exchange for main stream water supplied by that project shall have a first priority to receive main stream water, as against other users supplied by that project which have not so yielded water from other sources, but only in quantities adequate to replace the water so yielded.

"(h) In the operation of the Central Arizona Project, the Secretary shall offer to contract with water users in New Mexico for water from the Gila River, its tributaries and underground water sources, in amounts that will permit consumptive use of water in New Mexico not to exceed an annual average in any period of ten consecutive years of eighteen thousand acre-feet, including reservoir evaporation, over and above the consumptive uses provided for by article IV of the decree of the Supreme Court of the United States in Arizona against California (376 U.S. 340). Such increased consumptive uses shall not begin until and shall continue only so long as delivery of Colorado River water to downstream Gila River users in Arizona is being accomplished in accordance with this Act, in quantities sufficient to replace any diminution of their supply resulting from such diversions from the Gila River, its tributaries and underground water sources. In determining the amount required for this purpose full consideration shall be given to any differences in the quality of the waters involved. All additional consumptive uses provided for in this subsection shall be subject to all rights in New Mexico and Arizona as established by the decree entered by the United States District Court for the District of Arizona on June 29, 1935, in United States against Gila Valley Irrigation District and others (Globe Equity Numbered 59) and to all other rights existing on the effective date of this Act in New Mexico and Arizona to water from the Gila River, its tributaries and underground water sources, and shall be junior thereto and shall be made only to the extent possible without economic injury or cost to the holders of such rights.

"(i) For a period of ten years from the date of enactment of this Act, no water from the projects authorized by this Act shall be

delivered to any water user for the production on newly irrigated lands of any basic agricultural commodity, as defined in the Agricultural Act of 1949, or any amendment thereof, if the total supply of such commodity for the marketing year in which the bulk of the crop would normally be marketed is in excess of the normal supply as defined in section 301(b) (10) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, unless the Secretary of Agriculture calls for an increase in production of such commodity in the interest of national security.

"(j) The Secretary shall integrate the Dixie project, heretofore authorized, into the repayment arrangement and participation in the Development Fund established by section 605 of this Act consistent with the provisions of this Act.

"Sec. 603. The conservation and development of the fish and wildlife resources and the enhancement of recreation opportunities in connection with the Central Arizona Project works authorized pursuant to this Act shall be in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Water Project Recreation Act (79 Stat. 213).

"Sec. 604. The Secretary shall determine the repayment capability of Indian lands within, under, or served by the Central Arizona Project. Construction costs allocated to irrigation of Indian lands (including provision of water for incidental domestic and stock water uses) and within the repayment capability of such lands shall be subject to the Act of July 1, 1932 (47 Stat. 464), and such costs as are beyond repayment capability of such lands shall be nonreimbursable.

"Sec. 605. (a) There is hereby established a separate fund in the Treasury of the United States, to be known as the Lower Colorado River Basin Development Fund (hereafter called the "Development Fund"), which shall remain available until expended as hereafter provided, for carrying out the provisions of section 602 of this Act, and to be expended or applied in connection with water conservation and development for the Lower Colorado River Basin as may hereafter be prescribed by the Congress.

"(b) All appropriations made for the purpose of carrying out the aforesaid provisions of section 602, and such projects as are hereafter authorized by the Congress for water conservation and development for the Lower Colorado River Basin, shall be credited to the Development Fund as advances from the general fund of the Treasury and shall be available for such purposes.

"(c) There shall also be credited to the Development Fund—

"(1) All revenues collected in connection with the operation of the works and facilities authorized pursuant to section 602 and hereafter authorized in furtherance of the purposes of this Act (except entrance, admission, and other recreation fees or charges and proceeds received from recreation concessions); and

"(2) All Federal revenues from the Boulder Canyon and Parker-Davis projects which, after completion of repayment requirements of the said Boulder Canyon and Parker-Davis projects, are surplus, as determined by the Secretary, to the operation, maintenance, and replacement requirements of those projects: *Provided, however*, That the Secretary is authorized and directed to continue the in-lieu-of-taxes payments to the States of Arizona and Nevada provided for in section 2(c) of the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act so long as revenues accrue from the operation of the Boulder Canyon Project.

"(3) All Federal revenues from the portion of the Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest intertie, located in the States of Nevada and Arizona which, after completion of repayment requirements of the said part of the Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest intertie located in the States of Nevada and Arizona, are surplus, as determined by the Secretary,

to the operation, maintenance, and replacement requirements of said portion of the Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest Intertie and related facilities.

"(d) All revenues collected and credited to the development fund pursuant to this Act shall be available, without further appropriation, for—

"(1) defraying the costs of operation, maintenance, and replacements of, and emergency expenditures for, all facilities of the project within such separate limitations as may be included in annual appropriation Acts;

"(2) payments, if any, as required by section 608 of this Act;

"(3) payments as required by subsection (f) of this section; and

"(4) payments to reimburse water users in the State of Arizona for losses sustained as a result of diminution of the production of hydroelectric power at Coolidge Dam, Arizona, resulting from exchanges of water between users in the States of Arizona and New Mexico as set forth in section 602 of this Act.

"(e) Revenues credited to the Development Fund shall not be available for construction of the works authorized pursuant to section 602 of this Act except on appropriation by the Congress.

"(f) Revenues in the Development Fund in excess of the amount necessary to meet the requirements of clauses (1), (2), and (4) of section (d) of this section shall be paid annually to the general fund of the Treasury to return—

"(1) the costs of the project or separable feature thereof, authorized pursuant to section 602 of this Act which are allocated to irrigation, commercial power, or municipal and industrial water supply, pursuant to this Act, within a period not exceeding fifty years from the date of completion of each such unit or separable feature, exclusive of any development period authorized by law; and

"(2) interest (including interest during construction) on the unamortized balance of the investment in the commercial power and municipal and industrial water supply features of the project at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury in accordance with the provisions of subsection (g) of this section, and interest due shall be a first charge.

"(g) The interest rate applicable to those portions of the reimbursable costs of the Central Arizona Project which are properly allocated to commercial power development and municipal and industrial water supply shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, as of the beginning of the fiscal year in which the first advance is made for initiating construction of such project, on the basis of the computed average interest rate payable by the Treasury upon its outstanding marketable public obligations which are neither due nor callable for redemption for fifteen years from the date of issue.

"(h) Business-type budgets shall be submitted to the Congress annually for all operations financed by the development fund.

"Sec. 606. The Secretary may undertake programs for water salvage along and adjacent to the main stream of the Colorado River and for ground water recovery. Such programs shall be consistent with maintenance of a reasonable degree of undisturbed habitat for fish and wildlife in the area, as determined by the Secretary.

"Sec. 607. (a) In order to provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Animas-La Plata Federal reclamation project, Colorado-New Mexico; the Dolores, Dallas Creek, West Divide, and San Miguel Federal reclamation projects, Colorado, as participating projects under the Colorado River Storage Project Act (70 Stat. 105; 43 U.S.C. 620), and to provide for the completion of planning reports on other participat-

ing projects, subsection (2) of section 1 of said Act is hereby further amended by deleting the words 'Pine River extension', and inserting in lieu thereof the words 'Animas-La Plata, Dolores, Dallas Creek, West Divide, San Miguel'. Section 2 of said Act is hereby further amended by deleting the words 'Farsall, Troublesome, Rabbit Ear, San Miguel, West Divide, Tomichi Creek, East River, Ohio Creek, Dallas Creek, Dolores, Fruit Growers extension, Animas-La Plata', and inserting after the words 'Yellow Jacket' the words 'Basalt, Middle Park (including the Troublesome, Rabbit Ear, and Azure units), Upper Gunnison (including the East River, Ohio Creek, and Tomichi Creek units), Lower Yampa (including the Juniper and Great Northern units), Upper Yampa (including the Hayden Mesa, Wessels, and Toponas units)', and by inserting after the word 'Sublette' the words '(including the Kendall Reservoir on Green River and a diversion of water from the Green River to the North Platte River Basin in Wyoming), Uintah unit and Ute Indian unit of the central Utah, San Juan County (Utah), Price River, Grand County (Utah), Ute Indian unit extension of the central Utah, Gray Canyon, and Juniper (Utah)'. The amount which section 12 of said Act authorizes to be appropriated is hereby further increased by the sum of \$360,000,000 plus or minus such amounts, if any, as may be required, by reason of changes in construction costs as indicated by engineering cost indexes applicable to the type of construction involved. This additional sum shall be available solely for the construction of the projects herein authorized.

"(b) The Animas-La Plata Federal reclamation project shall be constructed and operated in substantial accordance with the engineering plans set out in the report of the Secretary transmitted to the Congress on May 4, 1966, and printed as House Document 436, Eighty-ninth Congress: *Provided*, That the project construction of the Animas-La Plata Federal reclamation project shall not be undertaken until and unless the States of Colorado and New Mexico shall have ratified the following compact to which the consent of Congress is hereby given:

"ANIMAS-LA PLATA PROJECT COMPACT

"The State of Colorado and the State of New Mexico, in order to implement the operation of the Animas-La Plata Federal Reclamation Project, Colorado-New Mexico, a proposed participating project under the Colorado River Storage Project Act (70 Stat. 105), and being moved by consideration of interstate comity, have resolved to conclude a compact for these purposes and have agreed upon the following articles:

"ARTICLE I

"A. The right to store and divert water in Colorado and New Mexico from the La Plata and Animas River systems, including return flow to the La Plata River from Animas River diversions, for uses in New Mexico under the Animas-La Plata Federal Reclamation Project shall be valid and of equal priority with those rights granted by decree of the Colorado State courts for the uses of water in Colorado for that project, providing such uses in New Mexico are within the allocation of water made to that State by article III and XIV of the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact (63 Stat. 31).

"B. The restrictions of the last sentence of Section (a) of Article IX of the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact shall not be construed to vitiate paragraph A of this article.

"ARTICLE II

"This Compact shall become binding and obligatory when it shall have been ratified by the legislatures of each of the signatory States.

"(c) The Secretary shall, for the Animas-La Plata, Dolores, Dallas Creek, San Miguel, West Divide, and Seedskadee participating

projects of the Colorado River storage project, establish the nonexcess irrigable acreage for which any single ownership may receive project water at one hundred and sixty acres of class 1 land or the equivalent thereof, as determined by the Secretary, in other land classes.

"(d) The words 'any western slope appropriations' contained in paragraph (1) of that section of Senate Document Numbered 80, Seventy-fifth Congress, first session, entitled 'Manner of Operation of Project Facilities and Auxiliary Features,' shall mean and refer to the appropriation heretofore made for the storage of water in Green Mountain Reservoir, a unit of the Colorado-Big Thompson Federal reclamation project, Colorado; and the Secretary is directed to act in accordance with such meaning and reference. It is the sense of Congress that this directive defines and observes the purpose of said paragraph (1), and does not in any way affect or alter any rights or obligations arising under said Senate Document Numbered 80 or under the laws of the State of Colorado.

"Sec. 608. The Upper Colorado River Basin fund established under section 5 of the Act of April 11, 1956 (70 Stat. 107), shall be reimbursed from the Colorado River development fund established by section 2 of the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act (54 Stat. 774), for all expenditures heretofore or hereafter made from the Upper Colorado River Basin fund to meet deficiencies in generation at Hoover Dam during the filling period of reservoirs of storage units of the Colorado River storage project pursuant to the criteria for the filling of Glen Canyon Reservoir (27 Fed. Reg. 6851, July 19, 1962). For this purpose \$500,000 for each year of operation of Hoover Dam and powerplant, commencing with the enactment of this Act, shall be transferred from the Colorado River development fund to the Upper Colorado River Basin fund, in lieu of application of said amounts to the purposes stated in section 2(d) of the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act, until such reimbursement is accomplished. To the extent that any deficiency in such reimbursement remains as of June 1, 1967, the amount of the remaining deficiency shall then be transferred to the Upper Colorado River Basin fund from net revenues derived from the sale of electric energy generated at Hoover Dam.

"Sec. 609. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to alter, amend, repeal, modify, or be in conflict with the provisions of the Colorado River compact (45 Stat. 1057), the Upper Colorado River Basin compact (63 Stat. 31), the water treaty of 1944 with the United Mexican States (Treaty Series 994), the decree entered by the Supreme Court of the United States in Arizona against California and others (376 U.S. 340), or, except as otherwise provided herein, the Boulder Canyon Project Act (45 Stat. 1057), the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act (54 Stat. 774), or the Colorado River Storage Project Act (70 Stat. 105).

"Sec. 610. The Secretary is directed to—

"(a) make reports as to the annual consumptive uses and losses of water from the Colorado River system after each successive five-year period, beginning with the five-year period starting on October 1, 1965. Such reports shall include a detailed breakdown of the beneficial consumptive use of water on a State-by-State basis. Specific figures on quantities consumptively used from the major tributary streams flowing into the Colorado River shall also be included on a State-by-State basis. Such reports shall be prepared in consultation with the States of the lower basin individually and with the Upper Colorado River Commission, and shall be transmitted to the President, the Congress, and to the Governors of each State signatory to the Colorado River compact;

"(b) condition all contracts for the delivery of water originating in the drainage

basin of the Colorado River system upon the availability of water under the Colorado River compact.

"Sec. 611. (a) The Secretary shall propose criteria for the coordinated long-range operation of the reservoirs constructed and operated under the authority of the Colorado River Storage Project Act and the Boulder Canyon Project Act, consistent with the provisions of those statutes, the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act, the Colorado River compact, the Upper Colorado River compact and the Mexican Water Treaty. To effect in part the purposes expressed in this paragraph, the criteria shall make provision for the storage of water in storage units of the Colorado River storage project and releases of water from Lake Powell in the following listed order of priority:

"(1) Releases to supply one-half the deficiency described in article III(c) of the Colorado River compact, if any such deficiency exists and is chargeable to the States of the upper division.

"(2) Releases to comply with article III(d) of the Colorado River compact.

"(3) Storage of water not required for the releases specified in clauses (1) and (2) of this subsection to the extent that the Secretary, after consultation with the Upper Colorado River Commission and representatives of the three lower division States and taking into consideration all relevant factors (including, but not limited to, historic streamflows, the most critical period of record, and probabilities of water supply), shall find to be reasonably necessary to assure deliveries under clauses (1) and (2) without impairment of annual consumptive uses in the upper basin pursuant to the Colorado River compact: *Provided*, That water not so required to be stored shall be released from Lake Powell: (i) to the extent it can be reasonably applied in the States of the lower division to the uses specified in article III(e) of the Colorado River compact, but no such releases shall be made when the active storage in Lake Powell is less than the active storage in Lake Mead, (ii) to maintain, as nearly as practicable, active storage in Lake Mead equal to the active storage in Lake Powell, and (iii) to avoid anticipated spills from Lake Powell.

"(b) Not later than July 1, 1968, the criteria proposed in accordance with the foregoing subsection (a) of this section shall be submitted to the Governors of the seven Colorado River Basin States and to such other parties and agencies as the Secretary may deem appropriate for their review and comment. After receipt of comments on the proposed criteria, but not later than January 1, 1969, the Secretary shall adopt appropriate criteria in accordance with this section and publish the same in the Federal Register. Beginning January 1, 1970, and yearly thereafter, the Secretary shall transmit to the Congress and to the Governors of the Colorado River Basin States a report describing the actual operation under the adopted criteria for the preceding compact water year and the projected operation for the current year. As a result of actual operating experience or unforeseen circumstances, the Secretary may thereafter modify the criteria to better achieve the purposes specified in subsection (a) of this section, but only after correspondence with the Governors of the seven Colorado River Basin States and appropriate consultation with such State representatives as each Governor may designate.

"(c) Section 7 of the Colorado River Storage Project Act shall be administered in accordance with the foregoing criteria.

"Sec. 612. (a) Rights of the upper basin to the consumptive use of water apportioned to that basin from the Colorado River system by the Colorado River compact shall not be reduced or prejudiced by any use of such water in the lower basin.

"(b) Nothing in this Act shall be construed so as to impair, conflict with, or otherwise change the duties and powers of the Upper Colorado River Commission.

"Sec. 613. Part I of the Federal Power Act (41 Stat. 1063; 16 U.S.C. 791a-823) shall not be applicable to the reach of the Colorado River between Lake Mead and the present western boundary of the Grand Canyon National Park until and unless otherwise provided by Congress.

"Sec. 614. Except as otherwise provided in this Act in constructing, operating, and maintaining the Central Arizona Project, the Secretary shall be governed by the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902; 32 Stat. 388 and Acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto) to which laws this Act shall be deemed a supplement: *Provided*, That the sale or disposition of power or energy acquired pursuant to section 602 of this Act and surplus to the requirements of the Central Arizona Project shall be in accordance with the provisions of section 9 of the Act of August 4, 1939 (63 Stat. 1193), as amended.

"Sec. 615. (a) All terms used in this Act which are defined in the Colorado River compact shall have the meanings there defined.

"(b) 'Main stream' means the main stream of the Colorado River downstream from Lee Ferry within the United States, including the reservoirs thereon.

"(c) 'User' or 'water user' in relation to main stream water in the lower basin means the United States, or any person or legal entity, entitled under the decree of the Supreme Court of the United States in Arizona against California, and others (376 U.S. 340), to use main stream water when available thereunder.

"(d) 'Active storage' means that amount of water in reservoir storage, exclusive of bank storage, which can be released through the existing reservoir outlet works.

"(e) 'Colorado River Basin States' means the States of Arizona, California, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming.

"Sec. 616. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for construction of the Central Arizona Project, including prepayment for power generation and transmission facilities, but exclusive of distribution and drainage facilities for non-Indian lands, \$768,000,000 (October 1963 price) plus or minus such amounts, if any, as may be justified by reason of ordinary fluctuations in construction costs as indicated by engineering cost indexes applicable to the types of construction involved herein, and not to exceed \$100,000,000 for construction of distribution and drainage facilities for non-Indian lands and, in addition thereto, such sums as may be required for operation and maintenance of the project."

Mr. HAYDEN also submitted an amendment (No. 363), intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 11641, making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Atlantic-Pacific Interoceanic Canal Study Commission, the Delaware River Basin Commission, Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Water Resources Council, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 364

Mr. ELLENDER submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H.R. 11641) making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Atlantic-Pacific Interoceanic Canal Study Commission, the Delaware River Basin Commission, Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Water Resources Council, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: On page 4, before the colon on line 22, insert: "*Provided further*, That in connection with the rehabilitation of the Snake Creek Embankment of the Garrison Dam and Reservoir Project, North Dakota, the Corps of Engineers is authorized to participate with the State of North Dakota to the extent of one-half the cost of widening the present embankment to provide a four-lane right-of-way for U.S. Highway 83 in lieu of the present two-lane highway"

Mr. ELLENDER also submitted an amendment (No. 364), intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 11641, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

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

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 365

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to 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, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] be added as cosponsor of the bill (S. 213) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to restore to individuals who have attained the age of 65 the right to deduct all expenses for their medical care, and for other purposes.

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

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], which was omitted inadvertently from the bill (S. 2476) to amend title III of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 to establish more effective criteria for a finding of serious injury to domestic industry as a result of concessions granted under trade agreements, to make mandatory the findings of the Tariff Commission with respect to the necessity for tariff adjustment, and for other purposes, I introduced yesterday, be added as a cosponsor.

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

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON S. 886

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, on October 17, 18, and 19, the Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization of the Committee on Government Operations will hold hearings on S. 886, a bill to redesignate the Department of the Interior as the Department of Natural Resources and to transfer certain agencies to and from such a Department. The hearings will be held in room 3302 each day at 10 a.m. Testimony will be given by sponsors of the legislation and the Government agencies that would be affected. Private witnesses will be heard from at a later date.

NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF NOMINATION BY THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, as acting chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that today the Senate received the following nomination:

Walter N. Tobriner, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Jamaica, vice Wilson T. M. Beale, Jr.

In accordance with the committee rule, this pending nomination may not be considered prior to the expiration of 6 days of its receipt in the Senate.

FEDERAL CAMPAIGN FINANCING

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, pending in the Senate is a bill which would require the taxpayers to subsidize the political campaigns of candidates running for President and the U.S. Senate.

This proposal, to me, is the height of irresponsibility. I shall oppose it vigorously. I cannot conceive that the Members of Congress could go home and tell the taxpayers in their States, already burdened with high taxes and a staggering Federal deficit, that from now on they are going to be forced to shoulder the cost of senatorial and presidential campaigns.

As a member of the Senate Finance Committee, I voted against the bill in committee. It was reported by a vote of 10 to 7, and I regret to state it has administration support.

Taxes are already too high. The Federal Government has a debt of \$335 billion and is going further in debt by more than \$2 billion per month.

The President has recommended a 10-percent surtax on personal and corporate taxes. Many citizens—and I join them—are urging a cutback in spending so as to eliminate the need for new taxes.

It is estimated that this fantastic scheme of financing the political campaigns of the presidential candidates and Members of the Senate would cost the taxpayers about \$100 million in the 1968 campaign.

The presidential candidates for the two major parties would receive \$14 million

each. The candidates for the U.S. Senate would receive a total of about \$26 million.

If this bill were approved, the candidates for the U.S. Senate in Kansas could receive \$268,000 each. This is absurd. If Congress should vote to provide this kind of money, I would not accept it. I do not see how any Senator could vote for this bill.

The excessive spending of money in political campaigns has—in many instances—destroyed decent and honest elections. I believe this proposal to provide all this money would only serve to increase corruption in political campaigns.

In addition to direct contributions from the U.S. Treasury to the candidates, this bill would permit a taxpayer to take a tax credit up to \$25 from his income tax. It is estimated that this would cost the Treasury another \$50 to \$60 million. This would permit a candidate to use both Federal and private funds. The availability of the commingling of public and private funds would be almost unlimited and would prevent the accurate accounting and reporting as required by law.

Our taxpayers are in no mood for this unwarranted expenditure of tax moneys. It is my hope that Congress will reject this ill-advised bill.

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

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Kansas may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I concur in the remarks of the Senator from Kansas, that this proposal to finance political campaigns out of the Federal Treasury is certainly ill-advised under any circumstances but particularly so at a time when we are operating at a deficit of approximately \$2 billion per month.

I cannot conceive that Congress would have the gall to vote for such a proposal.

In this connection, if the Senator would permit, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a breakdown of the allowances that would be paid out of the Federal Treasury to the respective senatorial candidates in each of the 50 States should this bill be enacted.

I point out that these payments which range from \$100,000 in small States to more than \$1.5 million in the larger States, are payments which would be made to each of the senatorial candidates of both major parties. It would mean that from \$200,000 to \$3 million would be made available out of the Federal Treasury just to senatorial candidates in the respective States.

I ask unanimous consent that this chart be printed in the RECORD, followed by an editorial entitled "A Plan To Subsidize Politicians," Chicago Tribune of September 16, 1967.

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

Application of payment formula for each major party senatorial candidates based on votes cast in a preceding election

State:	Amount of maximum Federal payment
Alabama	1 \$251,000
Alaska	1 100,000
Arizona	1 186,000
Arkansas	1 202,000
California	1 1,500,000
Colorado	1 245,000
Connecticut	1 334,000
Delaware	1 100,000
Florida	1 461,000
Georgia	1 318,000
Hawaii	1 103,000
Idaho	1 132,000
Illinois	1 1,031,000
Indiana	1 508,000
Iowa	1 327,000
Kansas	1 262,000
Kentucky	1 299,000
Louisiana	1 269,000
Maine	1 163,000
Maryland	1 313,000
Massachusetts	1 559,000
Michigan	1 731,000
Minnesota	1 401,000
Mississippi	1 172,000
Missouri	1 454,000
Montana	1 128,000
Nebraska	1 207,000
Nevada	1 100,000
New Hampshire	1 130,000
New Jersey	1 659,000
New Mexico	1 145,000
New York	1 1,523,000
North Carolina	1 375,000
North Dakota	1 121,000
Ohio	1 884,000
Oklahoma	1 276,000
Oregon	1 247,000
Pennsylvania	1 1,054,000
Rhode Island	1 167,000
South Carolina	1 195,000
South Dakota	1 133,000
Tennessee	1 319,000
Texas	1 615,000
Utah	1 170,000
Vermont	1 100,000
Virginia	1 298,000
Washington	1 342,000
West Virginia	1 248,000
Wisconsin	1 428,000
Wyoming	1 100,000

¹ Denotes State in which there will be a senatorial election in 1968.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Sept. 16, 1967]

A PLAN TO SUBSIDIZE POLITICIANS

A new plan to nick the taxpayers for election campaign expenses has been approved by the Democratic majority of the Senate finance committee. The cost for the 1968 election would be at least 54 million dollars, taken out of tax money.

The bill would make available 14 million dollars in federal tax funds to each of the two major party candidates for President and 26 million dollars to the candidates in 34 Senate races. The subsidy costs would be higher if House candidates also got on the gravy train.

There are several objections to this scheme. One of them was stated by Sen. John J. Williams [R., Del.], who was one of the leaders in a fight to repeal an earlier measure to provide a government-financed political slush fund. He said:

"At a time when the federal deficit is 25 to 30 billion dollars and we're talking about increasing taxes, it's unbelievable that Congress and the administration would ask their grandchildren to finance the 1968 election. The money isn't in the treasury."

Another objection to the plan is that it would not do much to reduce over-all expenditures in Presidential campaigns or to eliminate the advantage which rich candi-

dates now have. Much of the spending is on the campaigns for the nomination. The finance committee's bill would apply only to the two months before election day. During that period the candidates would have a choice: either continue spending privately collected funds for the remainder of the campaign or stop spending such money and use the federal tax funds.

The committee's proposal is a variant of a scheme sponsored by Sen. Russell B. Long of Louisiana, the finance committee chairman, which was slipped thru Congress at the close of the 1966 session. Under the Long plan each federal income tax payer could mark a box on his return authorizing the use of \$1 of his taxes for election expenses. This proposal aroused much opposition and Congress voted to suspend its operation.

The finance committee's latest plan includes a variant of the Long check-off. The bill would permit income tax payers to subtract up to \$25 from their annual tax bill for contributions to political candidates at any level.

Encouraging small contributions to political campaigns is a good idea. The high proportion of small gifts made to the Republican party in 1964 was a feature of that campaign. The party received 651,000 individual contributions of \$100 or less. The treasury department estimates that the proposed income tax credits would amount to 50 million dollars or more in 1968. The total cost of the proposed subsidy therefore would be more than 100 million dollars. As Sen. Williams says, "The money isn't in the treasury."

The subsidy bill is designed to be a companion to another measure before the Senate which tightens the rules for reporting of campaign expenditures. The present laws set limits on the spending of candidates for federal offices but the laws are evaded by setting up committees supporting the candidates.

The reform bill would require reporting from all political committees and the committees would have to report the full names and addresses of contributors. Contributors would have to report not only gifts of money but loans and other things of value.

Democrats on the Senate finance committee want to consolidate this desirable bill with the new plan for campaign subsidies. The result is likely to be no bill at all.

Campaign funds are at the center of the ethics problem now disturbing both houses of Congress. The best hope of making campaigns more honest is a strict law requiring disclosure of contributors. Such a law deserves to be considered on its merits, not as part of an unwise scheme for campaign fund subsidies.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I appreciate the comments of the Senator from Delaware. We have been together in committee on this matter, and I share the Senator's views.

I hope the Senate will give serious consideration to this matter before we vote on the bill.

MILWAUKEE JOURNAL CALLS UPON CONGRESS TO CLOSE THE BIGGEST TAX LOOPHOLE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the oil depletion allowance is the biggest and the most indefensible of the loopholes in the Federal tax laws. The Milwaukee Journal, in a recent editorial which inveighed against this anachronism, said:

The truth is that oil and gas have made more millionaires more quickly than any other enterprise—and it is because of the terrific tax advantages our inequitable laws grant.

As the Milwaukee Journal editorial points out:

Every American taxpayer suffers when others get unfair tax advantages.

These unfair advantages should be eliminated before we consider adding a tax increase to the already onerous tax burden of the average American. The Government would reap enormous additional revenue if the loopholes were closed or even reduced in size. For example, a proposal by Representative HENRY REUSS, Democrat, of Wisconsin, to reduce depletion allowances on oil and gas and minerals to 15 percent from the present 27½ percent, in the case of oil and gas, would bring in an estimated \$600 million in additional revenue.

I commend the Milwaukee Journal editorial to the attention of other Senators, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

BIGGEST TAX LOOPHOLE; OIL DEPLETION ALLOWANCE

The Democratic platform of 1960 promised to "close the loopholes" in federal tax laws. A year later President Kennedy made some reform proposals but omitted the most flagrant loophole of all, the oil depletion allowance. For years congress has refused, although by slightly smaller margins each time, to cut the allowance. The senate rejected a proposal to do it by 71 to 9 in 1951. By 1958 the vote was 58 to 31.

The depletion allowance works this way: For tax purposes oil and gas producers may deduct 27½% of their gross income to an amount not exceeding 50% of their net income before depletion and pay no tax on it. Besides that they can claim the normal depreciation that most businesses can and deduction of the "intangible costs of drilling and developing" that no others may claim.

The allowance was written into the first income tax law in 1913 on the ground that it was necessary to compensate for reduction of a national resource. By 1954 a depletion allowance was allowed for most minerals—from 5% for brick and tile clay to 23½% for uranium.

In 1962 when the senate defeated an effort to cut the oil and gas depletion allowance Sen. Tower (R-Tex.) lamented that "it is hard for an oil man to keep his head above water economically."

But listen to Grant E. Judge, partner of Arthur Anderson & Co. of Houston, Tex., an authority on oil and gas taxation. He said that "oil and gas are among the few opportunities by which a person can acquire a substantial fortune." Individuals in the 90% tax bracket, he said, "can consider Uncle Sam as partner in up to 90% of all losses in exploring for oil and gas." And because of the 27% depletion allowance "Uncle Sam takes a relatively moderate share of the income of successful ventures."

The truth is that oil and gas have made more millionaires more quickly than any other enterprise—and it is because of the terrific tax advantages our inequitable laws grant.

There are new moves in congress to close tax loopholes. A major plan is that of Rep. Reuss (D-Wis.). He would reduce depletion allowances on oil and gas and minerals to 15%. It needs support.

Former Sen. Douglas (D-Ill.) often cited the case of a large oil company which, because of tax advantages, had a net income in 1951 of \$4.5 million and paid a federal tax of \$404—less than that paid by a couple with two children and an income of \$4,911!

Every American taxpayer suffers when others get unfair tax advantages. It is past time to close the loopholes for gas and oil.

ADMINISTRATION STRONGLY SUPPORTS RATIFICATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS CONVENTIONS—CXLVI

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in May of 1966, speaking to a representative group of ambassadors from African countries at the White House, President Johnson made an eloquent statement on the subject of human rights. The President said:

The foreign policy of the United States is rooted in its life at home. We will not permit human rights to be restricted in our own country. And we will not support policies abroad which are based on the rule of minorities or the discredited notion that men are unequal before the law.

We will not live by a double standard—professing abroad what we do not practice at home, or venerating at home what we ignore abroad.

This statement of the President very aptly indeed defines what the human rights conventions are all about. I believe firmly that the foreign policy of the United States should be and generally has been rooted in our domestic life. Certainly, U.S. domestic policy is not mute on the vital questions of forced labor, slavery, and the political rights of women. Our foreign policy should obviously reflect the same humanitarian concern which our domestic policy does. This is one more strong argument for the Senate giving its advice and consent to all the human rights conventions before us.

This administration is committed to U.S. ratification of these conventions. At the hearings this year on the Conventions on Forced Labor, Political Rights of Women, and Slavery—so ably chaired by the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd]—the administration was well represented.

Ambassador Arthur J. Goldberg was the leadoff witness and made a tremendously convincing presentation. Accompanying Ambassador Goldberg before the Dodd subcommittee were Richard D. Kearney, the deputy legal adviser of the State Department; Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization, Joseph J. Sisco; Robert Starr, attorney, Office of the Legal Adviser; and Assistant Secretary of Labor for Labor Standards, Esther Peterson.

The presence and endorsement of these distinguished representatives are conclusive proof of this administration's commitment to the ratification of the Human Rights Conventions as being in the best interests of the United States.

I once again urge the Senate to give its advice and consent to the Conventions on Forced Labor, Freedom of Association, Genocide, Political Rights of Women, and Slavery.

LONG-GORE BILL WOULD REDUCE MOST CORRUPTING FORCE IN AMERICAN POLITICS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, there have been some heated and intemperate attacks on the Gore-Long bill that would

follow President Theodore Roosevelt's prescription for taking the corruption out of senatorial and presidential campaigns.

I might say that I am not referring to the remarks which were made this morning. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] is never intemperate.

Of course, the bill can be improved on the floor, and in the House. Obviously, it is not perfect. But it does have the advantage of providing an alternative to the present vicious practice—by far the most corrupting element in American public life—and that is: candidates for the highest offices in this country going hat in hand on bended knee for political contributions from these fat cats—who have an ax to grind—the lobbyists, the big money boys who want to buy political advantage.

In this day of campaigns costing hundreds of thousands of dollars, money does make the difference in many campaigns for high office and every Senator must know this is true.

This difference does work to the advantage of those Senators who have big money on their side. It works to the advantage of those Senators who win without any significant opposition and without much money being spent in their campaign when the big money operators discourage effective opposition.

The present system undoubtedly tends to corrupt members of this body. It undoubtedly gives direct advantage to those forces that can shell out big political money and are willing to do so.

In my view, no force today does more to frustrate the public interest than the power of organized money to buy political influence through campaign contributions.

Furthermore, I am sure it would save far more than it would cost in keeping special vested interests from getting the political handouts and giveaways they now get under the present system.

The Long-Gore bill would go far to end this situation. I hope that Senators will not be intimidated by the intemperate and often self-serving criticisms that have been made against the bill. I accept the remarks made this morning by my two distinguished and revered colleagues.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a fine article written by Charles Bartlett, analyzing the rationale behind the opposition to the bill.

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

THE ELECTION SUBSIDY OPPOSITION

(By Charles Bartlett)

The Republicans and Southern Democrats lining up against the Gore-Long bill to finance elections to federal offices with federal funds are being less than candid in the tenor of their attacks.

The Republicans unanimously oppose the legislation because their money-raising techniques are working far better at the moment than the Democrats'. They did well after they spent more in the 1966 elections and they expect to do the same in 1968.

President Johnson has not found a treasurer who can raise money as efficiently as Gen. Lucius Clay is raising it for the Republicans. As a consequence he is relying heavily upon Congress' passage of the Gore-Long measure to furnish the funds that he will need. In contrast the Republicans believe

they can raise and spend more than the \$14 million that the bill would yield them for the presidential race.

Southern Democrats and other established members with safe seats dislike the bill for the practical reason that it will incite opposition against them. A man will shrink from a hopeless race if it's going to cost him money, but he has little to lose if the expenses are paid by the Treasury. He needs only to climb into the ring and swing and hope.

In the hardheaded world of politics, these seem to some to be unanswerable arguments for resisting the effort by Senators Albert Gore and Russell Long to clean out the Augean Stable of campaign financing. But the difficulty is that these arguments don't have an enlightened, unselfish, or statesman-like ring when they are publicly reiterated.

Accordingly many Republicans and Southern Democrats are adopting a tactic of condemning the Gore-Long bill as a new extravagance that is being foisted upon the taxpayers, a "raid upon the Treasury" as Senator John Williams of Delaware put it. This is a line of argument which smacks of demagoguery.

It is true that the cost of the campaign subsidies, if utilized in 1968 by two candidates for President and all candidates for the Senate and if the candidates for House seats are allotted an average of \$50,000 each, would total slightly more than \$100 million.

This is slightly less than \$1 for every eligible voter. It is 4 percent of the annual cost to the Treasury of the gas and oil depletion allowances, a tax preference that would be certain to dwindle in scope if Congress becomes less beholden to oilmen. It is a tiny fraction of the cost of all the tax loopholes that would become vulnerable if the members ceased to worry about campaign funds.

The cost of the subsidy would be an infinitesimal slice of the \$45 billion in defense contracts awarded annually to companies whose executives feel an intangible and unhealthy sense of compulsion to join President's Clubs and ante up for party dinners. No matter how purely the contracts may be administered by the Pentagon, this interplay of political fund-raising becomes a corrosive force.

The subsidy would accomplish one critical economy in yielding members of Congress more control of their time. Now stretched so thin that they tend to be superficial in most areas in which they deal, the members lose time in their necessity to court their contributors with such gestures of deference as accepting invitations to make speeches or attend long, dull banquets.

Theodore Roosevelt was the first major sponsor of the subsidy idea. He spoke out for it in 1907 and Republicans who oppose it today ignore the opportunity it provides to launch the party in every district of the South and shake off the big business label which has hobbled the GOP, in some elections unfairly, for over 30 years. This is a Republican chance to become the party of the middle class.

The Gore-Long bill is not a final answer to all the problems of election costs. It does not deal with the pre-convention costs of presidential candidates or with primary costs in races for the House and Senate.

But it leaves a candidate free to accept or turn his back on the subsidy. This is a far more honorable alternative than many that arise to confront men seeking federal office in races in which the need for funds usually exceeds their availability.

GENERALS WHO SOUND OFF TRYING TO DIRECT THE FOREIGN POLICY OF OUR NATION DESERVE REBUKE

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, it has become nauseating in the extreme to continue to read of members of the

Joint Chiefs of Staff sounding off publicly as to what should be the proper foreign policy of our country. This week, Gen. Earle G. Wheeler, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, when asked about a policy to limit the air bombing to that portion of Vietnam south of the demilitarized zone, stated:

In my judgment, this proposal is dead. It sort of burgeoned for a while; it died off and except for an occasional piece in the paper, I have seen no reference to it recently. Certainly, in the circles that I have access to, there is no discussion of this concept any more.

Here is an example of what former President Eisenhower in his farewell statement to the American people at the end of his final Presidential term denounced as the evil and danger to our country of the military-industrial complex seeking to chart the course of our country and to take control. General Wheeler's tirade also once again proves the wisdom of the statement of the great World War I French Premier Clemenceau that:

War is too serious a matter to be entrusted to generals.

General Wheeler would be well advised to stop regarding himself as a statesman and attend to his military duties.

It really would be a fitting and needed rebuke if Secretary of Defense McNamara were to state bluntly to General Wheeler and to Adm. U. S. Grant Sharp, the Pacific Fleet commander who also periodically attempts to influence foreign policy, to cease and desist and inform them that the men who wrote the Constitution of our country 178 years ago were wise men. They were indeed great patriots. They had helped our colonial forebears win independence from England and they provided in no uncertain terms in the Constitution of the United States that civilian authority must always be supreme over military authority.

General Wheeler deserves a rebuke for his effrontery in trying to direct the foreign policy of our Government. He has declared that we Americans must, through bombing, close north Vietnam's major port of Haiphong; that the bombing of North Vietnam should continue without interruption; and that restrictions on what targets will be hit which have been imposed by President Johnson should be lifted. He and Admiral Sharp have proposed as a policy of our Government to revoke the restrictions placed by President Johnson and his Secretary of Defense, Robert S. McNamara, and proceed to mine the harbor of Haiphong and bomb the docks. What care they if some Russian freighters entering the port or at the docks are damaged or blown up and some members of the crew killed and wounded?

They have both testified as favoring closing the port of Haiphong and thereby shutting off North Vietnam's supplies coming in ships from the Soviet Union and Communist China and also those many ships laden with war supplies and food from Hong Kong to Haiphong bearing the Union Jack of Great Britain. They opposed "gradualism," as they call it, in waging the war.

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, President Johnson and the Nation would be much better served if these warhawk generals and admirals refrained from attempting to influence our Nation's foreign policy and restricted themselves to their job of soldiering. If the President and his advisers and the Senate Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee seek the advice of military leaders, then it should be balanced advice. There are other extremely knowledgeable and qualified generals who have expressed views directly contrary to those of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I refer, as three of many, to Lt. Gen. James Gavin, former Chief of U.S. Army Plans and Operations, a famed combat paratrooper, and former Ambassador to France; to Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, former Army Chief of Staff and commander of our forces in the Korean war; and to Gen. David M. Shoup, former Commandant of the Marine Corps, who publicly stated:

I don't think the whole of South East Asia, as related to the present and future safety and freedom of the people of this country, is worth the life or limb of a single American.

These are just a few of the proven and outstanding military leaders of our Nation who oppose the reckless and foolhardy course on which we have embarked in Vietnam.

Another notable military leader, retired Army Gen. Hugh B. Hester, has also spoken out opposing our involvement in the civil war in Vietnam. General Hester served in the U.S. Army for 34 consecutive years and holds the Silver Star and Distinguished Service Medal. On September 18, 1967, there appeared in the Akron Beacon Journal, one of the country's great newspapers, a letter to the editor from General Hester. In his letter he clearly and concisely refutes the arguments of the warhawk for escalation of the bombing of North Vietnam, a course of action most recently urged by General Wheeler. General Hester wrote:

Few will challenge the view that the full use of U.S. military might could destroy the Vietnamese people, even return them to the Stone Age, as General LeMay put it. Most of our intellectual and spiritual leaders and millions of just ordinary plain people however, challenge the wisdom of doing so. . . .

The present pace of the war, if maintained by Mr. Johnson, is certain to bring China actively into the war eventually, along with the support, logistically at least, of her socialist allies. . . .

The question then immediately arises: Could the United States conquer China by conventional bombing? The answer is obviously NO. The U.S. could no doubt destroy China with the use of nuclear, bacteriological, chemical and radiological weapons, but the U.S. still could not conquer China.

In the process, however, of destroying China, the fallout would also destroy America along with most of the rest of the world.

The next question is, could the war be limited to China, even using conventional weapons? The answer again is NO. War has its own logic, absurd as it may seem.

World tensions are much higher today than

they were at the beginning of both World Wars. . . .

My own belief is that the flames of war would spread to all of Africa, Asia, Latin America and even Europe within a matter of weeks, once the 700 million Chinese became directly involved in the Vietnamese war. The revanchist West German Nazi would not be likely to pass up this opportunity to recover the German losses of World Wars I and II. . . .

Any escalation . . . can only hasten this disaster. . . .

Earlier this year General Hester publicly stated:

I oppose the Vietnamese War now, not only because it is being waged in violation of the U.S. Constitution and U.S. treaty obligations under the U.N. Charter, but also because it is in violation of the basic interests of the American people. The Vietnam war is not a war of self-defense or even of general self-interest. It is a war in the profit interests of only a very few. . . . This is an illegal, immoral and wholly unnecessary war.

Mr. President, in the September 18 edition of the Akron Beacon Journal there also appeared an excellent editorial entitled "Worth the Risk," calling for an unconditional end to the bombing of North Vietnam as a step toward bringing the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong to the negotiating table where a cease-fire and an armistice might be arranged, thereby ending our involvement in that civil war. I commend this editorial to my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

[From the Akron Beacon Journal,
Sept. 18, 1967]

WORTH THE RISK

Although U.N. Secretary General U Thant reports that there are no new peace gestures from North Vietnam, he told a press conference Saturday that he believes it would be worth the risk for the U.S. to stop bombing North Vietnam for three or four weeks.

"I am convinced," U Thant said, "there will be meaningful talks within three or four weeks if the bombing is halted."

He also believes that, as long as the bombing continues, there will be no chance of getting Hanoi to peace talks. North Vietnam, he says, will not commit itself to go to the peace table in advance of a cessation of the bombing, but he relies on information from governments close to Hanoi that, if the bombing is halted, the chances for talking peace will be vastly improved.

Isn't it worth risk?

Perhaps, if North Vietnam is spared bomb attacks for three or four weeks, it could amass new military strength and repair its damages.

But the alternative is a chance to end this futile and costly war, to stop the slaughter that has cost 13,129 American lives in combat and has left 81,669 Americans wounded.

It is unlikely that even greater bombing will force North Vietnam to capitulate. On the contrary, the bombing carries the risk of involving Red China or the Soviet Union—or both—on the side of the Communists.

If U.S. does not stop the bombing for three or four weeks, we'll never know whether U Thant's sources were reliable. If the Secretary General is correct in his appraisal of the situation and the Washington "hawks" are wrong, we risk sacrificing thousands more men in an even greater war.

The answer to U Thant is clear. Stop the bombing.

If no peace talks are forthcoming within a stated period, the raids can be resumed and intensified.

Whatever the risk involved, it's worth taking, to stop this war.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, every effort must be made to counteract the pressures of the generals and admirals who strive to override the decisions of their civilian superiors. Let us hope that President Johnson will soon announce an unconditional cessation of our bombing of North Vietnam and take meaningful steps toward obtaining a cease fire and an armistice. Whatever risk is involved, it is worth taking in order to bring an end to this unconscionable war.

PRESENTATION OF MEDAL OF HONOR TO SGT. DAVID DOLBY, U.S. ARMY, WHO COMES FROM PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, this morning, at a most impressive ceremony at the White House, the President of the United States conferred the Congressional Medal of Honor upon Sgt. David C. Dolby, U.S. Army.

The ceremony was attended by Sergeant Dolby's mother and father, and younger brother.

The Dolby family comes from the beautiful Perkiomen Valley, near the post office of Oaks, in Montgomery County, Pa.

This young man is an authentic American hero.

I wish to read into the RECORD the brief but impressive citation which was read by the Secretary of the Army at the ceremony this morning:

The President of the United States of America, authorized by Act of Congress, March 3, 1863, has awarded in the name of The Congress the Medal of Honor, to Sergeant David C. Dolby, United States Army for conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity in action at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty:

On 21 May 1966, Sergeant Dolby, then Specialist Four, was serving as a machine gunner of Company B, 1st Battalion (Airborne), 8th Cavalry in the Republic of Vietnam, when his platoon, while advancing tactically, suddenly came under intense fire from the enemy located on a ridge immediately to the front. Six members of the platoon were killed instantly and a number were wounded, including the platoon leader. Specialist Dolby's every move brought fire from the enemy. However, aware that the platoon leader was critically wounded, and that the platoon was in a precarious situation, Specialist Dolby moved the wounded men to safety and deployed the remainder of the platoon to engage the enemy. Subsequently, his dying platoon leader ordered Specialist Dolby to withdraw the forward elements to rejoin the platoon. Despite the continuous intense enemy fire and with utter disregard for his own safety, Specialist Dolby positioned able-bodied men to cover the withdrawal of the forward elements, assisted the wounded to the new position, and he, alone, attacked enemy positions until his ammunition was expended. Replenishing his ammunition, he returned to the area of most intense action, single-handedly killed three enemy machine gunners and neutralized the enemy fire, thus enabling friendly elements on the flank to advance on the enemy redoubt. He defied the enemy fire to personally carry a seriously wounded soldier to safety, where he could be treated and, returning to the forward area,

he crawled through withering fire to within fifty meters of the enemy bunkers and threw smoke grenades to mark them for air strikes. Although repeatedly under fire at close range from enemy snipers and automatic weapons, Specialist Dolby directed artillery fire on the enemy and succeeded in silencing several enemy weapons. He remained in his exposed location until his comrades had displaced to more secure positions. His actions of unsurpassed valor during four hours of intense combat were a source of inspiration to his entire company, contributed significantly to the success of the overall assault on the enemy position, and were directly responsible for saving the lives of a number of his fellow soldiers. Specialist Dolby's heroism was in the highest tradition of the United States Army.

Mr. President, all of us in Pennsylvania are very proud of this brave young man.

UNNECESSARY COSTS IN PROCUREMENT OF RADAR SETS

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, on September 19, I delivered a speech concerning two different Army procurements, one of which involved the AN/PRC-25 and AN/PRC-77 radio sets awarded to Radio Corporation of America in a multiyear procurement which the Army attempted to justify on the basis of lack of manufacturing drawings and also because of a supposed urgency for delivery. This award was made to RCA in spite of the fact that a small business firm had on file a bid which was lower by almost \$1 million for this identical equipment.

The claim by the Army regarding the lack of manufacturing drawings appears as specious as the urgency of delivery claim is fallacious. I have been reliably informed that the drawings do exist and that delivery of these radio sets 2 years from now is not urgent.

Mr. President, on September 21, 1967, I received a letter from the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army signed by the Honorable Robert A. Brooks, which actually states that drawings are not available and, I quote:

RCA was awarded a contract in June 1966 to produce the initial production quantities while further design changes and improvements were being affected.

Mr. Brooks goes on to state that:

As a matter of fact, due to design changes resulting from concurrent field tests, the final procurement package will not be available until early December, 1967.

In other words, Mr. President, what Mr. Brooks is saying is that the Army is engaged in a development program running parallel with two production contracts which exceed \$20 million for portable walkie-talkie radio sets.

This is the exact same practice that has been investigated by the General Accounting Office on radar set AN/PPS-4 and radiacmeter IM-108/PPD involving millions upon millions of dollars wasted by the Army in producing electronic equipment in quantity before the design was frozen.

In the case of the IM-108/PD radiacmeter, five separate and distinct contracts were awarded for 59,776 units, resulting in a waste of the taxpayers funds of a total of \$2.9 million for defective equipment. Moreover, in its decision ren-

dered on this case, the General Accounting Office recommended that the engineers in charge of that fiasco be fired, and they were in fact removed from the Government payroll only long enough for the national press to give its attention to more important matters. Whereupon, the Army quietly reinstated these same men, using as an excuse the fact that they had admitted they were wrong and promised not to do it again. This is incredible, but true.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reports from the Comptroller General Nos. B-146834 and B-146906 be printed in the RECORD.

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

UNNECESSARY COSTS INCURRED IN SOLE-SOURCE PROCUREMENT OF PORTABLE RADAR SETS, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

(Report to the Congress of the United States by the Comptroller General of the United States, October 1964)

To the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate:

Our review of sole-source procurements by the Department of the Army disclosed that the Government had incurred unnecessary costs of more than \$2.2 million in the sole-source procurement of 502 AN/PPS-4 portable radar sets. These unnecessary costs were incurred because agency officials procured the radar sets without waiting until known deficiencies in the sets had been corrected and technical data suitable for use in competitive procurement had become available. The deficiencies known prior to procurement were that the radar sets were not consistently accurate in determining the range of a target, were unable to detect a target satisfactorily, and were cumbersome to operate. After the contract for the sole-source procurement was awarded, it was necessary to stop production for 15 months while modifications were being made to correct these deficiencies. This delay unnecessarily increased the cost of the corrected units by \$356,220. In addition, we estimated that, on the basis of competitive prices obtained in a subsequent procurement, unnecessary costs of about \$1.86 million had been incurred because these sets had been procured without competition. In fact the successful bidder's price under the competitive procurement was more than 55 percent below the price paid to the sole-source producer.

The Acting Assistant Secretary of the Army (Installations and Logistics) agreed with the facts presented in the report and advised us that the report would be brought to the attention of procuring commands. He also indicated that, subsequent to the procurement in question, more extensive controls were instituted regarding procurement of new equipment that included the requirement that a summary of all objections to a proposed procurement be submitted to higher authority. This summary is to include engineer- and service-test results.

The Acting Assistant Secretary also stated that disciplinary action was not believed to be warranted because the decisions with respect to this procurement were made in accordance with the then accepted policy and that, when considered in light of the then prevailing policy, the facts presented were considered proper justification for these decisions. Officials in the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Installations and Logistics) subsequently advised us that, at the time of this procurement, there was an absence of guidance and control over the procurement of new equipment, generally, but that the Army's policy was that development and production of an item could be effectively accomplished simultaneously. Procuring offi-

cial in this instance, however, had been aware of the user and engineer objections prior to awarding this contract but had requested approval from higher authority for the award without disclosing this information. We believe, therefore, that these actions should be noted in the personnel records of responsible officials, for consideration in the future promotions, reassignments, and other personal actions.

The management weaknesses disclosed in this report have occurred in the past and have been identified in other General Accounting Office reports. We reported on the Department of the Army's procurement of defective radiation-measuring instruments (B-146834, dated December 17, 1963). Under 5 contracts for this equipment the Army spent \$3.8 million even though it knew prior to each contract that the equipment was defective. We recently reported also on the non-competitive procurement of military ¾-ton trucks (B-146921, dated August 12, 1964). By procuring these vehicles without competition, the Army incurred unnecessary costs estimated at \$12.1 million even though it could have obtained the information sufficient for competitive procurement purposes. As stated in this report and in previous reports, action has been taken by the Department of the Army to promulgate policies and regulations controlling the procurement of new equipment and to intensify its efforts to promptly obtain technical data for competitive procurement purposes. We will evaluate the effectiveness of these actions in future reviews.

Copies of this report are being sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of the Army.

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

INTRODUCTION

The General Accounting Office has made a review of the procurement of AN/PPS-4 portable radar sets by the Department of the Army. The purpose of our review was to inquire into the reasonableness of the award of a contract for these sets to Sperry Gyroscopic Company (Sperry), Great Neck, Long Island, New York, on a sole-source basis. This review was initiated in connection with a request dated May 13, 1963, from Congressman George H. Mahon on behalf of the Subcommittee on Defense, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, that the General Accounting Office make a review of electronics equipment with particular emphasis on sole-source procurements. This review was made pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 87). The scope of our review is shown on page 15 of this report.

BACKGROUND

The general policy of the Department of Defense, as set forth in the Armed Services Procurement Regulation (ASPR), section 1-300.1, provides that all procurements, whether by formal advertising or by negotiation, shall be made on a competitive basis to the maximum practicable extent. The responsibility for implementing these provisions is assigned to each military department. The Department of the Army has assigned this responsibility to each major subcommand of the United States Army Materiel Command (AMC).

The United States Army Electronics Command, a major subcommand of AMC, was established in August 1962 and assumed most of the logistic functions previously performed by the Office of the Chief Signal Officer, United States Army. This command has the responsibility for the research, design, development, testing, and supply management of electronic equipment.

In a recent reorganization of the major agencies within the Electronics Command, the United States Army Electronics Materiel

Agency (referred to in this report as the Materiel Agency) and the United States Army Electronics Materiel Support Agency (referred to in this report as the Support Agency) have been replaced by various directorates. The responsibility for the procurements discussed in this report now rests with the Philadelphia Division of the Procurement and Production Directorate, United States Army Electronics Command.

The duties formerly performed by the Materiel and Support Agencies and presently being performed by the newly established directorates include computation of requirements, control of inventories, award and administration of contracts, provision of engineering specifications for procurement of electronic equipment, performance or monitoring of preproduction testing and qualification, and approval of equipment.

In order to determine whether newly developed equipment is acceptable for Army use, the Department of Defense procedures require the cognizant military department to test such equipment prior to authorizing a contractor to commence production. These tests are generally referred to as service tests. The purpose of the tests is to determine the physical and operational characteristics, organizational maintenance requirements, and whether the equipment will be accurate, durable, and reliable when subjected to use by troops in the field.

The AN/PPS-4, developed by Sperry, is a silent, lightweight, portable, forward-area, combat-surveillance radar set used by infantry troops. This set is capable of detecting and locating moving targets and certain fixed targets under conditions of poor visibility. The Army procured 10 radar sets in June 1955 for experimental tests and evaluations. In August 1956 the Army procured eight additional sets with various modifications for further testing. The service tests of the developmental and preproduction models were conducted for the Electronics Command by the United States Continental Army Command (USCONARC) under actual field conditions. Subsequent to the Army reorganization in August 1962, the United States Army Test and Evaluation Command was given the responsibility for performing service tests on newly developed equipment.

Since June 1958, a total of 1,437 radar sets and related items have been procured by the Materiel Agency for about \$10.9 million.

A list of principal management officials of the Department of Defense and the Department of the Army responsible for the administration of activities discussed in this report is shown as appendix I.

FINDING AND CONCLUSIONS

Unnecessary costs incurred in the sole-source procurement of portable radar sets

The Government has incurred unnecessary costs of more than \$2.2 million in the sole-source procurement of 502 AN/PPS-4 portable radar sets by the Department of the Army. These unnecessary costs were incurred because agency officials procured the radar sets without waiting until known deficiencies in the sets had been corrected and technical data suitable for use in competitive procurement had become available. The deficiencies known prior to procurement were that the radar sets were not consistently accurate in determining the range of a target, were unable to detect a target satisfactorily, and were cumbersome to operate. After the contract for the sole-source procurement was awarded, it was necessary to stop production for 15 months while modifications were being made to correct these deficiencies. This delay unnecessarily increased the cost of the corrected units by \$356,220. In addition, we estimated that, on the basis of competitive prices obtained in a subsequent procurement, unnecessary costs of about \$1.86 million had been incurred because these sets had been procured without competition. In fact the successful bidder's price under the competitive procure-

ment was more than 55 percent below the price paid to the sole-source producer.

Initial award and service-test results

In June 1958 fixed-price redeterminable contract DA-36-039-SC-76361 was awarded by the Materiel Agency to Sperry Gyroscope Company on a sole-source basis at a cost to the Government of \$3,474,962, for the production of 462 vacuum-tube radar sets. The vacuum-tube model, suitable for Army use only as interim equipment, did not satisfactorily meet the Army's need because of its excessive weight and noise. This interim equipment was procured to furnish field units with combat-surveillance capabilities at a time when field units had no other equipment that could perform its function. This contract was awarded without the benefit of competition, and the Army justified the sole-source procurement on the basis that the Government did not have procurement data that were suitable for use in soliciting competitive bids. We did not ascertain the validity of the Army's justification at that time. The contract required that an updated set of drawings suitable for use in competitive procurement be delivered 30 days after the initial production equipment was submitted for acceptance.

In January 1959, about 7 months after the award of the contract for 462 vacuum-tube radar sets, the Electronics Command accepted a plan, submitted by Sperry to partially transistorize the radar sets. This plan was approved, and the partial transistorization was expected to result in the silent operation of the radar sets because a battery, rather than a gasoline-engine generator would be the primary source of power. The Materiel Agency reduced the quantity of radar sets on order from 462 to 402 by a contract modification, thus making \$440,000 available toward offsetting the increased costs of \$526,000 for the partial transistorization of the radar sets. The final contract price for 402 sets, including partial transistorization and other changes, was \$3,704,108.

In March 1960, USCONARC completed service tests of two preproduction models of the partially transistorized radar sets and concluded that (1) 3 of the deficiencies found in the service tests of the vacuum-tube-type developmental models had been carried over into the partially transistorized version without correction and (2) 20 of 29 new deficiencies found, when considered collectively, were so serious that corrective action was deemed mandatory prior to acceptance and issuance of these sets to troops. Among the major deficiencies noted and their effects on performance of the radar set were (1) erroneous range calibration, which resulted in loss of acceptable range accuracy, (2) transmission failure, which resulted in unsatisfactory detection of a target, and (3) faulty tripod design, which contributed to the cumbersome operation of the radar set and required, in many instances, time-consuming operations to realign the tripod legs. The Support Agency issued technical-action requests to the contractor in April and May 1960 that included actions to correct the above-cited deficiencies prior to production.

Additional procurement

Review and approval of proposed procurements of certain items at the Materiel Agency is performed by the Procurement Planning Committee. This committee consists of three officials of the Materiel Agency, the Chief Engineer of the Support Agency, and a secretary appointed by the chairman of the committee. On May 10, 1960, the Support Agency's Chief Engineer recommended that the committee require that all improvements to the radar sets recommended by USCONARC be incorporated in the 502 additional radar sets to be procured under a modification to contract -76361. He further recommended that the contract modification negotiated should provide that the improvements be made when the sets were produced,

which would preclude the necessity for engineering changes for that purpose subsequent to award of the contract modification. At that time the Procurement Planning Committee consisted of:

Col. J. G. Bent, Jr., Deputy for Procurement, Materiel Agency (chairman).

S. Rabinowitz, Assistant Deputy for Procurement, Materiel Agency (alternate chairman).

J. W. Weseloh, Chief Engineer, Support Agency.

Lt. Col. P. F. Balas, Assistant Deputy for Stock Control, Materiel Agency.

L. A. Kapust, Assistant Deputy for Industrial Preparedness, Materiel Agency.

J. H. Schroeter, Secretary, Procurement Planning Committee, Materiel Agency.

On May 13, 1960, the Committee agreed that the proposed procurement should be made in accordance with the recommendations of the Support Agency's Chief Engineer. On June 15, 1960, however, in a request to the Chief Signal Officers for approval of the modification to contract -76361, the Deputy for Procurement of the Materiel Agency failed to disclose that negotiations had already been held with Sperry on June 2 and June 6, 1960, on the basis that the improvements would not be required to be made in the sets to be procured under the contract modification. Further, on June 17, 1960, the Assistant Deputy for Procurement approved the Committee's request that the USCONARC-recommended improvements not be required in these sets. We were informed that this decision was made because previous negotiations with Sperry had been on that basis and that apparently this decision overrode the objections of the Support Agency's Chief Engineer. We could find no evidence that the Chief Signal Officer was subsequently informed of the decision not to make the improvements—considered mandatory by user and engineer organizations—to the 502 radar sets subsequently ordered.

On June 30, 1960, the Materiel Agency procured an additional 502 partially transistorized radar sets from Sperry, at a cost to the Government of \$3,267,016, under a modification to contract -76361. Subsequent modifications increased the cost to \$3,358,270, or a unit price of \$6,690. The records show that the sole-source procurement of this additional quantity was justified by the Army on the basis that adequate procurement data were not available for use in soliciting competitive bids. The contracting officer did not state that urgency was a factor in the decision to procure on a sole-source basis.

Stop-work order

On August 29, 1960, 2 months after the award for the 502 radar sets, the Materiel Agency issued an order to Sperry to stop all production. This stop-work order was issued so that improvements, modifications, and engineering changes could be incorporated into the 402 radar sets being produced under the basic contract. These changes were necessary to correct serious deficiencies identified by USCONARC in March 1960 in its service tests of the developmental and preproduction models. These are the same changes which, prior to procurement under the contract modification, the Support Agency's Chief Engineer had recommended be required to be incorporated in the 502 radar sets proposed for procurement.

The stop-work order, which was in effect for 15 months, was canceled, and authority to proceed with production was issued by the contracting officer on November 29, 1961. This work stoppage resulted in unnecessary costs of \$356,220, which were attributable to increased labor costs and to a loss in efficiency resulting from the 15-month gap in production. This amount increased the total price to the Government for the 502 sets to \$3,714,490, the amount agreed upon with Sperry in a price redetermination made in March 1962.

In October 1961 the Army completed service tests at the Tobyhanna Army Depot of the partially transistorized radar sets. The sets tested included the improvements that had been recommended by USCONARC and required improvements identified in subsequent tests. The Army then concluded, on the basis of these tests, that the partially transistorized radar sets would be accepted as suitable to the user and that the same improvements should be incorporated into all the 904 sets then being procured under the contract -76361. These partially transistorized radar sets were subsequently shipped to Army units for use.

Savings resulting from competition

On March 23, 1962, the Materiel Agency received procurement data, in the form of Government specifications and a model from the Support Agency, that were determined to be suitable for use in soliciting competitive bids. On April 16, 1962, the Procurement Planning Committee approved the plan to procure about 436 portable radar sets by formal advertising.

On April 26, 1962, the Materiel Agency issued an invitation for bids for various quantities of the radar sets. Twenty bids were received, 10 of which were lower than the bid of \$4,489 a set submitted by the sole-source producer, Sperry. The unit prices in these 10 bids ranged from \$2,978 to \$4,280. The lowest acceptable bid by quantity and unit price was submitted by Aeronca Manufacturing Corporation for 454 radar sets at \$2,978 each. The Materiel Agency awarded contract DA-36-039-AMC-01087(E) to Aeronca on August 24, 1962, for the 454 radar sets at a price of \$1,372,873.

The lowest acceptable bid price of \$2,978 a unit was a reduction of \$3,712, or 55.5 percent, from the unit price of \$6,690 previously paid the sole-source producer under the modification to contract -76361, or a total reduction of about \$1.86 million. Further, personnel of the Materiel Agency advised us that Aeronca's performance under the contract was satisfactory and records indicate that, during December 1963 and January 1964, 73 radar sets were accepted by the Army, 45 of which were shipped overseas for use in the field.

Agency comments and our evaluation

On April 30, 1964, we brought these findings to the attention of the Department of Defense and proposed that the Commanding General, United States Army Materiel Command, bring this report to the attention of procuring commands, to emphasize the need to (1) develop equipment, prior to procurement, to a point where major modifications would not be required and (2) accumulate the procurement data necessary to permit timely solicitation of bids for competitive procurement. We proposed further that the procuring agencies be required to bring to the attention of higher authority all objections to planned procurements raised by interested parties, including the using and engineering organizations, so that the approving officials would be in a position to consider these objections in their evaluation of the proposed contract. We proposed also that the Secretary of the Army take disciplinary action in this matter against those individuals who did not properly perform their duties and exercise prudent judgment in expending significant amounts of Government funds.

By letter dated June 26, 1964 (see appendix II), the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Army (Installations and Logistics) commented on our findings and proposals. He agreed with the facts presented in this report and advised us that a digest of this report would be brought to the attention of procuring commands. He agreed also that all objections in connection with a proposed procurement which might be raised by interested parties should be included in the facts

presented to approving officials for their consideration, and he indicated that, subsequent to the procurement in question, more extensive controls were instituted regarding procurement of new equipment that included the requirement that a summary of such information be submitted to higher authority. This summary is to include engineer- and service-test results. His additional comments are summarized as follows:

1. Army studies and reports on combat-surveillance and target-acquisition equipment covering the period fiscal years 1958-63 reflected continual emphasis upon the urgent need for this type of equipment. There was a concerted effort on the part of the Army to acquire a combat-surveillance capability as quickly as possible during that period of time. Under the Army reorganization, more extensive controls come into play in the event that urgency justifies procurement for troop issue before completion of the development and adoption as a standard item. The Combat Development Command is responsible for making recommendations to the Department of the Army on the urgency of a requirement of this nature. Further, the provisions of AR 700-20, dated July 25, 1963, require the satisfaction of 25 criteria before initiating production in a situation of this type.

Although there was a need for equipment of this type, the fact remains that the using forces did not want the particular equipment then being considered for procurement until major deficiencies in the equipment had been corrected. On the basis of the previous negotiations with Sperry, the contract modification—contrary to the Procurement Planning Committee's initial agreement—did not provide that corrections be made when the sets were produced. Further, the basis for the Army's justification for the sole-source procurement was not urgency but inadequate procurement data for use in soliciting competitive bids.

2. The recommended disciplinary action was not believed to be warranted. The decisions with respect to the award in question were made in accordance with what was then accepted policy. The facts as presented, when considered in the light of the prevailing policy, were considered proper justification for the decisions.

Officials in the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Installations and Logistics), in response to our request for clarification of the above comment, stated that, at the time of this procurement, there was an absence of guidance and control over the procurement of new equipment generally but that the Army's policy was that development and production of an item could be effectively accomplished simultaneously. Procuring officials in this instance, however, had been aware of the user and engineer objections prior to awarding this contract but had requested approval from higher authority for the award without disclosing this information.

Conclusions

We believe that, generally, production contracts for new equipment should not be awarded when the results of service tests performed by the user on developmental or preproduction models had disclosed deficiencies that rendered the item unsuitable for field use. We believe also that efficiency and economy are obtained for the Government by the maximum practical use of competition in procurement programs.

As disclosed in this report, deficiencies had been identified in the developmental and preproduction models of the partially transistorized radar sets that rendered them unsuitable for Army use. Notwithstanding the serious deficiencies found by USCONARC, a decision was made by the Materiel Agency to procure an additional quantity of 502 radar sets on a sole-source basis. Further, the Materiel Agency's stated reason for procuring

radar sets on a sole-source basis was that it lacked the procurement data necessary to solicit competitive bids. If the Materiel Agency had waited until an acceptable radar set was designed and procurement data suitable for solicitation of competitive bids became available, as provided for under the initial contract, the Agency could have procured the 502 radar sets at a savings of 55.5 percent, or about \$1.86 million. Also, the Army could have avoided costs of \$356,220 paid for the work stoppage under the contract modification for the 502 sets while the deficiencies identified in the developmental and preproduction models under previous awards were being corrected.

The Army advised us of the corrective actions taken to preclude recurrence of situations such as this, and we will evaluate them in future reviews. In view of the fact that responsible officials (1) were aware of the deficiencies in the equipment and objections of the using forces to buying this equipment prior to the correction of these deficiencies and (2) requested approval for the award without disclosing the user and engineer objections, however, we believe that these actions should be noted in their personnel records, for consideration in future promotions, reassignments, and other personnel actions.

The management weaknesses disclosed in this report have occurred in the past and have been identified in other General Accounting Office reports. We reported on the Department of the Army's procurement of defective radiation-measuring instruments (B-146834, dated December 17, 1963). Under five contracts for this equipment the Army spent \$3.8 million even though it knew prior to each contract that the equipment was defective. We recently reported also on the noncompetitive procurement of military ¾-ton trucks (B-146921, dated August 12, 1964). By procuring these vehicles without competition, the Army incurred unnecessary costs estimated at \$12.1 million even though it could have obtained the information sufficient for the competitive procurement purposes. As stated in this report and in previous reports, action has been taken by the Department of the Army to promulgate policies and regulations controlling the procurement of new equipment and to intensify its efforts to promptly obtain technical data for competitive procurement purposes. We will evaluate the effectiveness of these actions in future reviews.

SCOPE OF REVIEW

Our review included an examination of the records and reports relative to the development, testing, sole-source procurement, modification, and use of the AN/PFS-4 radar set within the Department of the Army for the period April 1955 to January 1964. Our review was made at the United States Army Electronics Materiel Agency, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, and at the United States Army Electronic Materiel Support Agency and the United States Army Electronics Research and Development Laboratory, both of which are located at Fort Monmouth, New Jersey.

PRINCIPAL MANAGEMENT OFFICIALS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND THE DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY RESPONSIBLE FOR THE ADMINISTRATION OF ACTIVITIES DISCUSSED IN THIS REPORT

	Tenure of office	
	From—	To—
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE		
Secretary of Defense:		
Robert S. McNamara...	January 1961...	Present.
Thomas S. Gates Jr....	December 1959...	January 1961.
Neil H. McElroy.....	October 1967....	December 1959.
Charles E. Wilson.....	January 1953....	October 1957.
Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics):		
Thomas D. Morris.....	January 1961....	Present.
Perkins McGuire.....	January 1957....	January 1961.

PRINCIPAL MANAGEMENT OFFICIALS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND THE DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY RESPONSIBLE FOR THE ADMINISTRATION OF ACTIVITIES DISCUSSED IN THIS REPORT—Continued

	Tenure of office	
	From—	To—
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY		
Secretary of the Army:		
Stephen Ailes.....	January 1964.....	Present.
Cyrus R. Vance.....	July 1962.....	January 1964.
Elvis J. Stahr, Jr.....	January 1961.....	June 1962.
Wilber M. Brucker.....	July 1955.....	January 1961.
Robert T. Stevens.....	February 1953.....	July 1955.
Assistant Secretary of the Army (Installations and Logistics):		
Daniel M. Luevano.....	July 1964.....	Present.
A. Tyler Port (acting).....	March 1964.....	July 1964.
Paul R. Ignatius.....	May 1961.....	February 1964.
Unfilled.....	January 1961.....	May 1961.
Courtney Johnson.....	April 1959.....	January 1961.
Frank Higgins.....	August 1954.....	April 1959.
Chief of Staff, U.S. Army:		
Gen. Harold K. Johnson.....	July 1964.....	Present.
Gen. Earle G. Wheeler.....	October 1962.....	June 1964.
Gen. George H. Decker.....	September 1960.....	September 1962.
Gen. Lyman L. Lemnitzer.....	July 1959.....	September 1960.
Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor.....	June 1955.....	June 1959.
Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway.....	July 1953.....	June 1955.
Deputy Chief of Staff (Logistics):		
Lt. Gen. Lawrence J. Lincoln.....	August 1964.....	Present.
Lt. Gen. R. W. Colglazier, Jr.....	July 1959.....	July 1964.
Lt. Gen. Carter B. Magruder.....	May 1955.....	June 1959.
Lt. Gen. Williston B. Palmer.....	October 1952.....	April 1955.
Commanding general, U.S. Army Materiel Command: Gen. Frank S. Besson, Jr.		
July 1962.....	Present.	
Commanding general, U.S. Army Electronics Command:		
Maj. Gen. Frank W. Moorman.....	August 1963.....	Do.
Maj. Gen. Stuart S. Hoff.....	August 1962.....	August 1963.
Chief signal officer (position abolished Mar. 1, 1964):		
Maj. Gen. E. F. Cook.....do.....	March 1964.
Maj. Gen. Ralph T. Nelson.....	May 1959.....	August 1962.
Maj. Gen. John D. O'Connell.....	May 1955.....	April 1959.
Maj. Gen. George I. Back.....	May 1961.....	May 1955.
Commanding general, U.S. Army Electronics Materiel Agency (position abolished May 1964):		
Brig. Gen. Wesley C. Franklin.....	September 1963.....	May 1964.
Brig. Gen. Allen T. Stanwix-Hay.....	August 1962.....	September 1963.
Col. Douglas O. Toft.....	June 1962.....	August 1962.
Brig. Gen. Charles S. Hays.....	November 1960.....	May 1962.
Brig. Gen. Elmer L. Littell.....	June 1957.....	November 1960.
Brig. Gen. William D. Hamlin.....	August 1956.....	June 1957.
Brig. Gen. William L. Bayer.....	October 1954.....	July 1956.

APPENDIX II

HEADQUARTERS, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY, OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY,

Washington, D.C., June 26, 1964.

Mr. R. W. GUTMANN,
Associate Director, Defense Accounting and Auditing Division, U.S. General Accounting Office, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GUTMANN: The following comments are provided on behalf of the Secretary of Defense in reply to your draft report of April 1964 concerning "Unnecessary Costs Incurred in the Sole-Source Procurement of Portable Radar Sets" (OSD Case No. 2004).

The facts presented in the GAO report are agreed with. Classified Army studies and reports on combat surveillance and target ac-

quisition equipment covering the period FY 1958 to FY 1963 reflected continual emphasis upon the urgent need for this type of equipment. There was a concerted effort on the part of the Army to acquire a combat surveillance capability as quickly as possible during that period of time.

A review of the circumstances as they existed at the time cannot establish that the procuring agency was in haste to obligate these procurement funds before Army obligatory authority lapsed. A required delivery schedule for this radar set commencing in April 1961 had been established. This factor coupled with an estimated minimum production lead time for the contractor of 9 months and a minimum administrative lead time of 2 months to negotiate an award, indicated a requirement for an award in May 1960. However, subsequent refinements in the plan, negotiations with the contractor, and approval cycles extended the actual award date to 30 June.

It is agreed that all objections in connection with a proposed procurement which may be raised by interested parties, such as using organizations and engineering agencies, should be included in the facts presented to approving officials for this consideration.

Under the Army reorganization, more extensive controls come into play in the event that urgency justifies procurement for troop issue before completion of development and adoption as a standard item. The major commands, particularly those overseas, make recommendations relative to the need for new equipment. The Combat Development Command is responsible for making recommendation to the Department of the Army on the urgency of a requirement of this nature. Further, the provisions of AR 700-20, 25 July 1963 require the satisfaction of 25 criteria before initiating production in a situation of this type.

The disciplinary action recommended by your office is not believed to be warranted. The decisions with respect to the award in question were made in accordance with what was then accepted policy. The facts as presented, when considered in the light of the prevailing policy, are considered proper justification for the decisions.

You recommend that this report be brought to the attention of procuring commands. Present procedures within the Department of the Army provide for distribution of a digest of all GAO reports of this type to procuring commands; a digest of this report will be included in this distribution.

Sincerely yours,

A. TYLER PORT,
Acting Assistant Secretary of the Army
(Installations and Logistics).

PROCUREMENT OF INACCURATE RADIATION MEASURING INSTRUMENTS, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

(Report to the Congress of the United States, by the Comptroller General of the United States, December 1963)

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,

Washington, D.C.

[B-146834]

To the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate:

Enclosed is our report on the procurement of inaccurate radiation measuring instruments by the Department of the Army.

Our view disclosed that the Army awarded five contracts for a total of 59,776 radiometers at a cost of about \$2.9 million even though it was aware, prior to the first production contract and each succeeding contract, that the radiometers were not suitable for Army use. In addition, over \$663,000 has been expended to modify the radiometers produced under the second and third contracts, and additional costs estimated at

about \$200,000 will be incurred to reimburse the contractors under the fourth and fifth contracts for a temporary work stoppage until the Army investigates technical difficulties and decides whether the radiometers will be acceptable to using organizations. The 10,800 radiometers produced under the first contract have already been scrapped, and the acceptability of any of the remaining instruments is still questionable.

These unnecessary costs have been incurred because responsible Army officials (1) were overly optimistic that deficiencies identified in tests of experimental model radiometers could be corrected in production despite a recommendation by the using organization not to enter into volume production until deficiencies were corrected, (2) accepted preproduction and initial production models and approved volume production without adequate and timely coordination of test data between the using organization and the engineering and procurement agencies, (3) awarded additional production contracts even though previously identified deficiencies had not been corrected, and (4) generally did not exercise their personal responsibilities to assure that Government funds were expended properly.

The Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army, replying on behalf of the Secretary of Defense, concurred with our findings. He stated that the Department of the Army is investigating further the causes for the conditions cited in the report. He stated also that further production of the equipment will not be accomplished until existing technical problems have been solved and the field user's accuracy requirements are met.

The Deputy Assistant Secretary stated further that, on the basis of results of tests, it was concluded that the design of the radiometer was sound but that further investigation of the specific causes for the inaccuracies would be made. However, our review disclosed that responsible engineering personnel at the United States Army Electronics Materiel Support Agency, Fort Monmouth, New Jersey, agreed that the contractors met all specifications but that there was a defect in the design of the radiometer. In view of the position taken by the Deputy Assistant Secretary, it is evident that a conflict of opinions exists within the Army as to the soundness of the design of the radiometer. We did not attempt to determine whether the deficiencies in the radiometers resulted from the contractors' production practices or from the Government's design specifications.

We are recommending to the Secretary of the Army that (1) those cases where supply management officials, because of the urgency of requirements for equipment, elect to overrule the recommendations of the using forces with respect to performance of the equipment and elect to enter into production before all known deficiencies are corrected be referred to the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Installations and Logistics) for his approval, (2) in the investigation of the specific causes for the deficiencies in the radiometers that are the subject of this report, the Department of the Army determine, and advise us, whether the deficiencies resulted from the contractors' production practices or from the Government's design specifications, and (3) consideration be given to taking disciplinary measures against management officials whose actions in this matter were not prudent. We are recommending also that the Secretary of Defense bring this report to the attention of management officials within the military departments and emphasize their responsibilities for determining the adequate performance of equipment before recommending or approving items for volume production.

Copies of this report are being sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of the Army.

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

INTRODUCTION

The General Accounting Office has made a review of procurement of the radiacmeters IM-108/PD by the Department of the Army. This review was made pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67).

The scope of our review is shown on page 16 of this report.

BACKGROUND

The Department of Defense has issued engineering policies and procedures to assure that military weapons, equipment, and systems are suitable for design, production, and use by the military services. Each military service is required by the Department of Defense to establish programs to implement these policies and procedures. The Department of the Army has assigned this responsibility to each major subcommand of the Army Materiel Command.

Under the reorganization of the Department of the Army, the United States Army Electronics Command, a major subcommand, was established in August 1962 and assumed most of the logistics functions previously performed by the Office of the Chief Signal Officer. This Command has the responsibility for the research, design, development, testing, and supply management of electronic equipment. Its mission is performed by three major agencies as follows:

1. The United States Army Electronics Research and Development Agency, Fort Monmouth, New Jersey, conducts continuing research for the development and design of new techniques and equipment relative to communication, radar, and electronic devices.
2. The United States Army Electronics Materiel Support Agency, Fort Monmouth, New Jersey, provides engineering specifications for procurement of electronic equipment, performs or monitors preproduction testing and qualification, and approves equipment.
3. The United States Army Electronics Materiel Agency, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, is the national inventory control point and, as such, computes requirements, controls assets on hand, and awards and administers contracts for procurement.

In order to determine whether newly developed equipment is acceptable for Army use, the Department of Defense procedures require the cognizant military department to test such equipment. These tests are generally referred to as "service tests." The purpose of the tests is to determine the physical and operational characteristics, organizational maintenance requirements, and whether the equipment will be accurate, durable, and reliable when subjected to use by the troops in the field. In addition to these service tests, and prior to commencing production, the contractor is generally required to test a preproduction sample to determine whether the performance measurements and capability of the equipment meet the environmental and other field conditions. The contractor is required to furnish a tested preproduction sample to the Army for evaluation and approval. Such evaluation includes an examination and testing by a Government field engineer, or by the contractor under the supervision of the field engineer, to determine whether the tested preproduction sample was manufactured in accordance with contract specifications.

The radiacmeter IM-108/PD is a tactical survey instrument used for detecting and measuring gamma radiation resulting from nuclear explosions and is considered vital for the safety of troops in the field. It is important that the individual using the radiacmeter obtain readings which are accurate and reliable to avoid being exposed to excessive radiation dosages. The service tests of the experimental models was conducted for the Electronics Command by the United States Continental Army Command under

actual field conditions. The evaluation of the preproduction models of the radiacmeter was performed at the contractor's plant by personnel of the Field Engineering Division of the United States Army Electronics Materiel Support Agency.

During the period from March 1958 to January 1962, five formally advertised production contracts were awarded by the United States Army Electronics Materiel Agency. The award dates, quantities, and costs of the production contracts follow:

Date of award	Contractor	Contract	
		Number of units	Cost
Mar. 29, 1958	Landsverk Electrometer Co., Glendale, Calif.	10,800	\$605,858
June 29, 1959	Jordan Electronics Division of Victoreen Instrument Co., Alhambra, Calif.	12,817	1,638,098
Oct. 9, 1959	do	12,017	1,615,150
June 7, 1961	Landers, Frary & Clark, New Britain, Conn.	11,417	2,543,169
Jan. 10, 1962	Victory Electronics & Research Corp., Chicago Ill.	12,725	2,526,163
Total		59,776	2,928,438

¹ In addition \$663,000 was expended by Army depots to modify radiacmeters produced under these 2 contracts.

² In addition, \$200,000 will be incurred under these contracts because the Government will have to reimburse the contractors for a temporary work stoppage.

A list of the principal Department of Defense officials responsible for administration of activities discussed in this report is appended.

FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Unnecessary costs incurred in the procurement of inaccurate radiacmeters

The Army awarded five contracts for a total of 59,776 radiacmeter at a cost of about \$2.9 million even though it was aware, prior to the first production contract and each succeeding contract, that the radiacmeters were not suitable for Army use. In addition, over \$663,000 has been expended to modify the radiacmeters produced under the second and third contracts, and additional costs estimated at about \$200,000 will be incurred to reimburse the contractors under the fourth and fifth contracts for a temporary work stoppage until the Army investigates technical difficulties and decides whether the radiacmeters will be acceptable to using organizations. The 10,800 radiacmeters produced under the first contract have already been scrapped, and the acceptability of any of the remaining instruments is still questionable.

These unnecessary costs have been incurred because responsible Army officials (1) were overly optimistic that deficiencies identified in tests of experimental model radiacmeters could be corrected in production despite a recommendation by the using organization not to enter into volume production until deficiencies were corrected, (2) accepted preproduction and initial production models and approved volume production without adequate and timely coordination of test data between the using organization and the engineering and procurement agencies, (3) awarded additional production contracts even though previously identified deficiencies had not been corrected, and (4) generally did not exercise their personal responsibilities to assure that Government funds were expended properly.

Disregard of user's recommendations

In 1954 a contract was awarded to Electronics Incorporated for the development of two experimental model radiacmeters, 50 of each, at a total cost of \$43,800. During 1956 and 1957 the United States Continental Army Command (USCONARC) performed a service test on some of the experimental model radiacmeters to determine their suitability for Army use. In May 1957, USCONARC reported to the United States Army Electronics Materiel Support Agency that several deficiencies were found in both models tested which made the radiacmeters unsuitable for use. The accuracy tests, included in the service tests, were performed by USCONARC after the radiacmeters were subjected to actual field use for several months. A serious deficiency noted during these tests was that the readings of the

radiacmeters were not within the plus or minus 10 percent accuracy required by the technical military requirements. Inaccurate readings up to minus 78 percent were recorded during this test.

USCONARC recommended to the Chief of Research and Development, Department of the Army, that a limited procurement of 1,100 radiacmeters be made to satisfy an immediate operational requirement, provided that the deficiencies noted in their tests were corrected in production. They recommended also that some production models be sent to them for testing. The records show that the Chief Signal Officer reported that all deficiencies initially identified in the experimental models could be corrected in production and therefore USCONARC's recommendation of limited procurement rather than volume production was disapproved by the Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations, Department of the Army.

The first production contract was awarded in March 1958 for 7,200 radiacmeters IM-108/PD. The quantity was subsequently increased to 10,800. This contract provided that preproduction models be submitted to the United States Army Electronics Materiel Support Agency (USAEMSA) for evaluation and testing to determine conformance with applicable specifications. In the testing of the preproduction models during September 1958, USAEMSA identified several deficiencies in performance and notified the contractor that some of the radiacmeters failed to meet shock, immersion, sensitivity, and calibration specification requirements. However, USAEMSA permitted the contractor to commence production provided that the deficiencies were investigated and corrected, subject to further tests during the initial production run.

In November 1958, USAEMSA approved the radiacmeters on the basis of tests from the initial production run. As a result of these tests USAEMSA engineers recommended, however, that the calibration accuracy measurement be revised to plus or minus 15 percent rather than to plus or minus 10 percent required by the military specification, but no changes were made to the specifications at this time.

Further, USAEMSA accepted the preproduction and the initial production run models without submitting the test results to the using organization or subjecting the units to actual field-use conditions, although USCONARC had previously advised USAEMSA that actual field use increased the inaccuracies of the radiacmeters.

Subsequent contracts awarded before original deficiencies corrected

In February 1959, or at least 3 months after production had started, USCONARC obtained some radiacmeters produced under the first contract for further testing. One year later, in February 1960, USCONARC reported that its tests showed that they were

still unsuitable for Army use. Inaccurate readings as much as plus 67 percent were recorded during these tests. These were the same type of deficiencies as those reported in the May 1957 tests of the experimental models. In its report of February 1960, in which it stated that no priority had been assigned to this project, USCONARC recommended that production of the radiacmeters be halted until the deficiencies could be corrected. However, prior to receiving this report, the Army accepted all the 10,800 radiacmeters under the first contract and, in the meantime, awarded two additional production contracts for 24,834 radiacmeters IM-108/PD and accepted 7,155 radiacmeters under the second contract.

Notwithstanding the length of time it took USCONARC to test the radiacmeters, USAEMSA should have been aware that the radiacmeters being produced were not acceptable for Army use. The records show that, in August 1959, an electronic engineer for USAEMSA visited the contractor's plant to investigate deficiencies noted in unsatisfactory equipment reports received from field personnel. During his visit the engineer simulated a limited field test by attaching several radiacmeters to his station wagon. During this test, among other deficiencies, the instruments deteriorated in calibration accuracy and did not come within the plus or minus 10 percent accuracy required in the military specifications. The calibration inaccuracy was attributable to the type of electrometer tube being used in the instrument. The test disclosed that when the tube was jarred its filament was adversely affected. The electronic engineer stated that this defect was a serious problem to which there seemed to be no immediate solution. However, no action was taken at this time to halt production until the defect had been corrected.

About May 15, 1960, the United States Army Electronics Materiel Support Agency began an investigation to determine the cause of the radiacmeter deficiencies noted in the USCONARC test report. They found that the batteries used in the radiacmeters had an unusual drop in the voltage level after limited usage which caused the inaccurate readings. At this time the contractor was advised to withhold production until further notice, and USAEMSA determined that a modification was required to provide greater stability of the voltage level of the batteries. This modification was made, and on May 25, 1960, five modified radiacmeters were delivered to USCONARC for retest.

USCONARC retested the modified radiacmeters simultaneously with some unmodified radiacmeters produced under the second contract. All those tested were again found to be unsuitable for Army use, due principally to inaccurate readings. In July 1960, USCONARC concluded that the modified radiacmeters may be suitable for use if the discrepancies were corrected. USCONARC again recommended to the United States Army Electronics Materiel Support Agency (USAEMSA) that, after deficiencies in the radiacmeters were corrected, they be submitted for retesting.

In August 1960, because the idle production lien costs were increasing under the second production contract, USCONARC agreed to the resumption of production, based on the contractor's description of how the deficiencies could be corrected in production. Records at the Electronics Materiel Agency show that, after production was resumed, the remaining 5,662 units under the second production contract and 1,300 units under the third production contract were accepted by the Electronics Command before any modified radiacmeters were submitted to USCONARC for retesting in March 1961. Before the USCONARC test results were received by the Electronics Command in July

1961, an additional 10,717 radiacmeters, or the remaining portion of the third production contract, were accepted, and in June 1961 a fourth production contract for 11,417 radiacmeters was awarded.

Radiacmeters scrapped because of potential casualties and fatalities to users

In December 1961, personnel of the Electronics Command determined that all 35,634 radiacmeters procured under the first three production contracts had major deficiencies. Although a more stable radiacmeter was produced as a result of the May 1960 modification, tests showed that the radiacmeters were still subject to large errors in reading if one or more battery cells failed. The users would not be aware of this error during actual field use and their remaining in an area with excessive radiation could result in casualties and fatalities. Therefore, instructions were issued in May 1962 by the Commanding General of the United States Army Electronics Materiel Agency (USAEMA) to all commands that the initial production of 10,800 radiacmeters costing \$606,000 should be disposed of.

Acceptability of radiacmeters still questionable even after modifications

The Electronics Command determined that it would be economically practicable to rework the radiacmeters produced under the second and third contracts, which were also subject to similar deficiencies in calibration accuracy. The costs incurred at Lexington and Sacramento Army Depots to modify these radiacmeters, which have not yet been field tested by the Army, have amounted to \$663,611.

In January 1962, a fifth production contract was awarded for an additional 8,400 radiacmeters. The quantity was subsequently increased to 12,725. USAEMSA determined that it was also necessary to change the specifications applicable to the fourth and fifth contracts in order to produce a more satisfactory radiacmeter. This change in specifications required certain modifications which were approved by the Electronics Command. All radiacmeters were then required to meet the plus or minus 10 percent calibration accuracy as provided by the original technical military requirements and would be redesignated radiacmeter IM-174/PD.

Results of tests performed on initial production models from the fourth and fifth contracts by USAEMSA engineers and the Lexington Army Depot in May 1963 showed, however, that various engineering deficiencies in the modified IM-174/PD radiacmeters posed a question as to whether the radiacmeters would be acceptable in meeting the requirements of the using organizations. One of the limitations identified by these tests was that, after being used, the equipment could not be used again for a period of 72 hours. The reason for this limitation is due to the type of tube contained in the modified radiacmeters. This was the same deficient tube identified by the USAEMSA engineer in August 1959.

On July 25, 1963, the Commanding General, United States Army Electronics Command, advised USAEMA that no further contracts for the production of the IM-174/PD radiacmeters were to be made either on the basis of the add-on quantities or new contracts. Subsequently on August 22, 1963, the Commanding General, United States Army Electronics Command, requested USAEMA to enter into supplemental agreements with the contractors under the fourth and fifth contracts to provide for temporary work stoppages of 120 days. This temporary delay in work under these contracts will result in additional costs to the Government of about \$200,000. During this period a technical investigation of the deficiencies in the IM-174-PD radiacmeters will be performed. Extensive tests of a total of 128 radiacmeters, comprising 64 produced under the fourth contract and 64 from the fifth contract, will

be made by the Lexington Army Depot. Subsequent to a review of the results of these tests, the Army will make a decision whether to resume production on this item or terminate the fourth and fifth contracts.

Agency comments

On April 11, 1963, we brought our findings to the attention of the Department of the Army and proposed that it institute effective controls and place responsibility within the Army Materiel Command to assure that either (1) volume production of new equipment is not undertaken when the results of tests of experimental models disclose that the item is unsuitable for field use or (2) when equipment with known deficiencies is authorized for production with the understanding that the deficiencies will be corrected, appropriate testing techniques are applied in a timely manner to determine that the items being procured will meet the requirements of the user in order to minimize the number of defective items produced.

By letter dated June 18, 1963, the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army (Installations and Logistics) stated that the Department of the Army concurred with our findings. He stated that the Army had a standing policy that volume production of new equipment is not undertaken if the results of tests of experimental models disclose that the item is unsuitable for use. He advised also that normal procedures require that appropriate and timely testing techniques be applied to assure that new items meet the user's requirements. He stated that the Department of the Army is investigating further the causes for the conditions cited in this report and that further production of the equipment will not be accomplished until existing technical problems have been solved and the field user's accuracy requirements are met.

The Deputy Assistant Secretary stated further that, on the basis of results of tests, it was concluded that the design of the IM-108/PD radiacmeter was sound but that further investigation of the specific causes for the inaccuracies would be made. However our review disclosed that responsible engineering personnel at the USAEMSA, Fort Monmouth, New Jersey, agreed that the contractors met all specifications but that there was a defect in the design of the radiacmeter. In view of the position taken by the Deputy Assistant Secretary, it is evident that a conflict of opinions exists within the Army as to the soundness of the design of the IM-108/PD, later designated the IM-174/PD radiacmeter. We did not attempt to determine whether the deficiencies in the radiacmeter resulted from the contractors' production practices or from the Government's design specifications.

Conclusions

Volume production of new equipment, generally, should not be undertaken when the results of tests performed by the user on experimental models disclose deficiencies that render the item unsuitable for field use. Further, when equipment with known deficiencies is authorized for volume production, with the understanding that these deficiencies will be corrected in the production model, it is of the utmost importance to determine, by appropriate testing techniques at the earliest possible time, that the deficiencies have been corrected and that the item is suitable for field use. These actions require timely and effective coordination between the responsible testing and procurement organizations.

Notwithstanding the Army's policy that volume production of new equipment is not undertaken if the results of tests in experimental models disclose that the item is unsuitable for use, our review disclosed that deficiencies had been identified in the radiacmeters IM-108/PD experimental models that rendered the item unsuitable for use, but a decision was made to enter into volume production and a contract was awarded. Fur-

thermore, four additional contracts for the production of these radiacmeters were awarded even though previously identified deficiencies had not been corrected. As a result, 10,800 radiacmeters that were procured at a cost of \$606,000 are now being eliminated from the Army's supply system, 24,834 other radiacmeters costing over \$1.2 million have been modified at a cost of over \$663,000, and additional costs estimated at about \$200,000 will be incurred because of a temporary work stoppage under the fourth and fifth contracts. As of September 18, 1963, the acceptability of any of the radiacmeters for Army use is still questionable pending the results of tests of the modified instruments.

Recommendations

We recommend to the Secretary of the Army that (1) those cases where supply management officials, because of the urgency of requirements for equipment, elect to overrule the recommendations of the using forces with respect to performance of the equipment and elect to enter into production before all known deficiencies are corrected be referred to the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Installations and Logistics) for his approval, (2) in the investigation of the specific causes for the deficiencies in the radiacmeters that are the subject of this report, the Department of the Army determine, and advise us, whether the deficiencies resulted from the contractors' production practices or from the Government's design specifications, and (3) consideration be given to taking disciplinary measures against management officials whose actions in this matter were not prudent. We recommend also that the Secretary of Defense bring this report to the attention of management officials within the military departments and emphasize their responsibilities for determining the adequate performance of equipment before recommending or approving items for volume production.

SCOPE OF REVIEW

Our review included an examination of the records and reports relative to the testing, procurement, use, modification, and disposition of this equipment within the Department of the Army for the period from April 1954 to September 1963. Our review was made at the United States Army Electronics Materiel Agency, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, and the United States Army Electronics Materiel Support Agency, Fort Monmouth, New Jersey.

PRINCIPAL MANAGEMENT OFFICIALS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND THE DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY RESPONSIBLE FOR ADMINISTRATION OF ACTIVITIES DISCUSSED IN THIS REPORT

	Tenure	
	From—	To—
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE		
Secretary of Defense:		
Robert S. McNamara...	January 1961	Present.
Thomas S. Gates, Jr....	December 1959	January 1961.
Neil H. McElroy.....	October 1957	December 1959.
Charles E. Wilson.....	January 1953	October 1957.
Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics):		
Thomas D. Morris.....	January 1961	Present.
Perkins McGuire.....	January 1957	January 1961.
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY		
Secretary of the Army:		
Cyrus R. Vance.....	July 1962	Present.
Elvis J. Stahr, Jr.....	January 1961	June 1962.
Wilber M. Brucker.....	July 1955	January 1961.
Robert T. Stevens.....	February 1953	July 1955.
Assistant Secretary of the Army (Installations and Logistics):		
Paul R. Ignatius.....	May 1961	Present.
Unfilled.....	January 1961	May 1961.
Courtney Johnson.....	April 1959	January 1961.
Frank Higgins.....	August 1954	April 1959.

PRINCIPAL MANAGEMENT OFFICIALS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND THE DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY RESPONSIBLE FOR THE ADMINISTRATION OF ACTIVITIES DISCUSSED IN THIS REPORT—Continued

	Tenure	
	From—	To—
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY—Con.		
Chief of Staff, U.S. Army:		
Gen. Earle G. Wheeler...	October 1962	Present.
Gen. George H. Decker...	October 1960	September 1962.
Gen. Lyman L. Lemnitzer.	July 1959	October 1960.
Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor.	June 1955	June 1959.
Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway.	July 1953	June 1955.
Deputy Chief of Staff (Logistics):		
Lt. Gen. R. W. Colglazier, Jr.	July 1959	Present.
Lt. Gen. Carter B. Magruder.	May 1955	June 1959.
Lt. Gen. Williston B. Palmer.	October 1952	April 1955.
Commanding general, U.S. Army Materiel Command: Lt. Gen. Frank S. Besson, Jr.	July 1962	Present.
Commanding general, U.S. Army Electronics Command:		
Maj. Gen. Frank W. Moorman.	August 1963	Do.
Maj. Gen. Stuart S. Hoff.	August 1962	August 1963.
Chief signal officer:		
Maj. Gen. E. F. Cook...	do	Present.
Maj. Gen. Ralph T. Nelson.	May 1959	August 1962.
Maj. Gen. John D. O'Connell.	May 1955	April 1959.
Maj. Gen. George I. Back.	May 1951	May 1955.
Commanding general, U.S. Army Electronics Materiel Agency (formerly U.S. Army Signal Supply Agency):		
Brig. Gen. Wesley C. Franklin.	September 1963	Present.
Brig. Gen. Allen T. Stanwix-Hay.	August 1962	September 1963.
Col. Douglas O. Toft...	July 1962	August 1962.
Brig. Gen. Charles S. Hays.	November 1960	May 1962.
Brig. Gen. Elmer L. Littell.	June 1957	November 1960.
Brig. Gen. William D. Hamlin.	August 1956	June 1957.
Brig. Gen. William L. Bayer.	October 1954	July 1956.
Brig. Gen. James S. Willis.	May 1953	September 1954.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, information which reached me yesterday is very disturbing. I am informed that the radio set AN/PRC-77 is, today, being manufactured by a company other than RCA, in a foreign country, by a company which is not American owned, and is being manufactured in accordance with the very drawings that Mr. Brooks has alleged to me do not exist. A representative of the foreign company has acknowledged publicly that the foreign company is, in fact, manufacturing this walkie-talkie radio set. In view of the foregoing, I believe that the public and the Congress is entitled to the real truth in this matter. I have, therefore, requested the Federal Bureau of Investigation to come into this case and learn how these manufacturing drawings came into foreign hands while the Army officials themselves claim that a data package on this radio equipment does not exist.

Mr. President, in addition, I intend to insert for the RECORD a copy of the letter which I have directed to the Comptroller General of the United States concerning this matter. Among other things, I have requested that an audit be con-

ducted of the earlier \$20 million RCA contract for radio sets the Army procured at \$2,156.91 each. Two million two hundred thousand dollars had already been paid RCA for development of this radio, after which RCA subsequently quoted a price of \$843.37 per unit for the identical equipment, in open competitive bidding. The purpose of this audit, of course, is to identify and recapture any excess profits which had to be generated in such an enormous contract for such a little radio.

Mr. President, I am more fully convinced than ever that in view of the questionable transactions which are coming to light an in-depth investigation into our military procurement practices should be initiated by Congress without further delay.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a very interesting article by Mr. Willard Edwards which appeared in the Chicago Tribune on September 23, 1967, be printed in the RECORD.

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

CAPITOL VIEWS
(By Willard Edwards)

WASHINGTON, September 22.—The panic button was pressed in the Pentagon this week when Sen. Peter H. Dominick [R., Colo.] arose on the Senate floor and asked a quiet question. Forces were thereby initiated that could mushroom into a scandal of government-shaking proportions.

Was it not time, Dominick inquired, to determine whether outright dishonesty, and not just bureaucratic fumbling and inefficiency, was responsible for the accumulating evidence of monumental waste in military procurement practices? Specifically, was someone in the defense department getting rich thru the allotment of huge contracts to large corporations despite lower bids by competitors? With more than 18 billion dollars allotted this year for military purchases, the temptation was great.

It was a question that has been begging for utterance in recent months. Dominick, a member of the Senate armed services committee, backed it up by citing two recent cases he had uncovered which suggested corruption instead of the inefficiency often accepted as normal to war time spending. He asked the government operations committee to determine whether the facts warranted a full-scale investigation and public hearings.

Scores of members have received complaints of cases similarly indicating fraud. Small business firms thruout the nation have reported numerous instances in which they were frozen out of defense contracts by bigger corporations with influential contacts in Washington. In all cases, the defense department paid more for supplies than was necessary.

DOMINICK SECRETLY APPLAUDED FOR CANDOR

Dominick brought into the open a situation which many had been loath to discuss and they secretly applauded his candor. Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara was alerted to the danger. President Johnson was advised that a political volcano was rumbling and might erupt in an election year. An emergency meeting of defense department officials was called to debate the threat.

McNamara has weathered many storms by putting up a barrage of angry denials and counter-charges. But he will proceed cautiously in this crisis, having been burned badly in his first encounter with congressional criticism of military procurement. He was forced to beat a quick retreat after

his first savage and sarcastic reaction to revelations by Rep. Otis G. Pike [D., N.Y.] of inexcusable defense buying.

Pike made public a series of military purchases which defied reasonable explanation. He told of small items of hardware, such as washers and nuts and bolts, for which the military paid \$1.55 each when they were available in any hardware store for 6 cents apiece.

The amounts were small but, as Pike remarked, the principle was not. McNamara, accustomed to dealing in billions of dollars, ridiculed Pike as a nitpicker. The New York congressman struck back by displaying a generator knob, available to any citizen for \$1.62, for which the army had paid \$312.50. Next day, a red-faced military canceled the contract.

DOMINICK'S CASES DEAL WITH BIG AMOUNTS

Pike referred to the purchases as "stupid" and "wasteful," not ascribing more sinister motives. The cases revealed by Dominick, however, not only dealt in big amounts but could not be excused as due to ignorance or inefficiency.

A small firm in Aurora, Colo., Dominick said, developed a lightweight flame thrower, submitted the low bid in it, and then found itself losing the contract to a bigger company which had bid more than double the amount. In the second case, a small business concern in Philadelphia lost out on a 10 million dollar contract for a portable radio although its bid was \$884,856 lower than the successful bidder, the giant Radio Corporation of America.

Both cases were marked by such glaring inequities, Dominick said, that he felt impelled to ask "whether any specific benefits have been derived by anyone in the army or elsewhere as a consequence of this peculiar procedure."

In other words, did someone get a rake-off? There are more than 100 similar cases of exorbitant costs and indefensible buying methods awaiting the congressional probe. On Capitol hill, the odds are considered more than even that the investigation could develop into an expose of deals dwarfing the "5 percent" operations of influence peddlers in the Truman era.

Mr. DOMINICK. I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the Army dated September 21, 1967, to me and my letter to the Comptroller General dated September 28, 1967, be included at this point in the RECORD.

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

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., September 21, 1967.

HON. PETER H. DOMINICK,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR DOMINICK: I have read your remarks of 19 September relating to two Army procurement transactions and feel it might be helpful to clarify a few of the points you raised. As you may know the Comptroller General has performed complete and impartial reviews of these procurements.

The Research and Development contract for a multi-shot portable flame weapon was protested by Custom Packaging Company to the General Accounting Office. The Assistant Comptroller General, in a report of 29 June 1967, copy attached, states, "A study of the record on this procurement as supplemented by presentations on behalf of Custom leads to the conclusion that the award as made represented a proper discharge of procurement responsibility and discretion as to which we find no legal basis to question." Therefore, the protest was denied.

I can find nothing to support the inference that any technical innovations by Custom

Packaging were revealed to any other contractor. None of the requirements contained in the Request for Proposals disclose any design features submitted by Custom Packaging. The requirements listed were in sufficient detail to permit potential contractors to offer proposed designs, and were developed independently of Custom Packaging.

This procurement followed the normal Research and Development procedure to obtain formal proposals from interested and qualified Companies setting forth their technical approach to provide the required weapon. In such a case we are not seeking the lowest price proposal, but rather the technical approach which would be most likely to provide the best weapon to meet the requirements of our Armed Forces. All proposed contractors were informed of this intention and of the fact that it was anticipated to award a cost reimbursement-type contract. The proposals submitted by Custom and several others, including Nortronics, were carefully evaluated by the Government, and Nortronics was selected since it offered the technical approach most likely to result in the best weapon. As noted by the General Accounting Office, "The Proposal of Custom was rated lowest and the proposal of Nortronics . . . received the highest rating." The General Accounting Office further noted, "Although Custom demonstrated its portable flame weapon system for Edgewood Arsenal, the record shows that such demonstration was not successful and that, in the considered judgment of technical personnel, such weapon did not meet the needs of the Government. We find nothing in the record which would lead to the conclusion that Custom had a valid basis for assuming that the Government would award it a contract for such weapon."

With regard to the procurement of PRC-25/77 Radios, the two-year contract awarded to RCA in April 1967 which you cited was also the subject of a protest to the General Accounting Office and in his letter of 1 June 1967, copy attached, the Assistant Comptroller General concludes, "Therefore, no legal basis exists to object to the subject procurements." I further note that Decitron has protested the 16 August 1967 award of the second increment of the April 1967 contract to RCA to the General Accounting Office. Acting on a request from that office, the Army is currently preparing an administrative report in response to this protest and we will be guided by the Comptroller General findings.

The successor radio to the PRC-25, the PRC-77, which was developed under a product improvement program by RCA provides substantially better communication capabilities, a means of secure voice transmission, increased range, lighter weight and less battery drain. Because of these advantages the improved radio was urgently needed in Southeast Asia and RCA was awarded a contract in June 1966 to produce initial production quantities while further design changes and improvements were being effected. In order to provide for competition in future procurements, this contract included a requirement for the delivery of a procurement data package. Due to design changes resulting from concurrent field testing, it was determined that competitive procurement of this radio could not be achieved prior to 1 January 1968. Therefore, the follow-on two-year contract was awarded to RCA to meet the priority requirements for Southeast Asia.

With regard to the unsolicited proposal by Decitron a competitive data package was not available in April 1967. As a matter of fact, due to design changes resulting from concurrent field tests, the final procurement package will not be available until early December 1967. Even if the data package had been delivered by 31 March 1967, it could not have been available for competitive procure-

ment for some months due to the necessity of Government review and verification. RCA was the only producer capable of manufacturing the radio to meet the required delivery schedule. It is presently anticipated that competitive procurement of the PRC-77 Radio will be accomplished in early 1968.

I trust this information will be of value to you in your further evaluation of these procurements.

Sincerely,

ROBERT A. BROOKS,
Assistant Secretary of the Army (Installations and Logistics).

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, D.C., September 28, 1967.
HON. ELMER B. STAATS,
Comptroller General of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. COMPTROLLER GENERAL: On September 19, 1967, I delivered a speech in the Senate which concerned two Army procurements, one of which involved the AN/PRC-25 and the AN/PRC-77 Radio Set which I understand is now pending under a protest No. B-161031. For your ready reference, a copy of my remarks is attached. In addition, I have attached a copy of a letter dated 21 September 1967, which I received from the Assistant Secretary of the Army Installations and Logistics, dealing with this very matter.

From the Army letter of 21 September, it appears that the Signal Corps is running a development program parallel to a production program for the same equipment. I am aware of the GAO Reports on the IN-108 Radiometer and the AN/PPS-4 Radar procurement wherein the Army previously did exactly the same thing in continuing development with parallel production which resulted in the waste of millions of tax dollars. (Comp. Gen. B-146834 and B-146906.)

It is for these very reasons that I hereby request the GAO to identify for me by name, rank and grade, title of all civilian and military personnel who are involved in the AN/PRS-25 and AN/PRC-77 development and production including engineering, logistic and contracting officials with particular emphasis on those names of Army employees common to AN/PPS-4 and IM-108 Radiometer procurements.

In addition, I request that the GAO audit RCA Contract 89511 in an effort to recapture possible excess profits which must have been realized under a \$20.5 Million award for radio sets at a unit price of \$2,156.91 (after \$2.2 Million had already been paid RCA for development) in a non-competitive procurement for that equipment which RCA subsequently quoted at \$843.37 per unit the very instant the force of competition was introduced into the procurement for the same radio.

And finally, it is requested that I be supplied a summary of DD-250 Documents which cover shipments made by RCA under contracts 01292 initiated March 21, 1965, and 10410, showing line for line, item for item, shipping dates.

When the audit is complete under Contract 89511, please arrange to supply me with a completely priced bill of materials for the radio set supplied by RCA under that contract, showing item for item prices and sources, which I want to use for comparison with other information from other manufacturers covering this same equipment.

Very truly yours,

PETER H. DOMINICK,
U.S. Senator.

SEVERANCE PAY FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, on Tuesday, September 26, there appeared on the front page of the Washington

Daily News an article by John Cramer, a very distinguished columnist of that paper, entitled "20 U.S. Workers in Line for Astonishing Windfall."

This article was in the form of an open letter to the Speaker of the House, Mr. JOHN McCORMACK, to the majority leader of the Senate, Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, to the chairman of the House Civil Service Committee, Mr. DULSKI, and to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, Senator MONRONEY.

In the article it was stated that possibly \$85,000 in severance pay might be paid to 20 employees whose employment was being terminated by one agency, but who were immediately being transferred to another agency.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

IMPLAUSIBLE PLUM: TWENTY U.S. WORKERS IN LINE FOR ASTONISHING WINDFALL

(By John Cramer)

(NOTE.—In an attempt to save a mere \$85,000 in taxpayer dough, I presume to send an open letter to four eminent Members of Congress.

To House Speaker John McCormack (D., Mass.) . . . Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield (D., Mont.) . . . Chairman Thaddeus Dulski (D., N.Y.), of the House Civil Service Committee . . . and Chairman Mike Monroney (D., Okla.), of the Senate Committee—JOHN CRAMER.)

GENTLEMEN: It's only \$85,000, but unless your interest in Government economy prompts you to produce a real fast law, that sum will be paid out needlessly, erroneously, and wastefully to some 20 employees of the National Capital Transportation Agency.

It has to be a "quickie" law, which (I think) has to take effect no later than Friday.

The \$85,000—an average of more than \$4,000 each—is what the 20 employees will get in "severance pay" when NCTA, now a Federal agency, becomes the Washington Area Transit Authority, a non-Federal, interstate agency, next Monday.

I'm not happy to be a party to depriving the NCTA people of their windfall.

But I'm completely certain situations such as theirs were not what Congress had in mind when it wrote generous severance pay provisions into the 1965 Federal Pay Act.

The severance pay law was designed to protect people who LOST their Federal jobs thru no fault of their own.

It was not designed for those who merely transfer—without loss of pay or income.

I address you Sen. Mansfield, and you Rep. McCormack, because of your recognized talent for making the legislative wheels grind . . . and you Sen. Monroney and you Rep. Dulski because your Committees handed the original severance pay bill.

Here's how this odd-ball thing, this \$85,000 give-away, came about:

When the new Metropolitan Authority was created by compact among the jurisdictions involved, the enacted legislation transferred duties, functions and funds of the NCTA to the Authority.

But for some reason—was it oversight or design?—no provision was made for the automatic transfer of personnel.

However, the Board of Directors of the Authority took care of that. It agreed to offer jobs to all NCTA employees—at no loss in pay.

So, as of Saturday, the employees will be separated from the Federal payroll, thereby becoming eligible for severance pay.

As of next Monday, the 20 who have elected to transfer will go to work for the Authority . . . some with pay increases . . . none losing a single day's work.

Total cost to the Government in severance pay is estimated at about \$85,000.

One principal beneficiary, it's said, will be NCTA Deputy Administrator Warren D. Quenstedt, a Presidential appointee, who reportedly will collect more than \$11,000 in severance, plus some \$3,000 in terminal annual leave—no complaint about the latter.

In the new Authority, his salary will be almost \$27,000.

Creation of the Authority required action by Congress, plus the legislatures of Maryland and Virginia.

But a quickie change in the Federal severance pay law, to prevent the unjustified windfalls, needs only Congress.

Meaning you, Messrs. McCormack, Mansfield, Monroney and Dulski. I realize you customarily deal in millions, billions. I know this is only a mere \$85,000.

Perhaps, however, you can find a way to pass a quickie bill, or amend some current bill, to forestall the unhappy give-away.

Sincerely,

JOHN CRAMER,
Government Columnist,
The Washington Daily News.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I can assure you that this article caused great concern among Members of the Senate, particularly the chairman of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service [Mr. MONRONEY], of which committee I am the ranking minority member, and other Senators, including the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

We immediately contacted Mr. John Macy, who is the distinguished Chairman of the Civil Service Commission. He immediately replied in the form of a letter dated September 26. I shall not read the entire letter, but I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., September 26, 1967.

HON. FRANK CARLSON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CARLSON: Since there have been a number of inquiries on the matter, I feel that you will want to know that the Civil Service Commission has the authority under Public Law 89-301 (by delegation of the President by EO 11257) to deny to employees of the National Capital Transportation Agency who take employment with the Metropolitan Transit Authority as of October 1, 1967, severance pay under that act. The Commission has exercised this authority in other situations. The authority is set forth in the law in these words:

"(b) This section does not apply to—
(8) such other officers and employees as may be excluded by rules and regulations of the President or of such officer or agency as he may designate."

The Commission is presently securing all the facts surrounding this problem and will make a determination on the issue within the next few days. At that time I will write you further.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. MACY, Jr.,
Chairman.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the concluding paragraph reads:

The Commission is presently securing all the facts surrounding this problem and will make a determination on the issue within the next few days. At that time I will write you further.

The distinguished Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, in his usual efficient and cooperative manner, did immediately go into this problem; and, having had several discussions with several Members of the Senate, including the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], and myself, has this morning, September 28, written to each of us a letter in regard to this particular transaction. I shall read it for the RECORD. The same letter also went to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service [Mr. MONRONEY] and the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]. It reads as follows:

On September 25, 1967, I wrote to you concerning payment of severance pay to employees of the National Capital Transportation Agency who transfer to the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority on October 1, 1967.

The Commission has found that National Capital Transportation employees who accept positions with the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority will not lose employment and other benefits, conditions for which severance pay was designed. Accordingly, the Commission has excluded from severance pay benefits employees of the National Capital Transportation Agency who are offered comparable employment, or who accept any employment before December 30, 1967, with the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority.

Attached is a copy of the Commission's press release on this action.

Thank you for your interest in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. MACY, Jr.,
Chairman.

I ask unanimous consent that the press release also be made a part of my remarks.

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

The Civil Service Commission today ruled that employees of the National Capital Transportation Agency who have been offered comparable employment in the new Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority are not entitled to benefits of the severance pay provisions enacted as part of the Federal Employee Pay Act of 1965.

Prior to reaching its decision, the Commission met with the Administrator and Deputy Administrator of NCTA to hear their views concerning this matter.

"It is clear that it was not the intent of the Administration in proposing or of the Congress in enacting the severance pay legislation to cover situations of this kind in which employees of a Federal agency are offered continuing and substantially comparable employment in a public non-Federal agency which in effect takes over a function or mission of the Federal agency being liquidated," the Commission said.

"Recognizing that situations such as this would arise, Congress included in the law regulatory authority to exclude employees from entitlement to severance pay. This authority has been delegated to the Commission."

"Therefore, we have exercised this authority to exclude those employees of the NCTA who have been offered comparable

continuing employment in the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority."

The Commission's attention was called to the situation by recent newspaper reports that some 20 employees of the NCTA, which expires on September 30, would be entitled to severance pay benefits totaling about \$85,000 even though all have been offered employment by the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority.

The Commission said that while it recognized and regretted that certain employees of NCTA may have been given reason to expect the benefit from the legislation, the clear intent of the law must prevail.

In 1965, in advancing its Severance Pay proposal the Commission stated:

"The need for severance pay has recently been emphasized by the plight of many long-service employees who are losing their jobs in shutdowns of military establishments. For many of them, no similar jobs are available in the commuting area which would utilize their special skills."

In announcing today's decision the Commission emphasized that the law was not intended to provide a windfall, but to cushion the blow of job loss and the likelihood of difficulty in gaining reemployment.

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

Mr. CARLSON. I am pleased to yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I concur in the remarks of the Senator from Kansas and join in complimenting Mr. Macy for his prompt answer to the question which was raised both by the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONROE], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], as well as by myself concerning the possible abuse in severance payments.

This same problem arose several years ago when it was discovered that there was an abuse of such payments. In fact, on February 4, 1953, I called specific attention to a glaring abuse in which many of these payments in the form of severance pay had been made to employees who, in turn, never lost a single day's work with the Government but merely had their classification changed.

I submitted the question at that time to the Comptroller General, who took the position that the payments were not in accordance with the law and issued a ruling, under date of March 4, 1953, which stated that this type of payment would not be permissible as he then interpreted the law.

Subsequent to that date the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, of which the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] was a member, wrote the substance of this ruling into law to make sure it could not happen again.

For the record I ask unanimous consent that my statement of February 4, 1953, showing how the abuse worked, along with a copy of the March 9, 1953, letter of the Comptroller General to me, wherein he refers to his new ruling of March 4, 1953, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT OF JOHN J. WILLIAMS IN THE U.S. SENATE, FEBRUARY 4, 1953

Mr. President, my attention has been called to a highly questionable procedure which apparently has been followed in the past by some of the agencies of this Gov-

ernment whereby annual leave payments involving hundreds of thousands, if not millions of dollars have been paid to Government employees without such leave being taken and while these employees were actually drawing their regular salaries.

The manner in which this indirect raid on the Federal Treasury operates is that the agency will give the employee a 30-day notice that he is to be separated from the service. Immediately upon the date of separation the employee is paid in lump sum for all accumulated annual leave up to 90 days. The following day the same employee is rehired for the same job and placed back on the regular payroll where he worked for 30 days as a temporary employee. At the end of the 30-day period he is reinstated as a permanent employee and automatically again begins accumulating annual leave.

This has the net effect during the period involved of these employees not only being paid double for the work but also accumulating annual leave for the next year.

The officials of the Rent Stabilization Bureau have confirmed that this procedure was followed in that agency, and as a specific example of how the program operates, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a breakdown of the lump sum payments to 49 employees of that agency totaling \$86,266.88. In this instance these employees were given a reduction in force notice on May 26, 1950, effective at the close of June 25, 1950. On that date they were separated from the service and they received lump sum payments as indicated. The following day all 49 employees were rehired for the same positions at the same salary, only they were \$86,266 richer.

OFFICE OF RENT STABILIZATION

EMPLOYEES REDUCED IN FORCE, EFFECTIVE SUNDAY, JUNE 25, 1950, RECEIVING TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS MONDAY JUNE 26, 1950—EMPLOYEES AS OF JUNE 25, 1950, RECEIVING LUMP-SUM PAYMENT WASHINGTON, D.C., UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED

Name	Title	Grade	Salary	Lump-sum payments, annual leave
Bloomberg, Florence	Secretary (steno)	GS-5	\$3,725	\$538.15
Borjes, Harry A.	Voucher examiner	GS-5	3,850	1,312.92
Boucher, Mae D.	Placement officer	GS-11	5,400	1,307.38
Campbell, Kenneth A.	Assoc. reg. hsg. exp.	GS-15	110,750	2,932.96
Crilley, Raymond E.	Asst. Dep. Hsg. Exp. (RT. Op.)	GS-14	9,000	3,059.16
Clarke, Clarke W.	Field representative	GS-13	7,600	1,700.37
Comfort, William G.	Dir. Bud. Plan'g and Fin. Br.	GS-14	9,000	1,829.75
Comrey, Halley S.	Secretary (steno)	GS-6	3,700	429.26
Davis, Milton B.	Comm. Ind. Econ. (Hsg. Sup.)	GS-14	9,600	2,650.65
Diggle, Burnham	Dep. Hsg. Exp. (RT. Oper.)	GS-15	10,750	3,501.53
Donine, Sophie	Time and payroll (supervisor)	GS-8	4,700	401.75
Dupree, Edwin D., Jr.	General Counsel (sup. atty AD)	GS-15	10,750	3,654.75
Edwards, Adolph M., Jr.	Trial attorney (gen. sup.)	GS-14	9,200	3,156.50
Engel, Anna M.	Employees relations assistant	GS-9	4,850	1,331.10
Fishbein, David M.	Business economist	GS-9	5,350	1,306.07
Green, Edna S.	Time, leave, and payroll sup.	GS-7	3,825	917.48
Hale, Golda M.	Administrative assistant	GS-9	5,350	1,837.95
Hanback, Hazel S.	Archivist	GS-12	6,600	2,093.45
Happ, Howell C.	Trial attorney (gen. sup.)	GS-13	8,600	2,936.92
Hardiman, Raymond M.	Chief, audit section	GS-9	4,975	1,638.94
Hoffman, Charles N.	Attorney-Adviser	GS-13	7,600	2,275.83
Hoffman, Laura E.	Purchase clerk (typing)	GS-4	3,355	737.62
Hurley, James W.	Spec. rent review examiner	GS-11	5,600	1,353.14
Kennedy, Dorothy W.	Administrative officer	GS-12	6,800	1,666.25
McCarthy, John T.	National board coordinator	GS-15	10,750	3,681.71
McLeod, John A., Jr.	Attorney-adviser	GS-13	7,800	1,842.04
Madigan, John J.	Dep. Hsg. Exp. (Admin.)	GS-15	10,750	3,624.58
Matteo, Linda A.	Director, Personnel Branch	GS-14	8,800	1,644.37
Milam, Luther M.	Field representative	GS-13	7,800	2,625.45
Mills, Juanita N.	Placement assistant	GS-9	4,725	478.76
Mills, Lorise W.	Administrative officer	GS-12	7,400	2,505.13
Moore, J. Roy	Board coordinator	GS-13	8,400	2,089.74
Morell, R. Coy	Field representative	GS-13	7,600	2,559.65
Ninde, Virginia L.	Voucher examiner	GS-4	3,355	933.32
Plummer, Charles O.	Placement assistant	GS-7	3,825	869.00
Pohling, Joseph A.	Chf. Reprod. Plan'g Section	GS-11	5,400	1,146.05
Propps, Arch L.	Field representative	GS-13	8,200	2,214.44
Recknow, Myra I.	Time, leave, and payroll clerk	GS-4	3,115	330.40
Reimers, Leora	Secretary (steno)	GS-6	4,200	1,441.97
Siegel, Nathan	Trial attorney (gen'l. sup.)	GS-14	8,800	2,248.41
Sparks, Donna	Clerk-stenographer	GS-4	3,355	810.15
Taylor, Jessie K.	Time, leave, and payroll clerk	GS-4	3,195	784.27
Tompkins, Evelyn D.	Voucher examiner (sup.)	GS-7	4,575	805.21
Watts, Alexander H.	Field representative	GS-13	7,800	2,130.17
Weed, Katherine L.	Secretary (dict. mach. trans.)	GS-7	3,950	772.84
Weed, William H.	Director Adm. Services Br.	GS-13	7,600	2,489.90
Weissenberger, Mary L.	Asst. to nat'l bd. coord.	GS-11	5,600	1,542.92
Wolcott, Wilma O.	Secretary (steno)	GS-5	3,475	826.00
Workmaster, William E.	Personnel Procedures Br.	GS-11	7,800	1,294.52
Total				86,266.88

¹ Atlanta, Ga.
² San Francisco, Calif.

Immediately following this I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the body of the RECORD my letter of January 28, 1953, addressed to Mr. James McInnes Henderson, Director of the Office of Rent Stabilization, along with the reply thereto, signed by William G. Barr, Acting Director, under date of February 3, explaining their position.

U.S. SENATE,
January 28, 1953.

MR. JAMES MCINNES HENDERSON,
Director, Office of Rent Stabilization,
Washington 25, D.C.

DEAR MR. HENDERSON: As I recall, the Con-

gress appropriated for the fiscal year 1951, to the office of Housing Expediter, some two million dollars which were marked for the payment of accumulative annual leave to those resigning from the agency during the fiscal year.

It has come to my attention that since only a small portion of this appropriation would be expended by reason of resignation, your office executed a plan whereby many of the permanent officials and employees who had accumulated 90 days' annual leave became aware of your proposed reduction in accumulated annual leave by the Congress. These persons were given the opportunity to resign

and were paid in lump sum cash for the 90 days' accumulated leave, totaling anywhere from \$300,000 to \$500,000, and on the following work day all these permanent status officials and employees were placed on temporary status for the period of the accumulated leave, and at the expiration of such period were again restored to permanent status.

It is the purpose of this letter to request a list of all such officials and employees, together with their Civil Service designation and salaries at the earliest possible moment.

Awaiting a full report from you, I am,

Yours sincerely,

JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

OFFICE OF RENT STABILIZATION,
Washington, D.C., February 3, 1953.

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This is in response to your letter of January 28 addressed to Mr. Henderson and your telephone conversations with Mr. Madigan on February 2 concerning activities of the Office of Housing Expediter during the fiscal year 1951.

In that fiscal year the appropriation was made available through a series of actions as follows:

	For operating expenses	For terminal leave
Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951 (Public Law 843, 81st Cong., approved Sept. 27, 1950).....	\$8,615,500	\$2,000,000
Reappropriated from 1950.....	1,600,000	-----
Total.....	10,215,500	2,000,000
Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951 (Public Law 911, 81st Cong. approved Jan. 6, 1951).....	1,200,000	-----
Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951 (Public Law 45, 82d Cong., approved June 2, 1951).....	250,000	-250,000
Fourth Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951 (Public Law 43, 82d Cong., approved May 31, 1951).....	750,000	-750,000
Total.....	12,415,500	1,000,000

The OHE was not covered by the General Appropriations Act, 1951, P.L. 579, 81st Congress, approved September 6, 1950, which included the "use it or lose it" leave provision. There were no mass resignations during that year. The amount expended for lump sum payments (Terminal Leave) resulting from normal turnover, including reduction-in-force, was \$392,789.

However, it seems to us that your inquiry may be directed to activities in the fiscal year 1950. In that year funds also were made available in other than a single appropriation, as follow:

	For operating expenses	For terminal leave
Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1950 (Public Law 266, 81st Cong., approved Aug. 24, 1949).....	\$17,500,000	-----
Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1950 (Public Law 468, 81st Cong., approved Mar. 27, 1950).....	1,400,000	\$2,600,000
Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1950 (Public Law 583, 81st Cong., approved June 29, 1950).....	600,000	-----
Total.....	19,500,000	2,600,000

The \$2,600,000 made available by the Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1950, contemplated the termination of rent control on June 30, 1950, although legislation was pending to extend it through June 30, 1951. In view of this and to work out necessary adjustments in the personnel of the organization, Reduction-in-Force Notices were issued to all employees under date of

May 26, 1950, with active duty through June 6, 1950, followed by annual leave or leave-without-pay through June 30, 1950 (unless prior to that date separation was requested, transfer to another agency made, or recalled to active duty). Subsequently, many Notices were amended to show last day of active duty as June 30, 1950. A number of employees let their Reduction-in-Force become effective at the close of June 25, 1950 and were paid in lump sum for the accumulated leave to their credit at that time. Thereafter these employees were given Temporary appointments for stated periods under authority of the then Civil Service Commission Regulation 2.114 (b) (3) and 6.101(d). At various dates the reinstatement eligibles received "Conversion to Reinstatement" appointments.

As requested in your letter, a list of these employees is attached.

As of possible interest, of the \$2,600,000 available only for Terminal Leave in the fiscal year 1950, only \$1,061,494 was expended for that item, some \$827,806 having previously been expended for lump sum payments from the regular appropriation. As indicated above, \$1,600,000 of the funds appropriated for 1950, chiefly the balance in the Terminal Leave item, was reappropriated as part of our original 1951 appropriation.

All employees of the agency participated in mass voluntary leave-without-pay for a week during June of 1950 in order to assist in financing our operations. This included those who had accepted Temporary appointments.

The total of the lump sum payments to the 49 employees included in the attached list amounted to \$86,260.88.

If further information is desired, it will be made available to you promptly.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM G. BARR,
Acting Director of Rent Stabilization.

In the fiscal year 1950, \$1,061,494 was expended by this one agency alone on annual leave with some \$827,806 having been expended for lump sum payments from the regular appropriations.

I have been advised that this device has been used by practically all the agencies of the Government, and if so it means that millions of dollars are involved in the controversy.

Mr. President, I recommend that the Appropriations Committee and the Committee on Government Operations examine the extent to which this questionable procedure has been followed and if laws have been violated, appropriate steps taken. If this represents a loophole in the law, then it should be immediately corrected and the appropriations for these agencies reduced accordingly.

To say the least it is an unjustifiable raid on the Federal Treasury, and the heads of every agency in the Government who have condoned this practice should be called to task.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,

Washington, D.C., March 9, 1953.

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: Under date of February 20, 1953, there was forwarded for your information a report concerning lump-sum annual leave payments made to 52 employees of the Office of Rent Stabilization in 1950 and to one employee early in 1951.

In memorandum of the Acting Comptroller General of February 20, it was stated on page 7 that there was presently under consideration a review of decision of the Comptroller General dated December 14, 1951, 31 Comp. Gen. 215. By decision of March 4, 1953, the ruling of December 14, 1951, was modified. The March 4 decision holds that under the 1951 Annual and Sick Leave Act an employee who leaves a permanent position and receives a lump-sum leave payment

for accrued annual leave must upon reemployment in a temporary position make refund of the leave payment even though there is a break in service between the permanent appointment and the temporary appointment, and notwithstanding under the present law an employee is not entitled to be credited with annual leave until 90 days of service.

In my opinion, the decision of March 4, 1953, and the provisions of the 1951 Leave Act preclude any possibility of recurrence of a situation such as happened in the Office of Rent Stabilization.

Sincerely yours,

LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General
of the United States.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I next ask unanimous consent that a copy of the letter dated September 16, 1967, signed by Mr. Macy and confirming his authority under the existing law to deny the payments, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., September 26, 1967.

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: In response to your question, I wish to assure you that the Civil Service Commission has the authority under Public Law 89-301 (by delegation of the President by EO 11257) to deny to employees of the National Capital Transportation Agency who take employment with the Metropolitan Transit Authority as of October 1, 1967, severance pay under that act. The Commission has exercised this authority in other situations. The authority is set forth in the law in these words:

"(b) This section does not apply to—

"(8) such other officers and employees as may be excluded by rules and regulations of the President or of such officer or agency as he may designate."

The Commission is presently securing all the facts surrounding this problem and will make a determination on the issue within the next few days. At that time I will write you further.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. MACY, JR.,
Chairman.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I think the outline of how this matter developed over the years should be made a part of the RECORD, first so we can understand how this abuse took place, and, second, the steps that have been taken to correct it.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to say that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] and I, who are familiar with severance pay legislation affecting Federal employees, certainly did not intend that it be used as a windfall. There are instances in every agency of the Government where severance pay is justified and should be paid, but I would hope that at least the intent of the law not be violated.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I want to join with my colleagues in expressing our great concern about certain pay severance pay benefits which were to be paid to some 20 employees of the National Capital Transportation Agency, a Federal agency which is expiring this Friday and the duties and functions of which are being vested in a non-Federal,

tri-State compact agency called the Washington Metropolitan Area Transportation Agency.

In Monday's Washington Daily News, John Cramer, a distinguished newspaperman, whose column is widely read and respected, revealed that these 20 employees were entitled to get \$85,000 in severance pay because the expiration of their agency is an involuntary separation from the Federal service. One employee would receive \$11,000.

Obviously, Congress did not intend this windfall when we passed the Severance Pay Act in 1965. The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service developed that legislation to rescue Federal employees from economic hardship largely because of the Department of Defense base-closing program then in effect.

The Severance Pay Act was a landmark piece of legislation and it has benefited a great many employees who otherwise would suffer great financial hardship because of the abolition of their jobs, the closing of a military base, or the closing of a shipyard.

But we did not intend that in some cases an employee might go directly from a Federal agency into a non-Federal agency—supported in part by Federal funds—and never lose a day's work or a day's pay to be the beneficiary of such severance pay. Paying anyone severance pay under such circumstances is unjust enrichment.

It will not occur. I have been in close touch with Chairman John Macy, who has legal authority to issue regulations for the administration of the severance pay program, and Chairman Macy has assured me that payment will not be made in this case. The Commission has issued regulations this day which apply to cases of this specific sort and payment will not be made.

This is done under the provision of Public Law 89-301, which provides, in subsection (b), that the section does not apply to "such other officers and employees as may be excluded by rules and regulations of the President or of such officer or agency as he may designate."

This was written into the law to take care of such borderline cases as this, which would have resulted in unjust enrichment. I hope, Mr. President, that from this example and this precedent, we will be able to move forward, so that we will not have a further example of such cases.

I have also been in close touch with the Comptroller General and have received a report from him on this case concerning the legal aspects involved. Our concern that \$85,000 of the taxpayers' money would be spent may be laid to rest.

But further, I must say that it is very unfortunate that cases of this sort require such quick action. Policy decisions made on the spur of the moment, beginning with a newspaper article on Monday and ending with an agency's expiration on Friday cannot possibly take all factors into account.

Mr. President, our concern is just as great to be sure that Federal employees are not badly damaged by the abolition of the agency for which they are working, or its merger with another agency, as it is to prevent unjust enrichment. We

want to be certain that we give our Federal employees fair treatment. I intend for the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to evaluate the Severance Pay Act and determine what legislative changes, if any, should be made. When the committee has an opportunity to examine all the factors involved, to hold public hearings, and to recommend legislation after thoughtful consideration, our judgment will be based on better footing than it possibly could be now.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the official notice from the Civil Service Commission, signed by Mr. Macy, with reference to their determination on this Capital Transit case.

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

U. S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., September 28, 1967.
HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY,
Chairman, Committee on Post Office and
Civil Service, U.S. Senate, Washington,
D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On September 25, 1967, I wrote to you concerning payment of severance pay to employees of the National Capital Transportation Agency who transfer to the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority on October 1, 1967.

The Commission has found that National Capital Transportation Agency employees who accept positions with the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority will not lose employment and other benefits, conditions for which severance pay was designed. Accordingly, the Commission has excluded from severance pay benefits employees of the National Capital Transportation Agency who are offered comparable employment, or who accept any employment before December 30, 1967, with the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority.

Attached is a copy of the Commission's press release on this action.

Thank you for your interest in this matter. Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. MACY, Jr.,
Chairman.

THE 60TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE WASHINGTON CATHEDRAL

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, it was 60 years ago this month, September 1907, that the cornerstone of the Washington Cathedral was laid by President Theodore Roosevelt.

In recognition of this anniversary, President Johnson has issued a Presidential citation. In it, he attests to the witness the Washington Cathedral has demonstrated all through these six decades to the reality of the fellowship that exists among all men of faith by its cardinal precept that the cathedral is and always shall be a house of prayer for all people.

Mr. President, I join President Johnson in felicitating the Washington Cathedral upon this anniversary, and ask that his Presidential citation be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, September 23, 1967.
Six decades ago, when President Theodore Roosevelt laid the cornerstone of the Washington Cathedral, he expressed his implicit

faith in the good that would be done by and through this House of God. He based that faith on the conduct of those who would worship there—and on the truth of the text that "they shall be judged by their fruits."

For more than a half century, the great Gothic gates of this Cathedral have stood open for all God-serving men. They have served as doorways to a Christian fellowship that speaks of human dignity and charity to all. And from them have come forth men refreshed by the enriching spirit that resides within, and resolved to live—and to help others live—for God and for this land we love.

It remains—and will always remain—a touchstone of inspiration for us all.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

EXTENSION OF MEDICARE ENROLLMENT PERIOD

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 13026, a bill just messaged over from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 13026) to extend through March 1968 the first general enrollment period under part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act (relating to supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged), 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 was read twice by its title.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, this is a matter which must be signed into law before October 1, during the next 2 days. Under present law, persons who are eligible to enroll in part B of medicare, but who did not enroll at the time of initial eligibility are given an opportunity to secure this supplemental medical insurance during an open enrollment period held every 2 years. That open period is scheduled to be held from October 1, 1967—2 days from now—through December 31, 1967. Coverage of those enrolling during that period would become effective July 1, 1968. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is also required to announce any changes in the part B premium rate prior to October 1. That rate is now \$3 per month to the beneficiary—with an equal amount paid by the Federal Government.

H.R. 13026 makes the following changes in the enrollment procedure effective for this first open enrollment period only. They would not apply to subsequent open enrollment periods:

First, the open enrollment period is extended for an additional period of 3 months. Thus, it will run from October 1, 1967, through March 31, 1968. Coverage of those enrolling during those 6 months would still become effective as of July 1, 1968.

Second, the changes in the part B premium rate, if any, would not have to be announced by the Secretary until December 31, 1967. The new rate would be effective for the period beginning April 1, through December 1969.

These amendments are nothing more

than a "stopgap" measure. They are necessary because H.R. 12080, the social security bill, contemplates changes in the benefits under part B which will effect the premium cost.

Obviously, the Congress will not have completed action on the social security amendments by October 1, when HEW, under present law, is required to act. This is simply a means of giving HEW breathing room while the Congress decides what it wants to do about part B of medicare.

If the Secretary is required to announce that rate on October 1, as would otherwise be the case, whatever he announced is likely to be incorrect, and will simply confuse 17 million old people, because we have a social security bill upon which the committee has just concluded hearings, that if passed will undoubtedly change whatever rate the Secretary would announce.

Rather than confuse the elderly people of this Nation with regard to a decision that may have to be changed, it would be best, it was felt, simply to give the Secretary more time to decide that matter.

The ranking minority member of the Committee on Finance [Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware] has quite properly inquired in depth about this situation, and I believe that he has certain information which further expands the record on that subject. As always, he has been diligent in seeking to determine just exactly what the whole problem is. While I regard it as somewhat technical, I think it is very well that the Senator has obtained the information that he has sought on this matter, to find out what the rate would have to be if the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare acted right now, when, in all probability, he will declare a different rate after we have passed a social security bill which I am confident we will pass, if not this year, in the early months of next year.

I urge the Senator from Delaware, therefore, to address himself to that subject.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, as the Senator from Louisiana points out, under existing law not later than October 1 of each uneven year the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare must announce the rates of the medicare insurance program as they would apply for the ensuing 2 years.

That would mean that not later than October 1 of this year he would announce the effective rate for the 2 years 1968 and 1969.

As the Senator from Louisiana has pointed out, in view of the fact that Congress is considering a revision of the Social Security Act the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has requested an opportunity to withhold its decision until January 1, 1968, or until it sees exactly what Congress will do in connection with the 1967 Social Security Act, H.R. 12080.

During the hearings, I propounded several questions. I asked first the question, What would the rate for medicare have been for the next 2 years if Congress were taking no steps whatever to amend the law? In other words, what would the rate be under the existing law

if no revision were to be made at this session of Congress?

My second question was, What would the rate be if the Senate should accept the bill—H.R. 12080—as it has been passed by the House of Representatives with no major changes?

The third question was, What would the rate be if the Senate adopted the recommendations of the administration for changes in connection with this title of H.R. 12080?

I felt that this information should be available to Congress when we acted and that at the same time the information should be available to the 17 million participants in this program and to those who may be signing up under the medicare plan in the next few months.

We have a letter addressed to the chairman and delivered today, which I shall ask to have printed in the RECORD. I shall, however, read just two paragraphs in which this information is contained.

The letter begins:

I am writing in response to the request made by Senate Finance Committee members at the hearings yesterday on the Social Security Amendments of 1967, H.R. 12080. The Committee asked for our best estimate on the cost of the Supplementary Medical Insurance plan to date and our best estimates concerning a proper rate for the program for 1968 and 1969.

I am skipping some of it. The entire letter will be printed in the RECORD:

Members of the Senate Finance Committee have asked, nevertheless, what rate I would promulgate if it were necessary to proceed by October 1 as required by present law. My answer is that I would promulgate a rate of \$3.80 for the two-year period of 1968 and 1969, 25 cents of the increase being based upon our evaluation, as yet incomplete, of the extent to which we believe the premium rate was below the actual cost for 1966-67 and 55 cents being the estimated additional cost to be expected in 1968-69 arising from an estimated increase in utilization and in physicians' fees and an allowance for a contingency margin.

Continuing, he said:

As you know, we estimate that the additional benefits included in H.R. 12080 as it passed the House would call for a premium rate increase of about 20 cents per month.

In the letter he states that adding the recommendations of the administration to the House-passed bill in this section would make but a minimal change in this rate.

So, therefore, we have information—all of which is detailed in this letter and is to be printed in the RECORD—which states that under existing law the administration was going to announce the new rate of \$3.80 and the proposals before the Congress would, if adopted, increase that rate further by 20 cents, to a total \$4 monthly rate.

It should be noted as these increases are mentioned, that they are monthly charges equally applicable not only to the participants but also to the Federal participation matching.

In summary the costs of the administration's medicare plan is costing about 30 percent more than originally planned, or as had been sold to the participants when enacted.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, September 27, 1967.

HON. RUSSELL B. LONG,
Chairman, Committee on Finance,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing in response to the request made by Senate Finance Committee members at the hearings yesterday on the Social Security Amendments of 1967, H.R. 12080. The Committee asked for our best estimate on the cost of the Supplementary Medical Insurance plan to date and our best estimates concerning a proper rate for the program for 1968 and 1969.

As I indicated at the hearings, because of the time lag in the submission and processing of bills in this program, we do not yet have complete figures for the 6 months of 1966 and have only very incomplete data for the first 8 months of 1967.

We do, of course, have up-to-date figures of cash expenditures under the program, but these figures taken alone would be misleading because they do not take into account liabilities of the program arising from the natural delay in benefit payments until well after the date that services were received. Such delay is due to the tendency of enrollees to accumulate a number of bills before submitting a claim, the inherent delays by physicians and enrollees in completing the claim forms, and the time required by the carriers to adjudicate and pay claims. There was a balance of \$426 million in the Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund at the end of July but there are also many outstanding liabilities. On the basis of claims paid (a cash basis), the average monthly per capita expenditures of the program, including administrative costs, for the six months of 1966 were \$1.93 and in 1967, for the seven months through July, \$5.71. As indicated, however, these figures need to be adjusted for the estimated increase in liability that took place during the period.

Figures on an accrual basis (the proper basis for rate determination) for the six months of 1966 are, of course, much more complete than for 1967. On the basis of the 1966 accrual figures we now estimate that the \$3 premium rate for that period was about 15 cents too low. It is the best estimate of our experts that the liability of the system for the entire year and a half period of 1966 and 1967 will be about 8% higher than is provided for by the \$3 premium plus the matching government contribution. In other words, we expect that the \$3 premium for the entire 1966-67 period will be low by about 25 cents. About 15 cents is accounted for by the fact that physicians' fees have been rising at a faster rate during this period than was assumed in setting the premium; about 10 cents arises from the fact that there has apparently been a somewhat greater utilization of services under the program than had been anticipated. These estimates are based upon incomplete data for past periods and upon projection for the period September through December and may be somewhat more or less when the final accounts are in.

In estimating the cost of the program for 1968 and 1969, we cannot, of course, project the same per capita costs as for the past period. To be reasonably certain that the rate is properly set it is necessary to assume further increases in physicians' fees and in utilization.

Based upon our estimates of the cost for

the present program over the two years of 1968 and 1969, we now anticipate the need for an increase of about 50 cents in the premium rate in addition to what we estimate was needed for 1966 and 1967. The 50 cents would be matched, of course, by an equal amount from the government. This figure allows for approximately a 3% annual increase in utilization and a 5% annual increase in physicians' fees in each of the years 1968 and 1969.

As you know, H.R. 13026 as reported out by the House Ways and Means Committee yesterday would make it unnecessary for us to proceed with the announcement of a rate for 1968 and 1969 based upon present law, but rather would postpone a setting of the premium rate until the end of December. The Committee believed it would be best to postpone the setting of the rate until a time when our information would be more complete and when the changes in the program now under consideration by Congress could also be taken into account.

Members of the Senate Finance Committee have asked, nevertheless, what rate I would promulgate if it were necessary to proceed by October 1 as required by present law. My answer is that I would promulgate a rate of \$3.80 for the two-year period of 1968 and 1969, 25 cents of the increase being based upon our evaluation, as yet incomplete, of the extent to which we believe the premium rate was below the actual cost for 1966-67 and 55 cents being the estimated additional cost to be expected in 1968-69 arising from an estimated increase in utilization and in physicians' fees and an allowance for a contingency margin.

Under H.R. 13026 it would not be necessary to promulgate a premium rate until the end of December, at which time we would have better information concerning the liabilities of the program for the 1966-1967 period and, therefore, a better basis for estimating 1968 and 1969 costs. Thus, any rate promulgated at that time may or may not be entirely consistent with the figures supplied in this letter. Moreover, of course, the rate promulgated in December would cover any additional benefits included in social security legislation as finally enacted. As you know, we estimate that the additional benefits included in H.R. 12080 as it passed the House would call for a premium rate increase of about 20 cents per month.

I would also like to make clear in response to a further request for information at the hearing yesterday that the Administration does not propose any changes in the provisions of H.R. 12080 which would change the cost of the Supplementary Medical Insurance program.

Sincerely,

JOHN W. GARDNER,
Secretary.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I compliment the distinguished Senator from Delaware for his thoroughness in this matter, which is typical of him. It is most appropriate that the legislative record reflect the facts on which the Senator from Delaware has insisted. The letter, while it was directed to the chairman of the committee as a matter of protocol, could probably more properly have been addressed to the Senator from Delaware, who, with his usual diligence, insisted on obtaining the information, to which the Senate certainly is entitled.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to concur in the record of what has been accomplished as of this moment. I think it is essential that we do this.

On the other hand, I cannot stress too

much the importance of obtaining this information. This is information that we must have before we conclude final executive action on the proposed changes in the Social Security Act for 1967 so that the changes may become effective.

I hope therefore that the action we take will be taken promptly. I hope that we get the information in time so that the changes can be made in the act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 13026) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF AUTHORIZING LEGISLATION OF THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1862) to amend the authorizing legislation of the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of September 27, 1967, pp. 26978-26981, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, the House and Senate conferees completed work on S. 1862, a bill to amend the authorizing legislation of the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes, after a very thorough discussion of the differences in the Senate and House versions of the bill.

These differences and the action taken by the conference committee are as follows:

The Senate version would permit SBA to pay the travel and per diem allowance to the Service Corps of Retired Executives—SCORE—who provide free management counseling to small business.

The House version provided that per diem and travel should be allowed in connection with travel to a point more than 50 miles distant from the home of the SCORE volunteer.

The conference committee accepted the House version.

The Senate version would permit SBA to reimburse members of SBA advisory boards and committees for travel and other expenses incurred in attending meetings of such boards and committees.

The House version had no provision for such payment.

The conference committee agreed to permit SBA to pay travel and other expenses, but the payment would be made in connection with travel to points more than 50 miles distance from the homes of such members.

The Senate version granted discretion-

ary authority to SBA to use the mails to disseminate information regarding its programs to persons who have not requested it.

The House version did not contain this provision.

The conference committee accepted the Senate version, with the understanding that the new authority would be limited in use to certain programs.

The House version of S. 1862 amended section 301(c) of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 to revise the criteria to be followed by SBA in granting SBIC licenses. It requires the consideration by SBA of the probability of successful operations of the SBIC including adequate profitability and financial soundness.

The Senate version did not contain this amendment.

The conference committee accepted the House version.

The Senate version of S. 1862 contained an amendment to section 302(a) of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 requiring that each SBIC receiving a license after the enactment of the act to have private capitalization of at least \$1 million. In addition, all SBIC's presently in the program would be required to reach \$1 million in private capital by February 1, 1975. The Senate version would allow SBA to exempt groups or categories of SBIC's from the new capitalization requirement or to extend the time period in reaching the new capital requirement. It also provided for the extension of the time period to individual SBIC's under certain circumstances.

The House version contained an amendment to section 302(a) of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 to increase from \$700,000 to \$4,000,000 the amount of subordinated debentures which SBA could purchase from an SBIC on a matching basis.

The conference committee adopted new language for section 302(a) of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958. This provision requires each SBIC operating under the act to have not less than \$150,000 in private capital and capital in an amount adequate to assure reasonable prospect that the company will be operated soundly and profitably, and managed actively and prudently in accordance with its articles of incorporation.

This question caused the conferees great concern, and I want to be very careful in setting out the Senate conferees' understanding of the matter. In the first place, it is clear that section 302(a) of the act applies to existing as well as new SBIC's. I think it is also clear, since the conference specifically rejected the Senate provision which required an upgrading of all existing SBIC's to \$1 million capitalization, that this new provision cannot be used by SBA to require a blanket upgrading of capital of the smaller SBIC's.

However, it is reasonable to conclude from the language of the amendment that SBA may require increases in capital requirements of an SBIC if the operations of the SBIC shows that it cannot operate profitably or with financial

soundness or cannot afford adequate management. This would have to be done on a case-by-case basis. The conference provision also recognizes the need for SBA to insure that both new and existing SBIC's have adequate management resources for active and prudent operations befitting financial institutions.

The Senate version contained an amendment to section 303(b) of the act which establishes a new form of financing of SBIC's by SBA. It provides for a single new instrument—rather than the two presently used—with a 15-year maturity. This provision provides for the purchase by SBA of the subordinated debentures of an SBIC on a 2-to-1 basis to the private capital invested but in no event shall SBA's purchase exceed \$7,500,000.

It also provided extra leverage to an SBIC with \$1 million or more in private capital which invests 65 percent or more of its portfolio in equity investments. Under this provision SBA's purchase of subordinated debentures shall not exceed \$2 million plus 300 percent of that portion of the SBIC's capital and surplus which exceeds \$1 million. In no event shall the entire amount of the debentures of a single SBIC purchased by SBA exceed \$10 million.

The House version amended section 303(b) of the act by increasing from \$4 to \$6 million the limit in the amount of loans which SBA can make to an SBIC under this section.

The conference committee accepted the Senate version with the provision that all debentures purchased under this section shall be subordinated unless the SBA Administrator shall determine otherwise.

The Senate version of S. 1862 leaves to the determination of the SBA Administrator the definition of "equity capital" as it would be used in section 303(b) of the act.

The House version defines "venture capital" without granting any discretion to the SBA Administrator.

The conference committee accepted the Senate provision to permit the final definition to be left to the SBA Administrator but changed "equity capital" under this section to read "venture capital." This will permit SBA to accept as eligible securities a variety of debt instruments which do not meet the technical qualifications of equity but which are substantially similar to equity financing.

The Senate version amends section 306 of the act to change the amount of funds which an SBIC can invest in a single small business firm from 20 percent of statutory capital—Government and private funds—to 20 percent of private funds. It establishes a reduction schedule by which those SBIC's which have sold subordinated debentures to SBA will have time to adjust to the new legal limit. This section will not go into full effect until January 1, 1972.

The House version does not contain this provision.

The conference committee accepted the Senate version.

The House version of S. 1862 contained a provision which provides that SBA cannot by regulation limit the amount

of real estate investments by an SBIC if those investments are within the limits set out in the original SBIC licensing agreement.

The Senate version did not contain this provision.

The conference committee rejected the House provision, but the conferees agreed that the Senate and House Banking and Currency Committee should hold hearings on the subject before June 30, 1968.

The Senate version of S. 1862 provided that the amount which a bank could invest in an SBIC should be increased from 2 percent of the bank's capital and surplus to 5 percent.

The House version increased the amount from 2 to 5 percent also but provided that the amount which a bank invested should not exceed \$1 million and that in no event should a bank acquire 50 percent or more of the stock of an SBIC.

The conference committee agreed to the 2 to 5 percent increase and the provision that the bank should not be permitted to acquire 50 percent or more of the stock of an SBIC. It rejected the \$1 million limitation.

Some of the most effective SBICs in providing assistance to small businesses are bank affiliated. This was pointed out most clearly in SBA testimony before the committee. The conference report includes provisions which will make it possible for banks to play an even greater role in making SBIC financing available to small concerns. This desirable result is reached by virtue of the agreement of both Houses to increase from 2 to 5 percent the proportion of a bank's capital and surplus which it can invest in an SBIC, and by virtue of the conference committee's decision to remove the House proposal to impose a \$1 million limit on the amount of a bank's investment in an SBIC.

At the same time, I regret that the Senate's position to remove the 50 percent limitation did not prevail as well. After the effective date of the act—90 days from date of enactment—banks will not be able to acquire 50 percent or more of the stock of an SBIC.

On balance, then, it seems to me that the legislation should serve to encourage banks which are interested in the sound development of the SBIC program—both those which are already in the SBIC program and those which are considering entering the program in the days ahead.

The Senate version of S. 1862 provided that banks be permitted to make loans within limits to its affiliated SBIC's without regard to the strict collateral requirement of section 23A of the Federal Reserve Act.

The House version had no similar provision.

The conference committee rejected the Senate provision.

The Senate version of S. 1862 contained a provision which repealed section 204(c) of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, which grants an option to small concerns to purchase stock of an SBIC up to 5 percent of the amount of the equity financing obtained from the SBIC.

The House version did not contain this provision.

The conference committee accepted the Senate provision.

The Senate version of S. 1862 provided that SBA shall examine each SBIC at least once a year "unless waived by the Administrator for good cause."

The House version requires examination of every SBIC each year and did not permit a waiver by SBA.

The conference committee requires an examination each year but permits the SBA Administrator to waive examination of the SBIC which is involved in litigation or is in receivership.

The House version of S. 1862 contained a provision which requires as part of SBA's annual report additional information regarding the actions of SBA, Treasury, Bureau of the Budget, and SEC on matters affecting SBICs.

The Senate version did not contain this requirement.

The conference committee accepted the House provision with the understanding that Congress would not hold SBA responsible for the failure of the other agencies involved to supply SBA with the needed information.

The Senate version provided that the effective date of this bill shall be 90 days after its enactment except for the January 1, 1968, effective date of the section dealing with the legal loan limits of an SBIC.

The House version provided for an effective date of 90 days after enactment.

The conference committee accepted the Senate version.

The House version of S. 1862 contained a provision which authorizes SBA to conduct a study to determine the best ways for small business to protect itself from criminal acts.

The Senate version did not contain this provision.

The conference committee accepted the House version.

Mr. President, I think that we have come up, as a result of this conference, with an unusually strong bill. I believe that it will go far to meet the pressing need of many SBIC's for additional financing.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I believe that the action of the conferees demonstrates the concern which Congress has for strengthening the small business investment company industry to make it a stronger and more effective means of supplying needed capital to small businesses.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER], who is necessarily absent.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR TOWER

Mr. TOWER. I am happy to have the opportunity of supporting the conference report on S. 1862.

The Senate and House conferees, in my judgment, have agreed to a bill which contains some of the incentives to increase business velocity which Congress intended for Small Business Investment Companies, both large and small. Congress passed a bill last

operation which was designed to correct certain operations by restrictive legislation.

I also believe a good job was done in avoiding size discrimination in development of the incentives. It is the type of legislative oversight that is expected of the Congress in its effort to make good programs work.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

THE FARM LABOR SITUATION

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, once again a growing crisis on California farms as the peak harvest approaches compels me to speak out against the irresponsible actions of members of the national administration—actions which are resulting in an inexcusable waste of crops—in grievous losses to farm producers, in a consequent loss of jobs to workers in agriculture and allied industries, and which will inevitably cost our Nation's housewives higher prices at the marketplace.

This long dreary story began with the expiration of Public Law 78 on December 31, 1964, when Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz announced that he would replace the necessary supplemental foreign harvest laborers who had historically helped out on our farms during the harvest season from some mysterious reservoir of unemployed domestic workers. He did not seem to realize that this idea was not a new one—that our farmers had tried unsuccessfully for many, many years to get along only with domestic workers—and by law, always had to employ domestics before any foreign workers could be hired. I pointed out then, and have continually since, that neither the farmers nor I nor anyone else wants to displace one single, willing and able American worker with a foreign worker, but that the facts are clear that an adequate domestic work force just is not available for the short peak harvest periods.

I also have pointed out, and I do again today most emphatically, that our Nation's crops must be harvested. It is unconscionable that the product of a farmer's year's work should be lost, and badly-needed food destroyed, by a stubborn and foredoomed effort to prove the impractical social theories of the Secretary of Labor and his allied experimenters.

Since January 1, 1965, the Secretary of Labor has imposed an unbelievable and ever-changing variety of conditions and bureaucratic regulations on my State's farmers as a prerequisite to their being eligible to employ foreign harvest labor. There is no time today to tell again the entire story, but I repeat that the Secretary has failed utterly in his effort to bring domestic workers onto our farms to replace those foreign workers who formerly helped us out at harvest time. Today this fact is even more easily proved than it has been before.

For years I have been pointing out to Secretary Wirtz that since he restricted the use of supplemental foreign workers the harvests on California farms have been handled not by the unemployed domestics he promised to bring to our farms, who never materialized, but by Mexican nationals who came in as green

card workers and, unfortunately, by thousands of illegal entrant wetbacks. Mr. Wirtz has met these statements time and again with silence, possibly embarrassed to admit that his experiment in sociology just did not work.

Last Friday, September 22, the Secretary, in a different context admitted the truth of my previous statements when he told the Senate Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization that tens of thousands of Mexican green card workers are employed on our farms.

The Secretary made this statement in an effort to restrict the entry of these green card workers. I would point out that in all the statistics made available by the Labor Department during the last 2 years dealing with farm labor these same green card workers were referred to as domestics and the impression was generally given that actually the work was being done by American citizens which was not the case.

At that same hearing, Secretary Wirtz chose to congratulate the California Rural Legal Assistance Organization for its work in the farm labor area. The California rural assistance program was originated in August 1966, for a very definite and worthy purpose and there was great and justifiable support for its objectives. It was designed to provide legal assistance to poor individuals who could not afford a lawyer. But now it appears that the CRLA like so many other programs of OEO has begun to busy itself in areas for which it was not originally designed. These new activities of CRLA have attracted the attention of and were dissected in an editorial in the Los Angeles Times on September 26, entitled "OEO Law Program Raises Questions."

I would like at this point to read that editorial:

OEO LAW PROGRAM RAISES QUESTIONS

At its inception last year the California Rural Legal Assistance Program had a laudable objective.

Armed with a \$1,276,000 grant—largest of its kind ever made by the Office of Economic Opportunity—the CRLA proposed to give legal defense for persons in farming areas earning less than \$200 a month. Specifically, its organizers pointed toward assistance in juvenile proceedings, mental commitments, administrative hearings in unemployment compensation and bankruptcy.

The budget has now grown to almost \$1,546,000, the staff numbers more than 125 lawyers, investigators and secretaries—and serious questions are being raised as to the operation itself.

Singled out for particular criticism was the fact that this federally funded program financed a legal battle against another federal agency.

Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz certified to the need for 8,100 braceros to aid in the harvest of tomatoes and other California crops, but CRLA attorneys promptly filed suit to block the importation. The suit was dropped after the U. S. Department of Labor, which should have exclusive jurisdiction in the matter, agreed to give CRLA a voice in determining the need for foreign workers.

In effect a private organization backed by federal money challenged a decision made by a member of the President's Cabinet in conformance to federal law.

Without regard to the pros-and-cons of the current bracero controversy, there appears to have been a misuse of funds by the CRLA. It is the latest in a series of OEO allocations which are open to question.

Too often, it seems, federal money is being diverted to activities not envisioned when the program grant was made.

Obviously there is need for a tightening up of the administration of OEO if other worthy programs of that agency are not to be jeopardized.

So serious is the problem raised by CRLA's injection into this matter that I believe it deserved some discussion. When the program was originated in August 1966 there was great and justifiable support for its objective of assisting the poor in obtaining legal aid for their personal legal problems. The first suspicious note arose, however, when the organization's board of trustees was announced and was seen to include Mr. Cesar Chavez and others allied with him in past efforts to unionize farm labor. At that time the status of Mr. Chavez as a labor leader was questionable, and he had no official connection with any recognized union, his affiliation with Walter Reuther and the AFL-CIO coming much later. His affiliation with CRLA, and subsequent actions by him and lawyers under the CRLA program, caused much concern in legal circles from the outset as to whether the program was being diverted from its original objective to political and union organizing purposes.

That concern has been justified by recent developments. Here is one example: In the past 2 years, the Secretary of Labor has been among many encouraging the use of high school teenagers to harvest our crops. This year as a result of the desperate need of the farmer the State school system had proposed that the opening of the schools be delayed 1 week so that the high school teenagers might provide desperately needed help with the harvest in that area. One might expect that the Secretary of Labor would understand this situation and be disposed to applaud the emergency action suggested by the schools. What actually happened was that the CRLA went to court in Madera, Calif., in order to prevent the schools from making this sensible contribution and so it seems strange to me that the Secretary of Labor should now take advantage of his testimony to congratulate the CRLA.

I charge specifically that CRLA has no business in our farm affairs, that it possibly does not know enough about the subject to be involved there, and that by becoming involved it is departing radically from the purposes for which the poverty program has been designed by this Congress.

The citizens of California have been horrified by the spectacle of CRLA lawyers, paid by their tax dollars, going to court against the Secretary of Labor and his Justice Department attorneys, also paid by the taxpayers, in an action which will inevitably result in losses to farmers and higher food prices to American consumers. Poor old John Q. Public is paying the bill three times for this absurd three-ring circus.

There are other instances of meddling by the CRLA in political and social affairs which deserve separate attention. Let me just say here that for the good of the poverty program, and if CRLA as an institution is to survive, I would suggest that Mr. Shriver immediately re-

place its Director, James Lorenz, and its executive director, Mr. Gary Bellow, who must accept responsibility for the organization's improper and irresponsible actions. I call on Mr. Shriver to correct this situation, and get CRLA back on the track, or, as a member of the Senate subcommittee responsible for the poverty program, I will do all I can to submit legislation to restrict the CRLA by law to its proper and intended activities. If that cannot be accomplished, I will oppose further funding of the program. It seems a shame that such a good and worthy proposal intended to help the poor has once more been turned into what seems to be an extension of the extremely long organizing arm of Mr. Reuther and his allies in the farm unionization cause.

Following CRLA's intervention in court to get an injunction to stop the importation of 8,100 Mexican nationals so badly needed on our farms, attorneys from the Justice Department and the Labor Department met with representatives of CRLA 2 nights before the scheduled court hearing and worked out an agreement in which the Secretary of Labor in effect delegated part of his authority over the admission of foreign labor to CRLA. This is very disturbing to say the least. Subsequently I received a surprising report which indicated that members of the Labor Department had indicated that they could have won this case had it come to court but they were unwilling to and chose to make an out of court settlement because they felt it would be embarrassing for members of the Department to appear in court in defense of an action which might be misconstrued as being helpful to the farmers and growers.

I have always thought that our Government is supposed to represent all of the people. Following that incident, the Secretary has refused to certify any further badly needed supplemental harvest workers for California's fields.

As a result of the meddling of Secretary Wirtz and CRLA, California agriculture is today in a desperate state. I am advised that our farmers as of now need at least 3,760 pickers for tomatoes and grapes, and that this number will increase by at least 1,500 within a week. Grapes are rotting on the vines today because the Secretary last week refused to permit additional harvest labor.

Tomato farmers have told me that 20 percent of the crop in the Salinas area is presently being lost and that future prospects are bleak, simply because of inadequate labor supply.

I talked to one farmer yesterday who will lose 500 acres of strawberries rather than go through an impractical, ineffective, and exorbitantly expensive labor-seeking program instituted by the Secretary of Labor plus incurring the added risk of legal harassment from CRLA which would result from a request for foreign labor. In those fields alone this farmer will lose \$200,000 investment and the American housewife once again will lose because strawberry prices will inevitably rise. Statistics released by the Labor Department yesterday held sad news for America's consumer. Living costs climbed three-tenths of 1 percent

during August and the price rise was led by food costs which increased five-tenths of 1 percent. In view of the fact that food prices usually go down in August it is indeed startling to realize that actions by the Secretary of Labor and other Federal Government agencies are unnecessarily contributing to higher food prices.

This situation is almost unbelievable and reasonable people can justly ask why the responsible Government officials would permit it to happen. It is not part of an effort to get unemployed domestic workers from the cities to the farms, because this has been tried and proved a costly failure. It is not an effort to raise wages and working conditions of farmworkers because California farmworkers already enjoy the best of these of any State in the country and still our growers are discriminated against by the national administration. The Secretary and CRLA's recent actions with respect to braceros and green card workers and the proposed use of schoolchildren on the farms make it even more evident to me than before that their real objective is to see that none of our farm produce is harvested unless it is done by a member of the AFL-CIO. In other words, I must assume that this is being used as part of a further effort to force the organization of all farmworkers in the Nation and I submit that in my judgment this is not the proper function of either the Department of Labor or the Office of Economic Opportunity, and I speak with the experience of 40 years as a union member. The fact of the matter is, and has been known for many years in California, that the unions wherever they have signed contracts in the farm labor areas, have been unable to supply the needed workers.

It seems impossible that the President of the United States could be aware of this tragic situation on California farms. He has based his request for a tax rise on the allegation that we have an expanding economy. I would like to point out that with continued actions by members of his Cabinet such as I have described, the economy of my State will be diminishing rather than expanding, and I might respectfully suggest that he should send his Secretary of Agriculture to study the situation and speak up for our farmers in this situation—why does not Mr. Freeman come to California. I invite him to spend a day or two with farmers and I am sure that he will quickly realize the truth of the situation.

The President has spent a great deal of effort in attempting to improve our international balance-of-payments situation. Agriculture has always provided one of our best sources of income from foreign lands, our agricultural balance of payments having shown a \$2.3 billion surplus in fiscal year 1967. This situation is possible only because of the efficiency and imagination and hard work of our farmers and allied industries. The harassment and ever-changing conditions being imposed upon California farmers now do not make for efficiency and will certainly result in serious losses of foreign markets.

And last of all, the President has professed much interest in the problems

of American consumers. The high cost of living is on our front pages today and every day. How ridiculous it is that actions of members of this administration are contributing directly and unnecessarily to higher food costs.

The people of California, regardless of political party, are disgusted by this performance and they are rapidly coming to the conclusion that a complete change in our national governmental approach must take place or our State's largest industry—agriculture—will be destroyed.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, in connection with the remarks of the Senator from California, I want to stress the importance of continuing a most worthy and important migrant program by the Office of Economic Opportunity: the Self-Help Housing projects.

Over the last 2½ years I have visited migrant labor camps from my own State of New York to California. The conditions I have seen were often indescribable—families crowded into shacks without the barest minimum of decent sanitary or health facilities, often without protection from the elements. Many of these units have been condemned as unfit for human habitation. Yet they still stand; they still house many of the men and women and children who gather the food for America.

The self-help housing program, run by OEO, offers the prospect for change. Built with simple, inexpensive material, they are constructed in large part by the migrants themselves whose labor helps to pay for the houses they own. The projects I saw in Visalia, Calif., and elsewhere, were well kept and attractive and the pride of ownership was evident in the faces of the workers and their families.

This is the kind of program that can begin to provide a measure of decent living for our migrant workers. And it is a program which I urge the Senate to support.

SENATOR THRUSTON MORTON'S CHANGE OF POSITION ON VIETNAM—AN EXAMPLE OF COURAGE, WISDOM, AND GREATNESS

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, in a masterful speech yesterday before the National Committee of Business Executives for Peace in Vietnam, Senator THRUSTON MORTON, of Kentucky, reversed his previous position with respect to U.S. military involvement in Vietnam. He said in part, before setting forth a six-point program for U.S. military deescalation, that:

If the President of the United States has been mistaken, so have I. In early 1965 when the President began to escalate the war, I supported the increased American military involvement. I was wrong.

This confession of error evidences great moral and political courage for which I sincerely commend the Senator from Kentucky.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] is particularly well qualified to speak on this subject. As Assistant Secretary of State he was, in 1954, involved in sounding out the reaction of the Con-

gress to Secretary of State John Foster Dulles's proposal to send U.S. troops to Vietnam. The reaction of the Congress at that time was strongly opposed to such military involvement. The distinguished Senator from Kentucky has served his State ably and conscientiously first in the House of Representatives and, since 1957, in the Senate, and has served his party as chairman of the Republican National Committee from 1959 to 1961.

For over 3½ years I have spoken out against the tragic military involvement of the United States in Vietnam. I have repeatedly urged President Johnson to follow the course of action so courageously taken now by Senator MORTON and confess that the United States has made a great mistake in Vietnam and withdraw. This would be in keeping with President Johnson's magnificent record on the domestic scene where he has succeeded in putting on the statute books a blueprint for achieving a truly Great Society. That blueprint cannot be carried out with the needless military involvement of the United States in Vietnam draining America's energies and wealth.

If the President could but heed the example of the able and distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] and confess error and take the necessary steps for an immediate military disengagement in Vietnam, the people of the United States would applaud his courageous action and his image as a man of peace—as a man of inspiring leadership—would be restored.

I ask unanimous consent that the forthright, thoughtful, and courageous speech of Senator MORTON before the National Committee of Business Executives for Peace in Vietnam be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

ADDRESS OF SENATOR THRUSTON B. MORTON, REPUBLICAN OF KENTUCKY, BEFORE THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE OF BUSINESS EXECUTIVES FOR PEACE IN VIETNAM, SEPTEMBER 27, 1967

The last three years have witnessed a disastrous decline in the effectiveness of American foreign policy. The root cause of the trouble is the bankruptcy of our position in Vietnam.

The ramifications of the tragic decision to commit United States forces in strength to an Asian ground war are everywhere evident. A crisis of confidence and credibility threatens to undermine the nation's hopes for economic and social progress here at home. Around the world, American principles and programs are suspect, by friend and foe alike.

The Americanization of the conflict in Vietnam has created a kind of myopia that prevents the Administration from effectively coping with major problems elsewhere. The number one priority of United States foreign policy must be to reach an accord with the Soviet Union.

The world's two mightiest powers have no alternative to developing a set of ground rules that will prevent holocaust, and permit peaceful progress, however bitterly competitive. Vietnam stands in the way!

In Europe, a revolution of independence challenges American initiative, but Vietnam stands in the way. In Latin America a revolution of rising populations and rising expectations threatens the future of our own

continent. More imagination and energy must be devoted to these areas—vital to our national interest—but Vietnam stands in the way.

On the domestic front, apprehension and misunderstanding of our involvement in Southeast Asia are contributing to a dangerous political polarization. Extremists of the left and right are poised to destroy our basic social fabric, while men of reason are reduced to answering "after Vietnam!"

How did we reach this impasse? And where do we go from here?

President Eisenhower warned in his "Farewell Address" of the dangers of too much power and too much influence in the hands of a "military-industrial complex." I believe that President Johnson was brainwashed by this power center as early as 1961 when, as Vice President, he ventured to Saigon on a fact-finding mission. I believe he has been mistakenly committed to a military solution in Vietnam for the past five years—with only a brief pause during the election campaign of 1964 to brainwash the American people with "the war in Vietnam ought to be fought by Asian boys."

If the President of the United States has been mistaken, so have I. In early 1965 when the President began to escalate the war, I supported the increased American military involvement. I was wrong!

While I believed then that we should not telegraph our punches, as the President's program of gradual or phased step-up clearly did, I have grave doubts today that any military action, then or now, would have decisively influenced the conflict.

The basic mistake of the Administration has been its failure to give proper emphasis to the political nature of the war in Vietnam. And the basic but overwhelming reality in Vietnam today is that a political victory may well be out of reach.

I am convinced that further military escalation and an additional United States military commitment will not obtain our objectives of peace in Vietnam. I am convinced that unless we gradually and, if necessary, unilaterally reduce the scope of our military involvement we may well destroy the very society we sought to save.

The President has said the war "is worth the price." There is absolutely no indication that the Vietnamese agree. They want peace, period!

We face a clear dilemma. Can we accomplish in Vietnam the limited objective we want and, at the same time, provide the Vietnamese with the security they want? The simple, brutal truth is: No!

Therefore, we must decide—without delay—on a course of political and diplomatic action that offers some hope of settlement. We must make it crystal clear to the American people that there is no military solution in Vietnam. We must put an immediate ceiling on further U.S. military action and open up every possible avenue toward negotiations.

None of our options will be painless, but who would claim that present policies have been without pain.

None of our options will be cheap, but who would claim that present policies have not been costly.

There have been alternatives offered before that have been rejected out of hand as too painful and too dear. But in retrospect, these lost opportunities have looked like bargains once the chances to take advantage of them have passed us by.

I believe it would be a national, and indeed an international, tragedy if the Administration permits any further suggestions for an end to the war to pass by unexamined and unexplored.

With absolutely no claims to expertise or originality, I believe the United States should consider the following:

1. An immediate cessation of all bombing

of North Vietnam. I do not share, at this time, the concern of many that missions close to the border of China present a grave risk of intervention. I do not question the effectiveness of the bombing of the North upon the war in the South. I believe that an indefinite bombing halt just might encourage Hanoi to talk, and I believe we must give it a try.

2. An end to all search and destroy missions. The price has not been worth the accomplishments. And the price everyday goes up. Furthermore, the cost in civilian casualties and disruptions only adds to the growing disaffection of the Vietnamese population toward their American "saviors."

3. A gradual concentration of effort to secure the coastal and population centers of South Vietnam where a vast majority of the people live. This can and must be accomplished with a substantial reduction in American troop strength. The "over-presence" of our forces has contributed to a mounting tide of anti-Americanism among the Vietnamese populace.

4. Increased pressure upon the Saigon government to negotiate and to institute widespread reform. The only hope for any form of representative government or any kind of civil order lies basically with the Vietnamese and their leaders—the present regime and the NLF. We can encourage reform, but we cannot impose a military occupation or a colonial government.

5. An internal and regional settlement. The thrust toward negotiations, toward a ceasefire, and toward a long range solution to the conflict that has torn the entire Indochinese peninsula asunder for a generation has to be initiated locally. A climate for talks: between North Vietnamese and South Vietnamese, between North and South, between Laos, Cambodia, North and South Vietnam and Thailand, between the free, neutral and Communist nations of Asia, must be developed by Asians themselves. We must do more to encourage them.

I devoutly wish that the United Nations had the will and the wherewithal to accomplish this task, but such is unfortunately not the case. It is apparent that a return to Geneva is probably out of the question. Perhaps there is still hope that a regional or All-Asian peace conference, without outside involvement, could set the stage for meaningful local initiative toward peace and progress.

6. The Administration should precisely state to Hanoi and the world that our unilateral disengagement seeks an appropriate response. Let there be no doubt, in any quarter, that while we will take the first steps down the long and tortuous road toward peace in Vietnam, we pray for an equally peaceful response. Let there be no doubt upon whose shoulders will lie the responsibility for continued chaos and devastation, should our efforts fail.

SENATOR RUSSELL HONORED BY GEORGIA STATE SOCIETY OF WASHINGTON

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, on Saturday, September 16, the Georgia State Society of Washington sponsored a luncheon in honor of the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia, RICHARD B. RUSSELL, in recognition of his long and outstanding record of service to his State and Nation.

This was indeed a memorable occasion, and I was privileged to be one of those in attendance and to deliver some remarks paying tribute to my beloved colleague. The Sunday edition of the Atlanta Journal-Constitution contained an article about this luncheon which I think

appropriately reflected the solemnity of the occasion.

I invite the attention of the Senate to the article and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

GEORGIANS HONOR RUSSELL IN CAPITAL

(By Art Pine)

WASHINGTON.—A nostalgic Sen. Richard B. Russell told an audience of well-wishers here Saturday he has never regretted being a Georgian, even though it twice cost him a chance at the presidency.

"I wouldn't exchange my heritage for any honor they can give me on this green earth," Sen. Russell asserted at a testimonial luncheon in his honor at Washington's famous old Willard Hotel.

The 69-year-old senator made his remarks in response to a series of tributes paid him by guest speakers at the banquet, several of whom alluded to the presidential nomination Sen. Russell missed as a southerner.

"He should be President of the United States today," said Rep. G. Elliott Hagan of Sylvania, who offered a brief tribute to the senior senator, along with colleague Sen. Herman E. Talmadge.

Sen. Russell also received praise from two other now-famous Georgians: Acting U.S. Tariff Commission Chairman Glenn W. Sutton, once a University of Georgia professor, and Interstate Commerce Commission Deputy General Counsel I. K. Hay, who served as executive secretary to Sen. Russell when he was governor of Georgia in 1932.

More than 250 persons filled the Willard's crystal-chandeliered coral-and-blue ballroom for the occasion which was sponsored by the Georgia State Society, an organization of Washingtonians from Georgia.

Sen. Russell, clad in a dark blue suit and conservative striped tie, sat through a steak-and-potatoes luncheon and then listened smilingly as guest speakers recalled his early days as a senator.

Georgia-born Dean Rusk, the secretary of state, was scheduled to take part in the testimonial banquet, but was unable to attend because of State Department business.

Society President Carl Hancock read letters of tribute from Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey, Majority Leader Mike Mansfield, D-Mont., Rep. Robert F. Sikes, D-Fla., Adm. David L. McDonald, and others.

Recalling the first time he met the senator, Rep. Hagan told the audience how Sen. Russell had sufficient political skill in his early race for governor to appeal straight to the young people of the day.

"I was a fuzzy-faced high school boy back then," Rep. Hagan said of the 1931 campaign, "but the senator knew what we all cared about. He told us they wouldn't let him have his father over to the governor's mansion because he chewed tobacco. Now we all chewed tobacco then, and we gave him a big round of applause."

The audience Saturday gave Sen. Russell a standing ovation, which the senator acknowledged with a broad smile and wave of the hand.

The society gave him a plaque embellished with the seals of the U.S. and the state, and dubbed him its honorary president "in perpetuity."

THE PRESIDENT'S URBAN PROGRAMS NEED PROMPT ACTION BY CONGRESS

Mr. NELSON, Mr. President, 3 years ago, President Johnson told the Nation:

It is harder and harder to live the good life in American cities today. The catalogue of ills is long. Our society will never be great until our cities are great.

These are the words of a President who has sent to Congress twice as many legislative proposals to help the cities as was submitted in total by his three predecessors.

All told, some 30 legislative proposals for the urban poor have been enacted by Congress over the past 3½ years. At this very moment, Congress has under consideration 14 additional pieces of major legislation to help our cities.

These proposals were submitted by the President long before the summer riots. The need for them is compelling.

Yet there are those in Congress who criticize President Johnson for not doing enough for the cities.

The question, of course, is how much is enough? An accurate estimate is impossible, but a great deal more is needed.

We in Congress cannot abandon programs that have just begun; and we cannot ignore our responsibilities to help the urban poor.

Congress has not acted on a large array of urban programs that, with legislation already passed, comprises an unprecedented program of urban aid.

We have on hand a sound and effective blueprint to bring progress to our cities.

We have approved almost the total request the administration asked for the model cities program this year.

We have approved \$40 million request for the rent supplement program.

We have approved the \$20 million request for rat control.

We have requests for the poverty bill, the Teacher Corps, the crime control bill, the social security bill, and an \$80 million request for housing for the elderly.

Taken together, these programs provide the base for a minimum beginning. They focus on the problems of urban blight and social inequities that cause unrest and despair in cities from coast to coast.

We have a major problem to deal with. The basic tools for remedial action can be used only after Congress acts.

This Congress need only to vote these proposals into law in order to take a major step forward in the rebuilding of the American city.

WATER QUALITY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MCGEE

Mr. MCGEE, Mr. President, city and rural turmoil are largely cut from the same cloth, and the conditions which have spawned them must be attacked simultaneously by this Nation. The urban upheaval which has gained such wide notoriety in recent years coincides with and, in fact, largely follows the rural upheaval which has been going on for years and which is still continuing, the problems causing it being yet unsolved.

Since 1950, as a result, the rural areas of the United States have fed 15 million more people into the great urban centers. Their loss to small towns and farm communities has resulted in one set of problems, while their presence in the cities has but added to the problems faced there by the massive growth of demands for services, for jobs, for housing.

The mass migration to the cities has resulted in overtaxed resources. It has resulted in overtaxed public agencies.

And it has resulted, according to some, in overtaxed citizens as well. Now the eruption of the big city ghettos has focused sharp attention on the urban problems we face. But the urban problems are to a very real degree a reflection of the serious decay of the economic and social condition in which rural America finds itself, and in which smaller cities and towns also are entrapped. Happily, I think, there is a growing realization in the Government that the problems in the cities cannot be solved in the cities alone if people are continually migrating into the urban centers demanding new housing, schools, jobs, and other facilities.

Mr. President, last month I had occasion to address myself to one important facet of this vast urban-rural problem in a speech before the International Water Quality Symposium in Chicago. I ask unanimous consent that the text of that speech be printed in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS OF SENATOR GALE MCGEE BEFORE THE THIRD ANNUAL INTERNATIONAL WATER QUALITY SYMPOSIUM, CHICAGO, AUGUST 29, 1967

At the outset of these remarks, I would like to compliment all of you in attendance for organizing and participating in this symposium, for it gives me a great deal of satisfaction to see that heed is being paid to the storm signals that have been sounded so ominously in the past few years and, in my own case, most particularly since 1959—the year I first served in the U.S. Senate.

It was in that year that some of my colleagues and I were successful in obtaining passage of Senate Resolution 48 which created the Select Committee on National Water Resources—a committee on which I was privileged to serve.

During the active life of that Committee, we held hearings all across this nation; we heard from hundreds of experts; we compiled technical and scientific data, and we arrived at some rather startling conclusions. Most of those are known to those of you here today.

Those conclusions, though they were based on future consumptive needs, irrigable land needs, power needs, industrial needs, really boiled down to one obvious and overwhelming necessity. That, of course, was the need to arouse and awaken a lethargic and unconcerned nation.

It became patently clear to those of us who served on the Committee that this was the most demanding task to be achieved in the wake of our findings. And, I am glad to note that on the legislative level we have had some success. Largely as the result of the Committee's work, we were later able to see the passage of the Water Resources Planning Act. It already has resulted in hundreds of scientists and engineers working actively on water problems in every state of the Union. The passage by the Congress this year of legislation establishing the National Water Commission will be another outgrowth of the spade work done by the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources.

There have been other marks of progress, of course. It is good to see the increased attention and emphasis which has been placed on desalination research and development. And, of special interest here, we can point to the passage of the Water Pollution Control Act of 1965 and to the increased number of organizations composed of professional and lay members who are actively concerned with water quality and other water problems.

Unfortunately, gentlemen, this is not enough. Not nearly enough. And I would suggest, even, that there is a correlation be-

tween our present day domestic troubles, particularly those of our crowded cities, and our handling of, of all things, water resources.

The town where I spend a good bit of my time—Washington, D.C.—is an example. Washington, our Nation's Capital, is, in fact, an example of many things and not all of them good. Water, though, is one area of concern in Washington, as elsewhere. This year, good runoff and relatively plentiful precipitation has alleviated the drought conditions which had for several years plagued the Potomac Basin and other Eastern Seaboard areas. The fact that nature has, at least temporarily, solved this problem for us should not permit us to gloss it over, however. Dry years lie ahead as well as behind us. And, unfortunately, an even greater population buildup also lies ahead along the East Coast, as well as in other regions of the United States.

This population increase will greatly increase the demand for water, all the while adding to the problem of keeping ahead of pollution.

This, however, is an age-old problem. Historians, of which I am one, have long pointed to the importance of water availability in the formation of civilizations. Nor have they been alone. Engineers, sociologists, anthropologists, economists and other social scientists, including today's urbanologists, all recognize the importance of water resources to man's well-being. It is, of course, basic because of biology.

From almost the beginning of civilization, man has employed every shred of his inventiveness to overcome the lack of water. Aqueducts from the days of the Roman empire are still in use today in some areas, and we, of course, have highly developed systems for transporting water over long distances, including even across the Continental Divide in my part of the country, as well as systems to purify water so that it can be used again and again as it follows its inexorable path to the sea.

Much of this is eminently reasonable. The basic reason why man has spent this incredible amount of time, energy and money to secure water is simply because without it he would perish. But there are other reasons, not so compelling. Indeed, some, if we viewed them from the perspective of our total civilization, might even be classified as mischievous. And these are the point of my remarks to you today.

We can dispense with serious questioning of efforts to provide adequate supplies of potable water for existing population concentrations. Obviously, that need must be met. We cannot seriously doubt, I think, the necessity for continued advancement in the field of irrigation for agricultural purposes, for the world food crisis is upon us and destined to grow worse.

Today, however, we undertake more and more costly long-distance projects to move water from one region to another only to feed the insatiable thirst of burgeoning cities—the megalopolis that are continually spreading their tentacles over selected portions of our countryside.

This is foolish. In fact, it is dangerous. Staff writer Orr Kelly of the *Washington Evening Star*, in a special report on the nation's water crisis at the height of the Eastern drought two years ago, made the point that one section of the country—Southern California—has used up all of its water resources and is importing water from hundreds of miles away. By 1980, he wrote, "four major sections of the country will have used up their water resources—and their growth will come to a stop if they can't find more somewhere."

Let their growth come to a stop. It should.

That is my firm belief, reinforced by the feeling I believe we all have deep down within us that much of our nation's current troubles—including the turbulent con-

dition of our cities, ranging from the riots of recent weeks to the continuing abandonment of the cities by the so-called middle-class—derives from our insane propensity to nest together in gigantic rat burrows, too often with the rats in our very midst.

Somehow, water has to be shown to be, at the least, a powerful lever to be used in rectifying the problems of our society. It is, I think, a central consideration in the attack we should be launching to solve our problems, including those of our cities.

Earlier, I referred to Washington. I do not mean to say that it, or this city, Chicago, or even Los Angeles, is obsolete in its entirety. But I do think we have more than reached the saturation point in many areas of our country. Certainly, this is true when one metropolitan area overreaches the natural capacity of the available land and water to become, for all intents and purposes, a parasite upon adjacent or even distant areas, draining off their resources and thereby inhibiting their development.

What I am saying, in short, is that a city, when it has reached its optimum size, should stop growing.

What, then, of the people? Where will they go?

Hopefully, they would go to new cities, to new towns—or at least to rejuvenated cities and towns that dot our landscape—where the natural resources needed to support them and the industries to employ them are available. Most Americans do, in fact, reside outside the great cities as it is. Why encourage their continued migration into our present day pockets of crowded overpopulation? Instead, why not disperse our Nation over the vast space it contains, utilizing our land and water more sanely, less expensively, and, at the same time reducing the frustrations and tensions that seem part and parcel of megapolitan living, or of commuting?

Since the availability of adequate and pure water is central to the growth of cities, it is the judicious allocation of water which can play just as central a role in the future development of our Nation as a whole. Certainly, this is no new discovery. Six years ago, the Select Committee on National Water Resources observed: "Today the United States is shockingly in arrears in water resource management. We face a water crisis that threatens to limit economic growth, undermine living standards, endanger health, and jeopardize national security. We live on the edge of water bankruptcy."

Despite the very real advances that have been made, we have, in fact, barely scratched the surface. This is a fact which cuts through the entire fabric of our society, however, and in attacking our water problems we must not overlook the others as well.

I began these remarks by recalling the work of the Select Committee on National Water Resources and my own abrupt realization of the scope of our National water problem after taking office in 1959. In the intervening years, in fact, we have seen, in the field of reclamation, a total of 600 bills introduced and 179 enacted. Appropriations for reclamation have risen from the area of \$250 million in 1959 to \$325 million for the past fiscal year.

Our expenditures for saline water research and development, too, have risen, from scarcely more than \$1 million in 1959 to more than \$27 million last year. In this field three specific pieces of legislation have been enacted, out of 56 introduced in the Congress.

We've done, perhaps, better in the field of water pollution control. Appropriations for the Water Pollution Control Administration in the present fiscal year total \$293,800,000, bringing the total outlay for this vastly important endeavor to more than \$1 billion in this decade of the sixties alone.

It isn't enough, perhaps, but let us recall that there had been no serious activity in the field of water pollution control at the National level prior to 1960.

This, then, isn't a bad record which has been written in the past seven or eight years, when one compares it with the more distant past. But it is not enough, either. It is just a beginning.

A GENERATION OF DESPAIR

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the July 30 issue of the highly regarded Sunday Times of London published an article which Senators and other concerned Americans might well ponder. The article reviews the historical background to our present time of troubles in human relations and offers persuasive evidence to support the grievances of many of our fellow citizens concerning the gap between promise and performance of "the American dream." While I do not agree with all of its points, I feel that the article merits thoughtful attention. I therefore ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

A GENERATION OF DESPAIR—INSIGHT ON THE DEADLY ECONOMICS OF SEGREGATION: THE TIME-BOMB IN THE CORE OF THE AMERICAN CITY

To get an idea of the despair behind America's race riots requires a considerable effort of belief from most of us in Britain.

We are not used to thinking of America in images of poverty: and even if we were, the poverty which afflicts the Negro sections of a city like Detroit is of a kind so bizarre as to make any European experience irrelevant.

The whole story takes a lot of telling. But there are some facts which can be briefly and bluntly stated in advance, to give some idea of the scope and subtlety of the corruption which has taken over the American cities, at a moment when America's power and prosperity stand higher than ever before.

One in three of the Negroes in most Northern cities are unemployed, or as good as unemployed (according to the latest Department of Labour survey);

Thirteen years after the Supreme Court outlawed it, there is more segregation in the schools than ever before;

In a period of unparalleled boom, after six years on steady economic expansion, median incomes in the urban ghettos (where most Negroes live) have decreased during the 1960s.

This is also after several years of unparalleled promises to the Negroes, hardly one of which has come true. A tragic, automatic mechanism has been exposed in American society, through which nearly every attempt to help the poor—and the poor are, basically, the Negroes—has been transmuted into a device for making the rich richer and the poor poorer.

The kind of irony confronting America is that the Federal money for the urban renewal programmes—running this year at £200 million—is being diverted into replacing slum dwellings with middle-class housing, which the slum-dwellers cannot afford.

The situation is one in which a city like Detroit can be seriously regarded as "liberal"—although no public housing programme has been completed there since the early fifties. Against this background Stokely Carmichael, the apostle of Black Power, calls for guerrilla war against the whites. It is an immoderate and violent demand. But the current predicament of the Negro is as immoderate. The violence is part of a context in which thirty-six mur-

ders in the South, of Civil Rights workers, have produced only three convictions, and no sentence of more than ten years.

And even moderate Negro leaders freely admit their sympathy with Carmichael's bitter denunciation. Bayard Rustin, leader of the great 1963 Negro march on Congress: "What Stokely is saying is that if things have got worse after all we've been through, there's something — wrong with the leaders, the liberals, the Jews, the unions—the whole alliance which has not produced victories. He's lost such faith in the ability of this society to move that he's addressing only the Negroes."

According to Walter Lippmann, America's most respected commentator: "The race problem as we know it is really the by-product of our planless, disordered, bedraggled, drifting democracy.

"Until we have learned to house everybody, employ everybody at decent wages in a self-respecting status, guarantee his civil liberties, and bring education and play to him, the bulk of our talk about 'the race problem' will remain a sinister mythology. In a dirty civilization the relation between black men and white will be a dirty one. In a clean civilization the two races can conduct their business together cleanly, and not until then."

The sluggishness of America's response to this indictment is indicated by its date. Lippmann was writing in 1919.

That was the "Red Summer," the first of the long hot ones. More than twenty race battles flared in the streets that summer, seven of them exploding into major riots. In the bloodiest, erupting in Chicago in July, twenty-three Negroes and fifteen whites were killed.

Two myths pervade the subject. The first is that America has been grappling with the problem since the civil war a century ago. (This is commonly advanced in Britain to demonstrate that "you cannot legislate the hearts of men.") The second myth is that the upsurge of violence in the Negro ghettos of American cities over the last four years is a new phenomenon.

The central truth is that, right until the end of the second world war, American Government was, at least tacitly and usually explicitly, segregationist. President Woodrow Wilson—the man proudly bringing freedom to Europe at the close of the first world war—actually imposed segregation in all federal services. In the same period, only the intervention of the Supreme Court prevented the imposition of formal *apartheid* through racial zoning legislation.

Even Roosevelt's New Deal was segregationist. In the rural areas the Agricultural Adjustment Administration adjusted thousands of Negro sharecroppers off the land. When these destitute refugees swelled the urban ghettos, the New Deal housing agencies turned out to have policies rooted in the old deal. One agency, the Federal Housing Administration, blocked mortgages on homes that Negroes wanted to buy in white suburbs. The other, the United States Housing Authority, financed separate housing projects for black and white. Inevitably, the black developments became merely extensions of the old ghettos.

Effectively, the New Deal was the final tightening of the noose around the Negro's neck. The depression was probably the last occasion on which America confronted the shortcomings of her economic system with sufficient starkness to have come to terms with the basic, economic nature of the Negro plight—if anyone had wanted to look that hard. But the Negro emerged from the New Deal if anything worse than he had entered it: a depressed segregated urban sub-class.

But in a back-handed way the New Deal did bring about the alliance on which the Negroes pinned their faith for the next generation: the common front of the Negro organizations and the white labour unions.

That alliance is arguably the single most important reason why American cities enjoyed almost complete racial peace for twenty-one years up to 1964. As long as the grouping held the Negroes had at least some powerful allies—notably Walter Reuther's United Auto Workers—in the jobs market.

From the unions' point of view there was never much altruism involved. They were simply shrewd enough to see in the 1930s that, with millions unemployed, the Negroes would make excellent strikebreakers unless corralled.

It was in Detroit, home of the United Auto Workers, that the alliance between Negroes and the unions finally sundered in 1960, when the white craft unions and industrial unions rejoined forces, and all the craft unions old distrust of Negroes came to the fore. It was an ominous but inevitable parting. As automation ate up the unskilled and semi-skilled jobs, the Negroes were once again competitors of the white workers on the lowest rungs of the ladder.

In the Negroes' post-war struggle for equality, the Supreme Court judgment of 1954 against segregation in schools is often seen as a landmark.

But in fact the willingness of the Court to temper the Constitution to the times emasculated the victory. A constitutional right, the Court had always maintained was "personal and present"; it could not be suspended for a single day. Until 1954, when the Court handed down the unprecedented decision that desegregation of schools was to proceed, not at once, but merely "with all deliberate speed." As the Negroes have learned with growing bitterness, the court could not have handed the southern states a more perfectly fashioned weapon for delay. Ten years later, surveying the rubble of the desegregation programme, a Supreme Court justice was moved to remark: "There has been entirely too much deliberation and not enough speed. . . ."

Nor has the Government demonstrated any more alacrity to enforce the 1954 decision. The 1964 Civil Rights Act was clear: no more federal funds to segregated schools. That should have cut off about 1,900 of the South's 2,200 school districts right away. But Congress and the U.S. Office of Education decided to be lenient; it was ten years since the Supreme Court decision, but the schools could have even more time to case themselves into segregation.

The result goes far to explain the growing Negro disdain of Government or Supreme Court promises of action. In 1963 1.8 per cent of Negro pupils in the South went to integrated schools; by 1965, 5.8 per cent; today only 13 per cent—almost 14 years since the highest court in the land ruled it was every child's right.

At the time the Supreme Court's cautious 1954 decision was handed down, the processes which tore Detroit apart this month had been on the move a long time. (And Detroit was, in a sense, a liberal city; the Negro Handbook, published by Ebony magazine, lists it as one of the ten best cities for Negro employment.)

Building the ghetto began a long way from Detroit, in the Deep South. Ever since the turn of the century there has been a movement of Negroes from the southern farm-lands to the urban north; impelled most vigorously by the decline of employment in the cotton-fields. Four million have moved north since 1940—a million of them in the last ten years. Two-thirds of all adult Negroes in the northern cities were born in the south.

Mechanization of the farms, and the use of chemicals, are making the share-croppers obsolete. The pattern is continuing, and 60,000 Negroes are expected to be out of work in the Mississippi delta this autumn. Landowners, consolidating and mechanising their plantations are glad to see the Negroes go; their attitudes are not unlike those seen in Britain during the Enclosures movement of

the eighteenth century. Some of them have placed advertisements offering to pay the bus-fares of any Negroes who want to go north. Some rural counties are starving-out their superfluous black tenants by refusing to take part in Federal food-distribution programmes.

Willing or unwilling, scores of Negroes pack their cardboard boxes every day and board the buses for Harlem, Watts and Detroit. Their life has not usually helped them towards handling the urban experience; naturally most of them are trained only to chop, are illiterate.

In the northern city centres, they find accommodation in buildings vacated by whites—who are making for the suburbs in the classic pattern of white, middle-class America. The result is the estimate of the Congressional Quarterly that by 1970 at least fourteen core-cities will have populations more than 40 per cent, black. Three have passed that point already: Washington, Baltimore and Detroit.

In Detroit, the rotting of the core can be followed closely by the differences between the 1950 and the 1960 census. In those ten years, as manufacturing industry moved out into the suburbs, the core-city suffered a staggering loss in manufacturing employment of 34.4 per cent (a trend which appears to have continued).

Thus "blue-collar" job opportunities for the lower-class Negro moved out along the freeway, out of range of the skeletal public transport system. Since the qualification for people moving to the suburbs was wealth—and probably whiteness—the frequently unemployed Negro increasingly shared the Detroit core with the aged and the impoverished whites. Between 1950 and 1960 the core-city suffered a loss of 22.4 per cent of white citizens in the twenty-sixty-four age group—which is the one that pays taxes and gets involved in civic affairs. There was a 50 per cent increase in people sixty-five and over.

During the same time, the core gained 183,000 "non-whites" (almost all Negroes), making a 60.4 per cent increase in non-whites. The decline of wealth was shown in the fact that the core-city's share of retail sales in the Detroit metropolitan area fell from 60.5 per cent to 51.1 per cent. And as industries, trade and prosperous residents left, taxable property valuations fell. This is a crucial point: property tax is usually the sole source of local revenue for the educational and social facilities now needed in greater quantity than ever.

A great deal was said in Detroit about the need for an "urban renewal" programme to attract at least some whites back to the depressed core. But the city leadership's policy merely made things worse in some ways. A conservative mayor was elected in 1949 who cancelled plans for eight public housing projects. During the 1950s two public housing projects, planned since 1940, were completed. Since that time, no public housing has been completed in Detroit.

Rather than public housing, the limited equivalent of British council housing, Detroit relied on devices like the Gratiot Project to deal with its slums. This seems to have been a not untypical urban renewal programme, in which after slum property had been acquired and cleared with Federal financial aid, the area was turned over to private enterprise developers, on the philosophy, frequently held by city officials, that only the market can plan development properly.

Under the Gratiot Project 129 acres of slum were cleared, and 1,950 Negro families were ejected. Although 76 per cent of these families earned less than \$3,500 a year (i.e., were near or below the Federal "poverty line"), less than half were relocated in public housing.

Gratiot was supposed to provide "low-income" housing, but in the event the sim-

ple economics of capitalist housing produced an area that was integrated and middle-cost by U.S. standards—but way out of the reach of the displaced poor.

More than 1,000 Negro families were thus left homeless. They merely moved into the neighbouring slums, increasing the overcrowding which had already been aggravated by Gratiot's clipping-away of land. It was an example of the process by which over the last decade the Negro has been forced further back into ever more crowded slums, while on its borders, public money aids the building of accommodation for the largely white middle-class.

Social conditions in a decaying centre like Detroit's would obviously be bad. But not until this spring, when the U S Department of Labour submitted an unusual new report to the President did anyone know just how frightening the unemployment situation could become. The report, entitled "A Sharper Look at Unemployment in U S Cities and Slums," did not create a national sensation—but it described conditions in which this summer's riots are only a surprise because they have come so late.

The Labour study showed that the ten-year census, through a flaw, had missed one in six Negro men aged 20 to 30: which meant at once that all previous non-white unemployment figures were gross understatements. The study showed unemployment in city slums to be so much worse than in the country as a whole as to make the normally-accepted measurements of unemployment irrelevant.

Thinking in terms of the national average unemployment of 3.7 per cent to 4 per cent, is hardly realistic when looking at the 36 per cent unemployment rate among young Negroes in Philadelphia.

The essential fact discovered by the Department's men was that more than one-third of the dwellers in urban slums—predominantly Negroes—were not earning a basic living. They also found that there were 10 to 20 per cent, who could work, but had given up looking.

The slum unemployment, the researchers found, was not mainly due to the economic situation. It was chiefly a product of lack of education and training. "No conceivable increase in gross national product would stir these backwaters," said the report.

The problem was new to the U.S.—at least on the kind of scale the Department encountered it. So they broke away from the traditional American statistical concept of unemployment, which counts the part-time worker as employed (even if he is looking for full work), gives no consideration to earnings, and omits those not actively looking for work.

The Department worked out a new formula to include the regular jobless, the jobless who have stopped looking for work, those with low-paying part-time jobs and those known to be living in ghettos without showing up in normal employment or unemployment figures. They called this the "subemployment index." It produced alarming results.

For instance, New York's East Harlem district had a serious enough figure for normally-computed unemployment, at 9 per cent. But on the subemployment index it showed 33.1 per cent. Several other northern cities showed disturbing subemployment figures, but the southern city, San Antonio (regular unemployment 8.1) produced the most remarkable index: 47.4 per cent. (see chart).

The report exposed for the first time just how inadequate were the incomes of the Negro city-dwellers. And this situation is worsened by the fact that the food prices in the ghetto (as in Watts) may actually be higher than in better-off suburbs, although quality is lower. One reason for this is said to be that Negroes, trapped in the ghetto by

lack of transport, are unable to move around and enjoy "comparison shopping."

Certainly the financial troubles of the ghetto Negroes are made even worse by the prevalence of extortionate high-purchase arrangements. Senate hearings on a proposed Truth in Lending Bill (designed to stop dishonest H P ads.) have revealed interest rates of 289 per cent, and higher for cars, and up to 285 per cent, on television sets. Some of the smashing and looting of shops is said to be a product of bitterness against the (mostly white) shopkeepers known as "honkies."

Such economic deprivation would surely be enough to spark riots on its own. But for good measure, the Negroes have been given sharp—and increasingly frequent—doses of political frustration over the last decade since the Civil Rights Act was passed.

The period has been marked by "signs of progress" apparent to the middle-class, but not so apparent to the ghetto-dwellers who are mostly Negroes. Since 1957 eighteen States and many cities have passed laws to protect Negroes from discrimination when they buy a house. But as the majority of Negroes are too poor to buy, the benefits are largely symbolic—and naturally, one State or city rejecting a fair-housing law causes enough affront to cancel out much symbolic good.

In 1960 John Kennedy won the Presidential campaign on a strong civil rights promise which gained him crucial Negro support. Kennedy claimed that Eisenhower could wipe out all housing discrimination with "a stroke of the pen"—which was true, because the Federal government is the ultimate guarantor of all mortgages. But in office, he was a slow man with a pen: he did not issue an executive order until 1962. And then it only affected housing directly-backed by Federal money and sold by developers; it did not touch housing directly backed by schemes, or even owner-occupier houses within the Federal scheme. Nor did it apply to deals in the pipeline and so it was 12 months coming into effect.

The year 1964 saw the passing of the much-acclaimed Civil Rights Law: a fine enough thing, but much of it did only repeat the Civil Rights Law of 1875 which had been largely voided by the Supreme Court in 1883. And in the same year several cities, seemingly in response to a national campaign by the National Association of Real Estate Boards, adopted ordinances forbidding the council to pass fair-housing laws. The year saw riots in Harlem, Rochester (with 1,000 National Guards out), Jersey City, Philadelphia and Bedford-Stuyvesant.

Hope revived somewhat when President Johnson swept into office with strong civil-rights programme (adopting as a campaign theme the civil-rights song We Shall Overcome). But when the Congressional elections of 1966 swept away the Democratic majorities, the Administration swiftly dismantled its educational civil-rights programme.

Mr. Johnson devoted just 45 words to civil-rights in his Message to Congress in January 1967: but lingered sternly on ways to fight "crime in the streets"—the accepted Gold-waterism for rebellious Negroes.

The President's barometric reaction to the 1966 elections marked the real beginning of the end of hope among the Negro leaders. By summer 1967 the posters of the Black Panther party ("Move on over—or we'll move on over you") were proliferating on the ghetto walls.

Intractable, perhaps—but so was Congress. Last year 14,000 children were killed or maimed by rats in the U.S.: on July 20 Congress killed a rat-control bill with laughter about "rat patronage" and proposals for a "bug corps."

It was only one of many cuts made at social expenditure. Mr. Johnson requested \$662 million for a "model cities" programme,

which was cut by one-third. He asked for \$40 million for rent subsidies, but got nothing. He asked for \$230 million for public transport programmes but this was cut by a quarter. Congress has weakened the authority of the Federal education office and strengthened the states: and is stalling on Johnson's proposals for open housing, tighter penalties for denying civil rights, and tighter fair-employment laws.

The Administration's civil-rights programme is solidly bogged-down, and the civil rights movement that was intended to create the "beloved society" has been a "certified corpse" since 1966.

Yet the little progress that has been made is itself a danger; a study of the terrible Watts riots of 1965 says that "resentment is just as, or more likely to find expression in riot participation by those who are better off than by those who are disadvantaged."

Alexis de Tocquville said of the French Revolution that "only consummate statecraft can enable a king to save his throne when after a long spell of oppressive rule he sets to improving the lot of his subjects. Patiently endured so long as it seemed beyond redress, a grievance comes to appear intolerable once the possibility of removing it crosses men's minds."

There are few signs of "consummate statecraft." President Johnson's remedy of discipline through better police work sounds hollow even to an American audience unwilling to contemplate what does need to be done.

But the question which emerges in the end is whether white America realises the catastrophe in its midst, or perhaps whether white America even cares? In the Watts district of Los Angeles, where the riots of August, 1965, killed 34 people and caused over £14 million-worth of damage, the Government has since spent about £1.5 million in federal aid. But 51 per cent, of that has gone simply on administration: the rest, for all the change social workers can detect, might have run into the sand.

Across the bay from San Francisco, another poverty programme in the city of Oakland has consumed almost £10 million in the last five years. By June of last year the local unemployment among Negro youths of eighteen-nineteen years was a record 32 per cent. And the aid programme was creating scarcely any new jobs. There is a lot of work available, on the subway system being built in the area as part of San Francisco's new public transport network. But the craft unions on the subway jobs are so segregationist that they have insisted that white labour be imported.

That degree of intransigence has much in common with the House of Representatives' attitude to the rats. Ultimately, what is terrifying about the figure of 14,000 children killed or maimed by rats is that America is a society sophisticated enough to produce that kind of statistic but now apparently too irresponsible to do anything about it.

LOW YIELDS ON PUBLIC PROJECTS CALL FOR SPENDING CUTS

Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. President, a recent newsletter by a leading financial concern offers some penetrating analysis of our current economic debate over the administration's proposed surtax. Gabriel T. Kerekes, in "Trends in Capital Markets," which is published by Goodbody & Co., of New York, notes that—

The current debate as to the relative desirability of a tax increase vs borrowing is filled with agitated and persuasive arguments on both sides. Opponents of the surtax, of course, point out its inhibitive effects. They claim that more often than not the

yields obtained through raising taxes remain far below expectations. Those who wish to see the surtax enacted contend that the prime necessity is for the transfer of real resources from the private sector to the public sector to permit the Federal Government to carry out the high international and domestic responsibilities it has assumed. They emphasize that the availability of these resources would be jeopardized if consumers and business should be left with too much purchasing power to bid for them.

Mr. President, no justification exists for such a resource transfer as envisioned by proponents of the surtax if the return obtained from the funds in the public sector are unrealistically below the returns possible in the private sector. Yet, this is exactly the result that follows administration utilization of drastically low discount rates for many projects.

The Economy in Government Subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee has just completed a series of hearings into the planning-programing-budgeting system—PPB. During those hearings a panel of top economists unanimously agreed that administration policy employing the average interest rate payable by the Treasury on interest-bearing marketable securities is very wrong.

The rate the administration has been using is generally around 3 percent; for a long period it was $3\frac{1}{8}$ percent, and more recently it moved up to $3\frac{1}{4}$ percent; nevertheless, it is a low rate. Pinning down a specific private sector rate is hard to do, but the panel testifying agreed that such a rate would be at a minimum of at least 10 percent, and possibly as high as 15 percent. As long as such a diversity between the public and private rates is allowed to continue, resource transfers to the government sector will lead to increasing inflationary pressures. It will also lead to diminished economic growth because the private sector with an average return of better than 10 percent literally three times as high a return as the public section.

Mr. President, it is time for the administration to begin utilizing real discount rates in planning its expenditure programs. Despite the hurt cries coming from the administration when we suggest that spending programs be cut back, I have no doubt that vast savings could be accomplished to establish more realistically the total economic costs of continuing projects set up under the "wrong" discount rate.

THE VALUABLE HELP RENDERED THE FAIRBANKS FLOOD VICTIMS BY REPRESENTATIVES OF THE BUREAU OF STANDARDS

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, what can be done when floodwaters damage every home in an area only 6 weeks before the freezing season sets in?

This problem faced the residents of the Fairbanks, Alaska, area last month after the Chena River inundated their homes and businesses.

Because it was essential that these homes and other buildings be dried before cold weather arrived, I asked for technical assistance from the building and construction experts of the National Bureau of Standards in the Department of Commerce.

The response was quick and direct. Within 24 hours, two National Bureau of Standards engineers, William C. Cullen and Clinton W. Phillips were assigned to the task. They flew to the Fairbanks area with me and members of the staff of the Senate Public Works Committee.

After a field survey and discussions with Federal and State officials, the National Bureau of Standards engineers developed recommendations for the drying of buildings. The recommendations were made known to the people of Fairbanks through radio, television, leaflets, newspaper stories, and meetings with flood victims.

The assistance and cooperation of the National Bureau of Standards engineers is a bright landmark in Government-people relations. The story of their work appears in the September 1967 issue of the Bureau's employee newspaper, the NBS Standard. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

AFTER FAIRBANKS FLOOD: NBS ANSWERS ALASKA'S CALL FOR HELP

In the aftermath of the Great Fairbanks Flood, Alaskans called out for help—to rehabilitate their homes and businesses, to "dry out" before the winter freeze comes—and the National Bureau of Standards answered that call. At the request of Senator Ernest Gruening of Alaska, a member of the Senate Public Works Committee, a team from the Building Research Division, William C. Cullen and Clinton W. Phillips, traveled to the flood-ravaged area to make recommendations on drying out the water-soaked buildings.

The Senator's office called the Bureau for help on the afternoon of August 21. By the next afternoon, Cullen and Phillips had been assigned the task and were flying north with Senator Gruening and two members of the Public Works Committee staff, Joseph Van Vladriken and Harold Symes.

The arriving delegation found that, although flood waters had subsided, the problems were not over. The recalcitrant Chena River had left an inch or so of odorous brown mud on all level surfaces. Not one home in Fairbanks had escaped flood damage. Senator Gruening noted that this disaster is even worse "than the Alaska earthquake of 1964" because "no one who has a house or a business in the Fairbanks area escaped damage. It is universal, and in most cases very substantial."

At the Army Corps of Engineers' headquarters, Mr. Cullen and Mr. Phillips were brought up-to-date on the damage, the actions that had been taken, and those that were going on to restore utilities and to get residents back in their homes. The two men then explained that they were there representing the Building Research Division, to provide technical assistance, and to suggest procedures for the rapid drying out of homes without damaging or disturbing building components that were still structurally sound. They offered the support of NBS in other areas where its competence lies, should Fairbanks need it.

The most important fact—the one that shaped all rehabilitation efforts—was the rapid approach of Alaska's freezing season, only a month to six weeks away. Because of this, homes had to be dried and dehumidified as quickly as possible.

To get a first-hand look at the damage, Mr. Cullen and Mr. Phillips toured the area, along with Senator Gruening, Mr. Symes and Mr. Van Vladriken; Creath Tooley, Regional Director of the Office of Emergency Planning; Elmer Gagon, Director of the Federal Housing Administration for Alaska; Joseph Hong

of the Department of Housing and Urban Development; Alaska's Secretary of State Keith Miller; and William J. Niemi, Regional Administrator of the Federal Highway Administration. The residential streets of Fairbanks looked as if a giant rummage sale were underway. Chairs, tables, lamps—all kinds of household possessions—were strewn over the lawns and roofs to dry; clothing and linens festooned the trees. Some belongings, beyond repair, waited to be hauled away to the trash pile. The damage was extensive. The majority of homes had been flooded to a maximum of 36 inches above the living room floor level. In most cases, the heating systems were housed in the basement, and were therefore—because of the flooding—no longer operable. Small portable heaters had to be used to begin the drying out process. The preliminary estimate of damage to private and public buildings was somewhere in the neighborhood of \$150 million, not including personal property losses, such as furniture and clothing. Ninety eight percent of the losses suffered were categorized uninsurable in relation to flood damage.

Based on briefings, their observations and professional knowledge, critical examinations of the damage, and discussions with local engineers and flood victims, Mr. Cullen and Mr. Phillips made the following recommendations to the citizens of Fairbanks:

1. Remove standing water from the buildings by pumping, bailing, etc.
2. Repair the heating system as soon as possible.
3. Operate the heating system at a higher than normal thermostatic setting (80 to 90° F.). Leave windows and doors open until the interior of the structure has dried out.
4. After the interior has been reasonably dried, continue to operate the heating system at a higher than normal temperature, with doors and windows only partially opened to drive out the water from the insulation, sheathing, to the exterior walls.
5. Do not remove interior walls or the vapor barriers located directly beneath the wall unless it is absolutely necessary for their replacement due to physical damage. If damage to the vapor barrier is apparent, it should be repaired immediately.
6. Do not remove or open exterior walls unless absolutely necessary. Drying of insulation and sheathing in the walls will be hastened if the top and bottom of the exterior walls can be opened by some means at each stud space to provide for increased ventilation of the stud spaces. This procedure should be followed only if it can be accomplished easily and repaired easily. It is important that all buildings which have been flooded be heated during the winter to avoid further and serious damage by freezing of water in walls, foundations, and surrounding earth.

The recommendations were sent out to the people through radio messages, leaflets, newspaper articles, and through meetings with the Citizens Coordinating Committee, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and the American Red Cross, as well as direct communications with the residents of the homes visited. At one point, the two NBS representatives appeared on the local radio station with Senator Gruening to air and further stress these recommendations.

So, as the winter freeze approaches, the people of Fairbanks will be able once again to occupy their homes with confidence, thanks to two "rescuers" from the Building Research Division.

THE FOOTBALL COACHING STAFFS OF GEORGIA TECH AND THE UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, one of my warm friends and constituents has brought to my attention an excellent article published in the Atlanta Journal

and Constitution magazine of September 17 about the football coaching staff of the Georgia Institute of Technology, better known as Georgia Tech.

Georgia Tech is one of the most outstanding engineering schools in the Nation. Moreover, over the years it has compiled a remarkable record on the gridiron, and the Georgia Tech Yellowjackets are nationally known as a hard-playing, effective foe on the football field. Even more remarkable, as the magazine article points out, in the 64-year history of the Georgia Tech athletic program, Tech has had only four football coaches, the last being the well-known and respected Bobby Dodd, before his retirement this year to turn this position over to Bud Carson.

From any standpoint, the fact that there have been only four coaches at Georgia Tech in well over a half century is indeed extraordinary. Moreover, the athletic program at Georgia Tech has been a great force in molding the character and the bodies of some of Georgia's finest young men.

As an alumnus of the University of Georgia, which will meet Georgia Tech on the gridiron on December 2, I can commend Georgia Tech for its outstanding athletic program, but I cannot in good conscience wish Tech success on that day. My best wishes must go to Georgia Bulldogs' coach Vince Dooley, who has been coach at the University of Georgia for 3 years, and in those 3 years has put teams on the field that have emerged victorious over Georgia Tech. And in order to underscore my allegiance to my alma mater, I also am compelled to comment on a splendid article in the same magazine, September 24, about Coach Dooley.

I invite these articles to the attention of Senate and ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

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

TECH'S FOUR COACHES IN 64 YEARS
(By Furman Bisher)

Football was a relatively inconsequential aspect of the tribal routine at Georgia Tech until one day in October 1903. On that day, Oct. 17, Georgia Tech played a team from Clemson College on a field wet and slow and not given to high scoring, and Georgia Tech was annihilated, 73-0.

In the stunned aftermath of that dreadful moment, some of the Georgia Tech people, led by an alumnus ('99) named Frank Turner, decided that the school must achieve respectability on the athletic field, and that to do so, what was needed was a coach like this remarkable fellow, Heisman, who coached at Clemson.

In fact, why not Heisman?

And so in time, for an increase in salary amounting to \$50 a month, John W. Heisman was hired as Georgia Tech's first full-time, card-carrying football coach in 1904. As a kind of justification of the gesture, Georgia Tech narrowed its margin with Clemson by exactly 73 points in Heisman's first season. The two teams tied, 11-11.

Football was so nebulous in nature at Tech prior to Heisman that even today the most resourceful of historians cannot determine the name of the party he succeeded. Student-athletes, interested professors and one year a young lieutenant from Ft. McPherson—his name was Leonard Wood, who later had an Army post named for him—had

coached the Tech football team since the first one was formed in 1892. It was hardly a team, more a "club." Anybody who walked in off the street, had two arms, two legs and wasn't blind, could play, but obviously ineffectually. Before Heisman, Tech had won only eight games, and only two of those in 1903, and so the name of that unfortunate mentor is just as well lost in the ravel of time.

But the others, those who were paid and professional at their work, belong to a peculiar kind of clique all their own. Peculiar One (1) because of the exclusiveness of their group, Peculiar Two (2) because neither of them was ever forcibly disengaged.

In other words, Georgia Tech is believed to be the only major academic institution which has had only three head coaches and which has never fired one.

This year the club has added a fourth. His name is Leon Halden (Bud) Carson. Only a fool would walk onto such a stage without some trace of fear and trembling when following such an act as John W. Heisman, William A. Alexander and Robert L. Dodd, all three big winners in the profession of their choice and all three permanently memorialized in the National Football Hall of Fame.

One night last summer, long after the sun had set even by the Eastern Daylight standard, and all other true-blue businessmen were safely home with their families, Bud Carson was discovered in his office at Georgia Tech.

"What are you doing here at this hour?" I asked.

"Panicking," he said. "I want to be in good practice to handle it when it really comes during the season."

You might consider it unusual that the first and the latest of Georgia Tech's head football coaches are native Pennsylvanians, and western Pennsylvania at that. Heisman came from Titusville, famed for its history in oil and petroleum, and Carson came from Freeport, famous for next to nothing.

You might consider it unusual, too, that both came into their positions "foreign" to the campus, while Bill Alexander and Bobby Dodd both spent years of apprenticeship in the shadow of the bell tower. Heisman, of course, was a transient mercenary. He had already coached at . . . well, better yet, let's take a good, long, uncluttered look at all four, man by man, and see what sort of people have created this dynasty which has defied the erosion of time and the capricious disposition of alumni:

HEISMAN (1904-19)

He had already coached at four colleges before he reached Georgia Tech, beginning at Oberlin in 1892, then to Akron University, then to Auburn, then to Clemson. After Georgia Tech, he moved successively to Pennsylvania, Washington & Jefferson and Rice, but never again found the touch that created his remarkable record at Georgia Tech. Here, his teams won 120 games, lost only 29 and tied 6.

After retirement at Rice, Heisman became athletic director of the Downtown Athletic Club in New York City, and it was here that his immortality was assured. After his death in 1936, the Downtown Athletic Club created the Heisman Award in his memory, and the winner of the Heisman Award is generally acknowledged as the outstanding college football player of each year, beginning with Jay Berwanger of Chicago down through Steve Spurrier of Florida.

Heisman was a complex personality who operated as if he were a world to himself. He regarded his opinions as unchallengeable. He had a brilliant football mind and wasn't at all unwilling to make an opinion official by his own proclamation. He was an arrogant man and his football players, so the historians say, lived and played in fear of him.

However, a contemporary sports writer,

Fuzzy Woodruff, who was with The Atlanta Constitution at that time, tempers the views of Heisman detractors in a series of books he wrote called "History of Southern Football."

"I knew him, I guess," Woodruff wrote, "as intimately as anybody ever knew Heisman, for the great coach was never a man to encourage intimacies. He had received his football training at Brown and at the University of Pennsylvania and he had not stopped at being a great football player. He was a great football student. . . ."

"This is written years after old 'Heis' had disappeared from Southern Conference football, after he has given up the game for good, I understand. It is written to curry favor with no man. I know there are men who will take exceptions to these paragraphs, but they are written in hope that future football generations may have a correct idea of a gentleman much abused."

Something in support of Woodruff's portrait of the man is found in the manner in which Heisman left Georgia Tech. When he arrived, he was indeed supreme among Southern coaches, but simultaneous with that arrival, Dan McGugin came to Vanderbilt and Mike Donahue came to Auburn. These two young bucks swept to instant glory, Heisman was shot down, and he had to claw his way back to dominance. But he did, and was in full flight again, three national championships and a covey of All-Americans behind him when, shortly after the 1919 season, he called Chip Robert, of the athletic board, and gave him some stunning news.

"Mrs. Heisman and I have agreed to a divorce. There are no hard feelings. However, we have agreed that we must not live in the same town. Wherever Mrs. Heisman chooses to live, I will live elsewhere."

Mrs. Heisman chose Atlanta. Coach Heisman then resigned and left to accept his new position at Pennsylvania, which had been trying to pipe him back to his old campus.

ALEXANDER (1920-44)

A peculiar thing about him, he lived a good part of his boyhood in Athens, in sight of the Georgia campus, but he was determined to go to college at Georgia Tech. Perhaps it was the attractiveness of Heisman, who reached Atlanta about this time. And then, too, he was not a born-and-bred, dyed-in-the-wool Athenian.

He was born in Mud River, Ky. His father died when he was six and his mother supported her two children as a schoolteacher and moved from Kentucky to Tennessee to Georgia.

As a student and an athlete, Alexander apparently left a good deal to be desired, but not as a man. He used up six years to complete a four-year course at Georgia Tech, though it should be said in his behalf that he was a self-help student. He was never more than a "scrub"—they call it "bench" these days—as a player. After graduation, however, he was invited to remain on the campus, first as a mathematics instructor, and then as an assistant to Heisman. Football soon became the consuming influence.

When Heisman departed some members of the Tech administrative staff began casting about for a "name," such as Gil Dobie, then celebrated in the East. Chip Robert stumped for Alexander and it was Alexander who got the job.

When he retired after the 1944 season, his teams had won 134 games, lost 95 and tied 15.

Many men have written many sentences about Alexander the Man. Generally, they all add up to the same conclusion.

"Under him," Ralph McGill has written, "character-building was a part of football, not a cynical phrase as it is today. . . . Not many persons really knew him. He was shy. He wore severeness like a cloak. His tongue could rasp like a file. But this was merely a defense of a man who was, in truth, the gentlest of men, the softest touch, the kind-

est and most compassionate friend a man could have."

No one knew Alexander quite as well as Bobby Dodd, the man "Coach Alex"—that was Dodd's title for him—chose to succeed him.

Dodd has often described him in this manner: "The Old Man had the football know-how of Knute Rockne, the sense of humor and the story-telling ability of Mark Twain, the storehouse of miscellaneous information of John Kieran, and the sympathetic understanding of Dorothy Dix."

Alexander's retirement and Dodd's succession as head coach leaked out prematurely through the old football announcer, Harry Wismer. In the long run, though, it came off in the orderly manner in which Georgia Tech has handled its football affairs, and once again it was that man Chip Robert who was behind the scene directing the traffic.

DODD (1945-66)

This man sort of defies description as a football coach when you consider the mold of such men. He was nothing that either Heisman or Alexander was, except coach, neither the driver that Heisman was, nor the precisionist that Alexander was, but one who, as long as time and trends would allow it, kept some fun in the game.

He had a glorious collection of assets unrelated to coaching. He believed that good fortune follows those who "think lucky." He had an enormously well-developed sense of public relations. His greatest assets of all, though, including his ability as a coach and his knowledge of football, was his personal charm.

Dodd was one of those rare combinations of men-athletes, able to play as an All-American and later able to coach successfully. Not many All-Americans have ever become great coaches.

His record at Georgia Tech was 165 games won, 64 lost and 8 tied. As a bowl coach, he was superb. His teams won 9 and lost 4, but at one time they had a streak of six straight.

No college coach has ever made himself more accessible and been more friendly to newspapermen than Dodd. Therefore, his image nationally is one that glows. He has never practiced medicine-show tactics or demagoguery. Dodd is the same here as he is there, and now as he will be then. He has tripped once in a while and he'll probably trip again, but not over a phoneyism.

"We're not miracle-workers," he once said, "but you send us a good boy to Georgia Tech and we'll send you a good boy home."

When the end came for him, it was by personal choice. Mental and physical fatigue began failing at him. A lot of the fun had gone out of coaching. He wanted to move out while everybody was in a good humor.

Last Feb. 6, Dodd announced his retirement. I had the honor of breaking the story. Three days later Georgia Tech announced his successor.

CARSON (1967-?)

Once again Georgia Tech reached out for an assistant, though Carson had been on the campus only a year. He had impressed the people with his knowledge and precepts of defense. His contributions to Dodd's final season, one of mellow success, had not gone overlooked.

Here, too, is another man of personality and charm. He is articulate among audiences of varying tastes. He is devoted to his labor, has confidence, drives hard and expects nothing less than success as a result.

Carson played football at North Carolina at 160 pounds. He was a safetyman in the first hot run of platoon football. One reason he wasn't a tailback, his chosen trade, was that Charlie Justice was there ahead of him at Chapel Hill.

Carson spent two years in the Marine Corps, two years as a high school coach, one as a college freshman coach and later

six years as a varsity assistant at North Carolina, and one year as an assistant at South Carolina before reaching Georgia Tech.

He faced the first season at Georgia Tech with the cold, clear-eyed, level-headed attitude of a man who knows why he is here. "Anything less than 7-3 is not a good season," he said. And then he said, "You beat Georgia, you're in business. You don't beat Georgia, you're out of business."

It is oddly coincidental that all three former Georgia Tech football coaches, Heisman, Alexander and Dodd, all lost the last games they coached at the school. Heisman lost to Auburn. Alexander and Dodd lost in bowl games, Alexander to Tulsa in the Sugar Bowl and Dodd to Florida in the Orange Bowl. Yet, defeat and dissatisfaction among alumni played no part in their departure.

Thus, Bud Carson moves into a coaching situation unique in this country. Usually, a new football coach has two or three years of immunity to the displeasure of his constituents. This is because he is following a failure, a loser who moved on under duress. The new coach is endowed with the image of a saviour. Whatever he does is super, if only on the basis of relativity.

Carson has no such conditions in his favor. He is not succeeding a failure. He is succeeding success. After Dodd, what can you do for an encore?

VINCE DOOLEY'S SUCCESS STORY

(By Jesse Outlar)

From his office in the \$4 million coliseum Vince Dooley had gone to Sanford Stadium, recently enlarged to 58,773 seats at a cost of \$3 million, and now the Georgia head football coach was dining in new \$1 million McWhorter Hall, the plush new home of university athletes.

Dooley was discussing his defending SEC and Cotton Bowl champs, who finished fourth last season in the AP and UPI national football polls. Pre-season publications have made the Bulldogs a consensus choice for fifth in the current national standings.

Plainly, athletic prosperity has reached an all-time pinnacle at Georgia. During Joel Eaves' ultra successful regime Georgia has added Vince Dooley and \$8 million in athletic facilities.

A dozen days after Dr. O. C. Aderhold, then university president, announced on Nov. 22, 1963, that Joel Eaves, Auburn basketball coach, was the new Georgia athletic director, there was a vital investment of less than \$5 for a phone call.

Athletic Director Eaves called Dooley and invited him to become the new Georgia head football coach. Dooley, then the Auburn freshman coach and varsity scout, was on a recruiting mission in Memphis. By dark on that date, Dec. 4, 1963, 31-year-old Vince Dooley had been signed as the 21st head football coach at Georgia.

When Dooley arrived in Athens to be interviewed by the athletic board, Eaves was the only man in the room he knew personally.

It is now a matter of sensational record that the athletic board unanimously and wisely approved Eaves' recommendation. But why would Eaves gamble his future on an unproven freshman coach, particularly since Georgia had won 10 games in three seasons over former freshman coach Johnny Griffith?

Georgia alumni wanted the Bulldogs to enjoy again the prestige known in the days when Wallace Butts' teams won four SEC titles and visited eight bowls.

What Eaves said to the press on the afternoon of Dec. 4, 1963, has been repeated many times by jubilant Georgia old grads, but Eaves said it before Dooley won a single game. He said, "For a long time I have thought that Dooley was an excellent prospect as a head coach. You get to know a man when you coach him and scout with him. I'll tell you

why I picked Dooley. He has intelligence, poise, confidence; he won't panic. He's an organizer. He has character, dignity; he can be tough and he is a competitor."

Those traits outlined so vividly by Eaves have been the traits so evident during Dooley's surge near the top of the coaching profession.

Now, on the eve of his fourth season in Athens, Dooley sat in McWhorter Hall, named after Georgia's first All-American, the late Bob McWhorter, and recalled the first game.

Auburn-grad Dooley, who had three Auburn alumni on his Georgia staff, had drawn Alabama for an opener in Coach Bear Bryant's own backyard in Tuscaloosa.

"We had worked so hard, the players and coaches, getting ready for that game, for it obviously meant so much to us," Dooley recalled. "Well, Alabama clobbered us 31-3. It was a night game. We went back to Athens and in the wee hours when I got home my wife, Barbara, was still sleeping. I walked in numb from fatigue and the game. I'll never forget. She raised up in bed and said, 'How've you been?'"

"You know how you are when you're exhausted and in a state of shock. I started laughing. How had I been? Right then I resolved that we'd start over, and we did. When we studied movies that Sunday, strangely enough, despite the score, we discovered that our men had played fine football. We had done a lousy job of coaching. We had hit with Alabama, but poor coaching, mostly by me, beat us."

Adversity frequently is an excellent teacher, and the Bulldogs haven't been routed since that night in Tuscaloosa. In the vital weeks that followed Dooley rallied players and coaches and laid the platform of pride and desire which is the trademark of his Georgia teams. Georgia finished the surprise team of the SEC with a 6-3-1 record, beating Georgia Tech in the final game and Texas Tech in the Sun Bowl.

The second season in Athens produced high and low points of the Dooley career.

"The opening game with Alabama would have to be the most exciting," observed Dooley, who rarely gets excited. "Coming from behind to beat Alabama 18-17 on TV would have to be the high point. And the way we won, on a 73-yard pass play from Kirby Moore to Pat Hodgson, who lateraled to Bob Taylor; and then going for two and making it. Two weeks later we upset Michigan, and we beat Georgia Tech in the last game."

"But the lowest point came in between. After losing to Florida State and Kentucky we still had a chance to win the title, and the players played well enough to win, but we lost to Florida and Auburn on two plays. That was the lowest I've been after a game—after we lost to Auburn."

Georgia bounced back and beat Tech, but alumni didn't have long to celebrate, for they almost lost Dooley to Oklahoma during a frantic week in December.

Oklahoma antied up much more than Dooley was making at Georgia, not to mention fringe benefits which eventually would have made him a wealthy coach. Georgia made counter offers, and the alumni flooded the Dooley residence with phone calls, telegrams, poems and songs.

Dooley says his decision was easy after Georgia made a salary adjustment.

"Seriously, money wasn't the only thing, or I would have gone," said Dooley. "I realized what I owed Coach Eaves and Georgia people and the players and the high school boys we'd recruited. Only two years previously Coach Eaves and Georgia had given me a chance to become a head coach."

"Until Coach Eaves called me that day in Memphis I honestly hadn't thought he'd offer me the Georgia job. I figured he would get a big name coach, and I was planning to join Frank Broyles as an assistant at Arkansas.

"I was confident that sooner or later I'd get a chance to become a head coach. That's what I had in mind when I asked Coach Jordan to let me coach the Auburn freshmen."

Dooley reiterated that he had considered a military career while serving two years in the Marine Corps following his playing career at Auburn. If Coach Jordan hadn't had a job available in 1956, Capt. Dooley might have become a career officer.

Still later, if Dooley hadn't become a head coach he'd probably have become a history professor. While serving as an assistant at Auburn he took more than 80 hours of history and earned a masters in 1963. He is the only coach in history to write a thesis on "The United States Senator James Thomas Heflin and the Democratic Party Split in Alabama."

The intellectual coach still finds time to browse around the university library, but since coming to Georgia he's getting behind in his history. His wife Barbara, a beauty with brains and two degrees, is now working on her doctorate in guidance and counseling. She also teaches a speech class at the university.

Coach Dooley is not egotistical by nature and he doesn't have to guard against becoming overawed by his coaching awards.

"There's always one less great coach than you think," says Barbara Dooley when Georgia success is discussed by her husband.

When Dooley was elected king by an Atlanta club, coronation ceremonies were delayed because the crown was too small. "It will fit just as soon as he loses two or three games," advised Mrs. Dooley.

The Dooleys first met when Barbara Meshad of Birmingham was a coed at Auburn. She became interested in football after she became interested in Vince.

The Dooleys have three children: Deanna, 6; Danny, 4; and Denise, 3.

Deanna obviously takes after her father. After losing a toy travel game to her father, she frowned at him and said, "I just can't stand to lose. I can't stand it."

Neither can Vince Dooley, whose teams for three years have composed a rebuilding record of 23-8-1, a fantastic mark when you ponder that Georgia had logged only two winning campaigns in nine previous seasons.

Success and Dooley have run as an entry since prep days at McGill High in Mobile, where he earned all-star credentials in football and basketball. Along the way Dooley hasn't met anyone whom he holds in higher esteem than his high school coach, Ray Dicharry, who now coaches in Tampa.

"He did a great deal to turn me in the right direction off the field," says Dooley. "He had great influence on me."

Dooley also has enormous respect for his college coach and former boss, Ralph Jordan. Jordan called Dooley a "coach on the field" when Vince was quarterbacking the Plainsmen. Vince lists Bobby Dodd of Georgia Tech, Bud Wilkinson of Oklahoma, Wallace Butts of Georgia, Bear Bryant of Alabama and Frank Broyles of Arkansas as college coaches he observed attentively.

Dicharry, still close to Dooley today, recalls his prize pupil. "I always knew that Vince was an unusual person," says Dicharry, "and he has a lot of good qualities that make a coach successful. He was always a good student of the game, but most of all he could come through under pressure. He could handle any situation."

"The one thing that I think means most to a person in coaching is being calm and unemotional the way Vincent is. He never gets excited and this means a lot to the players."

Dooley seems to be the calmest guy in the stadium, but he gets his players excited, and the alumni have been excited since his second game at Georgia. As Dooley noted, the

opener against Alabama was unexciting from a Georgia viewpoint.

Perhaps he summed up the Dooley philosophy on football most vividly when he told the Georgia Athletic Coaches Association in Atlanta, "I believe in playing players according to their performance and not according to their potential. Don't wait for the guy who could be the greatest you ever saw to do it. He may never. Play the boy who will do it now."

"In discipline, I believe in being fair but firm. I also believe in giving a boy a second chance. If he lets you down again, that's it. I also believe that a coach should preserve the dignity of any boy who plays for him at all times."

"If you have loyalty, if you have morale, if you do a teaching job, if you recruit the right kind of boy, your system will be a good one."

Plainly Dooley has passed his own test. Georgia alumni, hoping for a break-even season only four years ago, are beefing now because the Bulldogs are picked no higher nationally than fifth. So what does Dooley do for an encore?

"The honeymoon is over, I suppose," says Dooley. "We'll just do the best we can."

University of Georgia boosters hope the marriage lasts a long, long time.

OBSERVATIONS ON ELECTIONS IN VIETNAM

Mr. McGEE, Mr. President, one of the Americans who went to Vietnam to observe the recent elections has made some most interesting observations on that troubled country.

David Sullivan, president of the Building Service Employees International Union and a vice president of the AFL-CIO, believes that the new Government will be judged by what it does to improve the living standards of workers and farmers.

So that we all may have the opportunity to know about Mr. Sullivan's observations, I ask unanimous consent that an article about his comments, published in a recent issue of the AFL-CIO News, be printed in the RECORD.

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

SULLIVAN SEES PROGRESS OF WORKERS CRITICAL TO NEW VIET GOVERNMENT

The newly elected government in South Viet Nam will be judged by what it does "to improve the living standards of workers and farmers," AFL-CIO Vice Pres. David Sullivan, an American observer to the Viet Nam election, declared.

And a growing Vietnamese labor movement, which played an important role in the election, has vowed to continue its "political action" and have an important voice in the nation's future, he added.

Sullivan recalled in an interview nine "packed" days in Viet Nam—traveling by plane, helicopter, jeep and car to visit union meeting halls and military units and to observe political campaigning and voting places.

He said the observers not only were briefed by generals from all the battle areas but also were given an opportunity to talk freely with soldiers in both the U.S. and Vietnamese armies.

Besides visiting polling places and watching the balloting, they also talked with candidates, campaigners, "poll watchers" for various parties and voters, he reported.

"I think we got close enough to actual happenings to make valid judgments," Sullivan said. These were some of the judgments he brought home with him:

A "very good impression" of the Vietnamese

Confederation of Labor (CVT), numbering more than 300,000 members and "actively organizing" to add strength. "I believe it is moving in the right direction and helping the people," Sullivan said.

A conviction that the election—similar to a U.S. election in some respects, different in others—"was conducted in an honest and fair manner."

Belief that "we are winning the war, militarily," that the morale of our fighting men is "very high," that an effort to help South Viet Nam improve living standards "still has a long way to go."

CVT was a strong force in supporting the election and in countering Viet Cong efforts to upset it, Sullivan said. He told how it worked actively to encourage citizens to cast ballots in the election, which produced an 83 percent turnout of registered voters.

Although CVT did not back any of the presidential tickets, it was the key organization behind a "peasant-workers-farmers" slate for senate seats, Sullivan pointed out.

That slate, he noted, carried 23 of 50 provinces and autonomous cities in the election and outpolled by more than 400,000 votes the closest rival party.

In talks with CVT Pres. Tran Quoc Buu, other labor leaders and union members, Sullivan was briefed on labor's collective bargaining contracts and its further efforts to organize in the nation's rural and industrial areas.

"I found that the union members in Viet Nam are looking for better wages, improved working conditions and a greater degree of recognition—much the same goals being sought by workers everywhere," he emphasized.

He was particularly enthused about a CVT program that is "reaching directly into the heart of some of the poorest areas of the country."

The labor organization has converted 22 meeting halls into combined welfare-education centers. They distribute free drugs to all citizens; they provide facilities for children's classes in the daytime and adult education at night.

HELP FROM OTHERS

Much of the cost of the centers' operations is borne by contributions that come from the U.S. and other nations, Sullivan pointed out. He visited one of the centers at a time when it was serving as a school for 75 children.

Sullivan observed the balloting as it occurred in Can-Tho, a city in Phong-Dinh province. He said the voting was "very heavy" despite the fact that only a week earlier the Viet Cong had attacked a hospital there, killing some 15 people.

The way the people of South Viet Nam streamed to the polls after the Viet Cong "did everything it possibly could to disrupt the election" was "simply amazing," he concluded.

Sullivan described many "unforgettable" experiences in Viet Nam—the impact of Saigon's "fantastic" traffic of pedestrians, bicycles, automobiles and military vehicles; the complexity of military operations; and visits with our soldiers as they maintained posts "in the very middle of rice paddies."

"I came away with the feeling that our young men serving in Viet Nam must surely be as competent as any that have ever served in the history of our nation," he declared.

He told of being billeted with the Seventh Air Force just outside Saigon, of eating with troops in a mess hall, and of traveling with two "highly competent aides:" Maj. Benjamin Uleak of San Antonio, Tex. and Robert Senser, labor attache to the U.S. Embassy in Saigon.

"It's a country with a great potential and its wonderful people are its greatest asset." They are devoted to self-government and "determined to be free," Sullivan concluded.

EVERYBODY'S GOT A GUN NOW

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, D. J. R. Bruckner, of the Los Angeles Times, has written a highly enlightening article on crime in the Midwest which appeared in this morning's newspapers.

Mr. Bruckner vividly describes the fear that is gripping the urban centers of the Midwest. The public's worry stems not just from the rising crime rate but more from "the notion that crime is breaking out of its older patterns and becoming much more general and much more violent."

There can be little question that underlying this upsurge of violence is the tragic fact that our country more than any other one in the world is a country of guns.

The appalling increase in armed robberies all over our country cries out for the enactment of a tough gun control bill this session. The first 6 months of 1967 have witnessed a staggering increase of 37 percent in the use of guns in robberies.

Referring to this development, Mr. Bruckner quotes the police chief of Kansas City as saying:

It is increasing enormously. Mostly it's robbery of small stores, laundries, and the like. Everybody's got a gun now.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that D. J. R. Bruckner's article be printed in the RECORD.

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

LAW ENFORCEMENT WORRIES CITIES

(By D. J. R. Bruckner)

CHICAGO.—In most major Midwestern cities there is a growing fear, official and among the citizens, that law enforcement is degenerating into street warfare.

What worries the public is not just the rise in the crime rate but the notion that crime is breaking out of its older patterns and becoming much more general and much more violent. The public reaction in Detroit was strong enough in the spring to spark a citywide petition for a recall vote against Mayor Jerome P. Cavanagh.

Irus W. Davis, Mayor of Kansas City, Mo., says, "I do not think there is any doubt about it; crime and fear of crime have reached terrible proportions. You have to understand that something like this can destroy a government completely."

An interviewer quickly finds that in the minds of the people there are five major areas of concern—armed robbery, assaults, youthful disorders or gang fights, riots and operations or organized crime syndicates.

The concern over guns is general, but in most cities it is based on the problem of armed robberies. All major Midwestern cities report a sharp increase in this type of crime.

In Kansas City, Police Chief Clarence M. Kelley says, "It is increasing enormously. Mostly it's robbery of small stores, laundries and the like. Everybody's got a gun now."

The most spectacular outbreaks of armed robbery and reaction occurred in Detroit before the devastating riot last July. Last winter in one five-week period, Detroit grocers killed five armed robbers, and robbers murdered four people in or around shops. Robberies in the city increased 65 per cent in a 12-month period and are still rising.

Last spring, the local grocers association sponsored a marksmanship course for members. In suburban Highland Park the Police Department gave gun training to merchants.

Detroit police tried to discourage the arming of merchants for some months, but after

the July riot the police themselves were caught up in the arms race. The department says hundreds of its officers have joined the National Rifle Association to get discounts on private rifles and shotguns.

Police said gun registrations have risen more than 10,000 in a year, and they believe there are thousands of unregistered guns loose in Detroit.

Months before the riot, there was a measurable exodus of shopkeepers from some Detroit neighborhoods to other towns or even to Canada. Citizens associations have been formed to organize public help in the crime war. Negro pastors have organized a citizen drive, pointing out that Negroes were 75 per cent of rape victims and 55 per cent of robbery victims in one winter month.

Detroit is only an extreme example. The same kind of problem is now plaguing Cleveland, where shop robberies and killings have risen sharply and the populace has begun to arm itself. Chicago and Cincinnati also have reported sharp rises in armed robbery.

In Detroit the parking lot and sidewalk area around the juvenile courthouse has become a permanent fear zone. During a three-week period last winter three women were robbed in daylight hours on the parking lot.

There are large sections of Chicago's South Side where for many years no one has used the parks in the evening for fear of assault. There are large sections of the city—north, south and west—where people simply refuse to ride public transit in the evenings.

In all cities public schools are from time to time thrown into chaos by youthful terrorism.

In some Chicago neighborhoods parents have joined with police to escort their children to and from school. They fear youth extortion and assault rings. The children being protected are usually 6 to 13 years old.

Organized gang activity is found in many of the cities. In Chicago, the big youth gangs may have 1500 to 3000 members tightly organized and indulging in robbery, burglary, extortion, assaults and a good deal of liquor and narcotics traffic.

Detroit and Cleveland have been plagued by motorcycle bands, some of which grow violent from time to time.

Riot is a major concern, and most people in the cities tend to refer to rioting simply as crime. Cleveland, Detroit, Chicago, Minneapolis and Milwaukee have all had small or large disturbances, mostly in ghetto areas, in the past year.

People in some cities are worried about organized crime and racketeering. This interest varies from total apathy in Cleveland, which has a powerful syndicate, to public uproar in Detroit.

In the St. Louis area, the syndicate operators in two states have been trying to seize control of the coin-operated machine industry. In the Illinois and Indiana suburbs of Chicago, the syndicate chiefs have moved in on gambling, prostitution and even government in some places to such an extent that there are campaigns to demand State and Federal cleanups.

A MOVING AND HISTORIC CEREMONY AT THE WHITE HOUSE

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, in a moving ceremony before a crowd that filled every inch of the East Room in the White House, President Johnson today swore in Walter Washington, Commissioner; and Thomas Fletcher, Deputy Commissioner, of the District of Columbia. I consider myself fortunate to have been invited to attend this historic and memorable ceremony. In the President's words—and I have never heard him more eloquent—the occasion celebrated "a new era for the Capital City." The

President also announced the names of the nine members of the City Council, which he will shortly submit to the Senate for confirmation. They are all excellent choices.

As one who has long felt that the city of Washington should have home rule, that it would have representation in the Congress, I welcome the new form of government that is an important step in the direction of complete self-government. It is only a short step but I am hopeful and confident that it is just a beginning. In keeping our Capital City as it has been under the rule of Congress, whatever may be the historic justifications, we are in violation of one of the most basic principles of our American faith. "Government by consent of the governed" is basic to our way of life. We should long since have applied it in the Nation's Capital. I shall continue to work for fullest achievement. To Walter Washington and Thomas Fletcher, both so well qualified by experience and character, as well as to the nine members of the Council, I tender my heartiest congratulations and best wishes for their success.

I ask unanimous consent that the President's remarks at this swearing-in ceremony be printed in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT SWEARING IN OF WALTER WASHINGTON, COMMISSIONER, AND THOMAS FLETCHER, DEPUTY COMMISSIONER OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. Justice Fortas, Mr. and Mrs. Walter Washington and family, Mr. and Mrs. Thomas Fletcher and family, distinguished Members of the Cabinet, Members of the Congress, Members of the Court, Ladies and Gentlemen:

More than ceremony summons us here to the East Room this morning.

We celebrate a new era for the Capital City as we meet here to swear in Walter Washington as Washington's first Mayor, and Thomas Fletcher as his deputy.

The citizens of the District have waited almost a century for this day to come, and all that it symbolizes.

This is the day—and this is the year—that the District emerges into the world of the 20th Century government.

With the recent reorganization plan, the Nation's Capital was liberated from the outworn practices of past years. That reorganization plan equips the city with new machinery to let its government serve the needs of its people.

But the best machinery can function effectively only in the hands of the best men.

I looked across America to try to find these men. And I think we found them—men with the strength and the character and the vision to deal with tough problems. Now, this morning, we commit those problems to their capable hands.

No one here, for a moment, minimizes these problems.

The District's new day comes at a time of real crisis for every American city. And Washington, D.C., the Capital City, represents the American city.

It is alive with promise. And more than any other, it houses the heritage of our history.

But beyond the monuments, urban erosion eats at a city's heart and at a city's hope.

The needs are clear to all of us: Safety on the streets and in our homes; driving crime from our midst; health and education for our children; a decent roof over every

family; a good job for every person who is willing to take it. Then every resident can share the pride that stirs every visitor to our Capital.

The leaders who will help to solve those problems know the challenge. They are uniquely qualified to act because their careers have been spent in action, in meeting the needs of cities and the needs of their people.

Together, this team has the energy and the experience to deal responsibly with the great urban and human problems of our time. Together, they will focus those talents on our national capital city.

Mr. Fletcher wrote an outstanding and distinguished record as City Manager of San Diego, California. He brings to his task a deep knowledge of how modern city administration and fiscal planning can work to the benefit of the people.

Mr. Washington brings unsurpassed skills as a city executive. He is taking a very large reduction in salary and making sacrifices to come here to accept this draft from his President. He is an authentic leader and he has devoted a lifetime of effective and inspired work in the cause of good housing, one of our most critical urban needs—to say nothing about what he has done for beautification in the District of Columbia. He has lived and worked on the streets of his home city. And he has said that he is going to travel those streets again, in pursuit of the progress that the people want and the people need and the people desire and expect.

Mr. Mayor, your walk will be long and arduous, but I believe it will be rewarding.

You will walk with the eyes of the Nation on you.

Everything you do will be known. You will live in a goldfish bowl as most of us public servants do. But, Mr. Mayor, and Mr. Deputy Mayor, we wish you well—and bid you godspeed.

Mr. Mayor, and Mr. Fletcher, you won't be walking alone. I am sending to the Senate my recommendations for the District of Columbia City Council.

In filling this Council, it was our goal to find among the 800,000 residents of the District of Columbia nine exceptional men and women to work with you, to work on the team, to assist you in leading the government of the Nation's Capital, to represent the people at all times in this new venture in government that we are undertaking.

We have spent weeks in considering recommendations made to us by organizations, in searching and consulting with the best authorities that we could talk to. We have reviewed hundreds of records and files. We have sought and obtained not only your recommendations, Mr. Mayor and Mr. Fletcher, but those of civic, labor, religious and other leading non-political groups.

Today I am happy to announce the names of those that I recommend to serve on the Council. And if the Senate is willing, they will serve on the Council.

As Chairman, a distinguished Washington attorney, a political scientist, a teacher, a wise counsellor, a leader in bringing educational television and modern transportation to the Nation's Capital, Council Chairman Mr. Max Kampelman.

As Vice Chairman, a crusader for effective government, for broader opportunities, for better housing for all the people, the Pastor of the New Bethel Baptist Church—the Reverend Walter Fauntroy.

Very deeply involved in the life of the city, honored as an outstanding citizen, an innovator in the field of programs for the young people of the District and Director of one of Washington's most successful youth projects, the Roving Leaders—Mr. Stanley Anderson.

A leader in church activities, a fighter against discrimination, an eminent attorney, Mrs. Margaret A. Haywood.

A second-generation Washingtonian, a

leader in the District's Head Start Program, a worker for better housing, Mr. John Nevius.

President of the Washington Urban League, a respected member of the community, an outstanding lawyer, a past President of the National Bar Association, Mr. William Thompson.

A labor leader who knows the problems of the workingman, who fought for the minimum wage, who has spent a lifetime of service in the cause of labor, a man who has made many contributions to helping his fellowman and to improving his city, Mr. J. C. Turner.

One of 13 children, a lifelong resident of the District, and at present an executive at IBM, he finds the time to teach high school dropouts at night, Mr. Joseph Yeldell.

A long-time Washington resident, an editor, a civic leader, active in the District's family and child welfare programs, Mrs. Polly Shackleton. Mrs. Shackleton this morning is observing conditions in Montreal as a background for what she is going to be called on to do here and cannot be present.

These nine citizens, we believe, will be a genuine voice for the people of Washington. We think they represent this city. We believe they know and understand and will certainly learn all about its urgent problems.

I hope the Senate will act promptly so that the new city government can move rapidly from promise to performance.

With them, Mayor Washington, you and your Deputy Mayor Fletcher can now show America what concerned and aroused municipal leaders can do. You can improve the lives of your fellow citizens. You can transform this city into a proud home for all the people.

Some of the most enlightened Members of the Congress, who at great sacrifice to themselves, have fought for years for a better government for the District of Columbia, are here this morning. We are grateful to all of you for having come.

Now, Mr. Mayor and Mr. Deputy Mayor and City Councilmen, it is up to you to get with it. And you had better learn these Congressmen and Senators.

THE OTTO OTEPKA CASE—A BLACK MARK

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, this week another page in the history of Otto Otepka will be written as briefs are filed in the appeal from his discharge as a State Department security officer. Perhaps now, after almost four and a half years, Otto Otepka will be exonerated.

Unfortunately, the outcome of this hearing makes no material difference to Mr. Otepka because his career already has been ruined. Perhaps, more important, it makes little difference to the security of the United States. The damage has been done; in large measure it cannot be repaired.

It will do the administration little good to try to sweep the Otepka case under the rug or to wish it into oblivion. Many of us in Government and many private citizens will recall often the shameful treatment accorded Mr. Otepka by the State Department. The indefensible way the Department tried to eliminate a conscientious security officer who disagreed with his superiors has been etched indelibly in our minds.

Otto Otepka's fate also has been etched into the minds of State Department security officers and those who will follow them. How many will be guided by loyalty to their country, and how many will be guided by the heavy-hand-

ed whims of their department superiors? It will take exceptional courage for these security experts to oppose their superiors, even in cases of clear danger to the Nation. It is here that America will pay most heavily for what has happened to Otto Otepka.

Mr. President, an excellent summary and appraisal of this entire episode appeared in an editorial published in the Omaha World-Herald of September 24, 1967. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

A BLACK MARK

The Otto Otepka case is surfacing again in Washington. Lawyers' briefs in the appeal of the fired State Department security officer will be filed September 29. Thereafter a hearing officer will recommend to Secretary of State Rusk either that Mr. Otepka be reinstated or that his dismissal be upheld.

Because it has dragged on for so long, and because of what it reveals about the hidden inner workings of the State Department, the Otepka case deserves recapitulation.

It probably began in 1955, when Mr. Otepka, then chief of the Evaluations Division of the State Department's Security Branch, was asked to evaluate the record of a prominent figure—as yet unidentified—who was being considered for appointment to a sensitive post in the Government.

Mr. Otepka produced evidence from secret CIA files showing that the man in question had been denied a position on a Cold War strategy board because of "reservations" about him as a "security liability."

The man was passed over for the appointment.

Twice more in five years the same name came up, and both times Mr. Otepka produced the same evaluation.

In 1961, under a new Administration, Mr. Otepka's reservations about this person were overruled. Observers who have followed the case closely believe that Mr. Otepka's decline began then.

In 1963, the Senate Internal Security subcommittee was investigating allegations of lax security procedures in the State Department.

The subcommittee counsel called on Mr. Otepka, who produced records of his findings and recommendations in several cases, including one in which he had balked at granting "emergency" clearances for 10 persons recommended for appointment to a State Department advisory committee.

Shortly thereafter, on June 27, 1963, Mr. Otepka was removed from his job and put to shuffling papers in another assignment.

A campaign of harassment began, accompanied by State Department charges that Mr. Otepka had acted improperly by providing the Senate subcommittee with classified information.

Mr. Otepka's telephone was bugged. His safe was cracked by State Department officials. Four security officials who supported him were transferred to meaningless jobs, and two of these later were fired. (The two appealed, were reinstated, and promptly resigned.) Two officials perjured themselves in an attempt to cover up evidence about the telephone tapping.

Mr. Otepka was suspended formally in September, 1963, and was fired in November. He immediately appealed, but hearings on the appeal were postponed six times. The hearing finally was held last spring—four years to the month from the time he was first removed from active service as a security officer.

The Internal Security subcommittee hearings, which produced a transcript of 1,500-

000 words, revealed indications of a systematic State Department purge of "hard" anti-Communist employees, of whom Otto Otepka was one of the most prominent.

The hearings revealed indications of Executive pressure to provide security clearances for some questionable risks, including William Wieland of Castro fame.

They also revealed a picture of Otto Otepka as a stubborn, conscientious civil servant who insisted on doing his job in the face of subtle pressures designed to lower the security bars to sensitive, high-level positions. (It was revealed after Mr. Otepka was fired that 63 State Department employees, including three senior officers in the Foreign Service, had resigned in 1963 after being confronted with evidence showing they were security liabilities.)

The irony of the case is that the State Department persecutors of Otto Otepka will have won, no matter how it comes out. Even if Mr. Otepka is reinstated, which doesn't appear likely, his career is ruined. Any successor in his office will remember vividly how conscientious work is rewarded, and can be expected to trim his sails accordingly.

The affair will leave a black mark forever on the record of the State Department. In the minds of many Americans, it will cast doubt as to whether the conduct of their country's foreign affairs is in completely trustworthy hands.

JAPANESE PRIME MINISTER SUPPORTS THE AMERICAN POSITION IN VIETNAM

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to the news today that Japanese Prime Minister Eisaku Sato has supported the conditions set by the Johnson administration for ending the bombing of North Vietnam.

The Prime Minister said:

In any suspension of the bombing of North Vietnam there should be a firm assurance that it will lead to a suspension of hostilities in the South.

And the Prime Minister also noted that it is not enough for the United States to want peace in Vietnam. The Communists must also share this desire.

Mr. President, these remarks by the Japanese Prime Minister are very significant. Mr. Sato is one of the most influential and respected statesmen in Asia. He represents a nation which has known the ravages of war. Yet he supports our position in Vietnam as one that is both reasonable, sincere, and necessary.

This is not a solitary statement of support from just one Asian leader.

There have been other statements of support for American efforts in Vietnam from numerous Asian leaders in the past, and I have referred to them on this floor before.

Some months ago the Prime Minister of Singapore said that if the Americans leave Vietnam "we're finished."

The Prime Minister of Malaysia said that the American presence has made the difference between "Asian stability and Asian chaos."

The President of the Philippines, the Prime Minister of Australia, the leaders of Cambodia and Thailand have all echoed similar sentiments.

Asians support our efforts with more than words.

There are 45,000 South Koreans fight-

ing for freedom in Vietnam. They know what Communist expansionism means.

Just days ago, Thailand sent 2,000 of its crack military men to South Vietnam to help fulfill their commitment to freedom.

And, of course, the valiant South Vietnamese have almost three-quarters of a million men under arms.

The United States is not alone in Vietnam.

Asian leaders and Asian people want us there to help them resist what is, in reality, aggression against an entire area of the world.

The statement yesterday by the Prime Minister of Japan, supporting our position on the bombing of North Vietnam, is another drastic illustration of the fact that this is a struggle for all free and independent people. The Asians, above all, know it and want us to persevere.

Those who say this is an American war ought to realize that the people and leaders of Asia emphatically do not accept that description.

This is not an American war. This is freedom's war against tyranny, whatever name it goes by, and whatever flag it flies under.

Let us all remember that in the dark days of the American Revolution when this new Nation could have gone down to defeat, men came from all over the world—from France, Germany, Poland, the Caribbean—to fight for the cause of America.

So, today in Vietnam, to use Tom Paine's words:

The cause of America is the cause of all mankind.

SNOOPING AND THE JUDICIAL CONFERENCE

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, last week, the Judicial Conference of the United States voted to endorse legislation which would permit law enforcement officers and investigators to tap telephones and eavesdrop electronically under court order. The Judicial Conference cautioned, however, that such legislation must conform to the Supreme Court's most recent pronouncement on the subject, which was handed down in the Berger case in June of this year.

This morning's Washington Post carries an editorial opposing the views of the Judicial Conference. According to the Post:

The social costs of such intrusion into privacy would, in our judgment, heavily outweigh the gains to law enforcement.

Earlier, on September 21, the Washington Post published an editorial which, in effect, stated that wiretapping and electronic eavesdropping legislation would not solve the problem which most seriously alarms the American people; namely, crime on the streets. I believe these two editorials from the Washington Post should be read together. I ask unanimous consent that these be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Sept. 28, 1967]

SNOOPING

The Judicial Conference of the United States has voted to endorse legislation that would permit Federal and state investigators to tap telephones and eavesdrop electronically under court order. With the highest respect for the authority of the Conference, we offer an opposition to its view. The social costs of such intrusion into privacy would, in our judgment, heavily outweigh the gains to law enforcement.

The Conference gave its approval to pending eavesdropping legislation with the proviso that it be amended to meet the restrictions laid down in last June's Supreme Court decision in the Berger case. In that case, the Court struck down as constitutionally invalid a New York statute authorizing eavesdropping under court order because it failed to meet the Fourth Amendment requirement of a reasonable search—that is, that it particularly describe "the place to be searched and the persons or things to be seized."

The truth is, we think, that this requirement cannot be met by any court order authorizing eavesdropping. As Mr. Justice Black observed in a dissenting opinion in the Berger case, the Court's decision "makes constitutional eavesdropping improbable."

It is a fallacy to suppose that a court order can circumscribe or control eavesdropping in the way that a warrant can limit an ordinary search. When a telephone is tapped or a room is bugged, the privacy of everyone using the telephone or the room is invaded, whether or not he is under suspicion of criminal conduct. The conversation of anyone calling the telephone or entering the room is recorded, whether or not it is related to a crime under investigation. Intimacies of every sort—social, business, conjugal—may thus be divulged to the eavesdroppers.

More serious, perhaps, than the eavesdropping itself is the pall which fear of it may put upon normal conversation. The most law-abiding men and women have things to say to each other which they want to say in confidence. Any official intrusion into such privacy is, as Lord Camden put it two centuries ago, "subversive of all the comforts of society." People who fear that government agents may be covertly listening to all that they say are not free people. They speak under constraint. And where this fear is endemic, freedom of communication is a casualty.

The community must choose, as is so often the case, between the claims of freedom and the claims of safety. Acknowledging that bugging and tapping may give the police some assistance in combatting organized crime—or may at any rate make it necessary for criminals to be extremely circumspect in communicating with each other—the question is whether the inhibition on lawful conversation is worth the cost. The choice is between facilitating the work of the police and facilitating free communication. Men cannot be free if they live in fear of official surveillance. "It is more than desirable, it is necessary, that criminals be detected and prosecuted as vigorously as possible. It is more necessary," as President Roosevelt put it, "that citizens of a democracy be protected in their rights of privacy from unwarranted snooping."

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

THE CRIME GAME

Make a silly accusation and you're pretty likely to get a silly response. Recently a Republican Task Force pointed a blunderbuss at the Department of Justice and let fly with a load of political birdshot to the effect that the Department has been indifferent to organized crime in the United States. The Attorney General, as well aware as any Repub-

lican that there is going to be a national election next year, fired back the other day with a couple of barrels of statistics indicating that racketeers are being prosecuted and convicted far faster than they can fleece the public.

The Republican rhetoric charged the Attorney General with "an incredible retreat in the war on criminal activity" because of "hamstringing of Federal agents" by his order forbidding the use of electronic eavesdropping devices. The Attorney General's modest retort to this was that "the Department of Justice is mounting an attack on organized crime which is unequalled in its dimensions and unparalleled in its results." And he added what seems to us somewhat dubious, that "in the final analysis for law enforcement, it is convictions that count."

Convictions are a help, of course. But in the final analysis, they are an acknowledgment of law enforcement failure. In the final analysis, it is prevention of crime that counts. And a diminishing rate of prosecution and conviction could be the healthiest of indices.

The attack and the answer represent, in some degree, a playing of "the crime game" on either side. Statistics in this area are notoriously unreliable and can be cited to prove almost any point. Besides, they tell only a fraction of the story. As the President's Crime Commission pointed out, "Offense and arrest figures do not aid very much in analyzing the scope of professional crime . . . Although the police statistics indicate a lot of crime today, they do not begin to indicate the full amount . . . The actual amount of crime in the United States today is several times that reported in the Uniform Crime Reports."

Moreover, the Republican Task Force attacks the Attorney General for what is precisely the most praiseworthy part of his performance. He has insisted, as no other Attorney General from Tom Clark to Ramsey Clark has insisted, that the investigating agencies of the Federal Government observe the law in enforcing the law. He has accorded respect to the right of privacy fundamental to all freedom by forbidding Federal agents to employ taps and bugs in violation of Federal and local laws. The attack on crime is in no way weakened by this signal commitment to human decency and constitutional command.

In the final analysis, the kind of crime that now most worries the American people, the kind of crime that makes them fearful of walking at night in the streets of their cities, is not organized crime at all but random, violent, individual street crime—robbery, rape, assault, wanton homicide, offenses to which electronic eavesdropping is totally irrelevant. Congress can do something about this kind of crime—not by sniping at an Attorney General who has demonstrated extraordinary sensitivity to the problem but by enacting the Safe Streets bill which the President has submitted to it. The responsibility now rests on the Hill.

STARVATION IN THE AFFLUENT SOCIETY

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the October issue of the very fine magazine, the Progressive, published in Madison, Wis., contains an article written by the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania, JOSEPH S. CLARK.

The Senator from Pennsylvania describes vividly the situation which the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty witnessed when it made an inspection tour of some of the poverty regions of the country.

Senator CLARK expresses the sense of

his article in quoting the philosopher Seneca:

A hungry people listens not to reason, nor cares for justice, nor is bent by prayers.

Mr. Morris Rubin, the renowned editor, is to be congratulated for another fine issue of the Progressive.

I ask unanimous consent that Senator CLARK's article, entitled "Starvation in the Affluent Society," be printed in the RECORD.

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

STARVATION IN THE AFFLUENT SOCIETY

(By Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK)¹

Gloria Palmer, a round-eyed, solemn-faced little girl of ten, stood shyly outside her slum home in Washington, D.C. and shifted her six-months-old baby brother from one arm to another, while two other tots leaned against her and stared up at the two United States Senators. Curiosity and childish bafflement were written across their faces. They did not know what Senators were or why they should be asking questions, nor did they recognize Senator Robert Kennedy or me. As we talked in front of the dilapidated and condemned tenements on Defrees Street, five blocks away could be seen the gleaming white dome of the Capitol.

I asked Gloria—one of eleven children of Wilhelmina Palmer—what she had eaten for lunch. "We didn't have any lunch," said Gloria quietly, and added, "But we have black-eyed peas for supper a lot." I asked her little brother, George, aged seven, "What did you have for lunch yesterday?" George replied, "Soup." "And what did you have for breakfast?" "Soup," George said.

A community action worker who accompanied Senator Kennedy and me on this personal inspection of slums in the shadow of the Capitol, commented: "There are hundreds of others in this neighborhood who are hungry, kids and adults who get up in the morning hungry and who go to bed at night hungry. It's been that way ever since I've been here, years and years."

When Senator Kennedy remarked that Gloria should have been in school during this neighborhood visit of our Senate Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower and Poverty, my thoughts suddenly whirled back two weeks to another group of youngsters who were also hungry and also not in school.

This time the Subcommittee, which I serve as chairman, was walking along the dusty, sun-seared country roads of the Mississippi Delta. Here in ramshackle homes of one or two rooms holding families of eight and ten, we encountered children who were not sent to school by their mothers because they had no shoes. Later on, doctors suggested to us a more shocking reason: "bloated stomachs, chronic sores of the upper lip, and extreme lethargy—all tragic evidence of serious malnutrition."

In Belzoni, heart of the Delta, a mother of four told me that she and her brood had bologna sandwiches for breakfast and this would be the big meal of their day. Other times they have rice or grits, she told me in an infinitely tired voice, "but we never have any milk or fruit or fresh meat." Over and over again I was told that the staple diet for Belzoni's poor was beans, rice, margarine, lard, meal, peanut butter, raisins, powdered milk, and one can of meat for each person in the family per month. The can lasts, at the most, a week and a half.

¹ JOSEPH S. CLARK is the senior U.S. Senator from Pennsylvania and one of the Senate's foremost spokesmen for progressive legislation. He is the author of two books, "The Senate Establishment" and "Congress: The Sapsless Branch."

The children we saw were visibly underweight, their bodies spotted with sores and untreated lesions.

Mrs. Ollie May Chapman and her nine children live in a tar-paper shack in Belzoni. On the day she was interviewed the family had gone without breakfast; for lunch they had soup made from a meat bone and cornmeal bread. For supper they would have beans—and a rare treat, a can of peaches.

We found a mother of fifteen children nursing a three-day-old child which she had delivered herself. There was no food in the house, she said, and no money. She didn't know what she would do.

Near Greenville, Mississippi, I came across a tumbledown collection of shacks ironically called Freedom City, housing the families of displaced plantation workers. Surviving, somehow, in this appalling squalor were forty-eight children who subsisted entirely on grits, rice, soybeans, and "whatever is donated," plus the customary one can of meat per month. Eggs, milk, and fruit juice, the mothers told me, were unknown.

There is no way in which you can prepare yourself for the overpowering effect of hunger and starvation seen close up. No matter how familiar you may be with the facts and figures of malnutrition, nothing can avert the feeling of stunned, disbelieving horror at the sight of little children with swollen bellies, shriveled limbs, and open sores that disfigure the small, bewildered faces and weakened bodies.

One reaches desperately for comparisons to give some semblance of reality to an experience that is essentially unreal and irrational. The mind rejects the evidence that innocent children can and do starve in this most abundant and fruitful of all nations, or go hungry in the Delta which contains 6,000,000 acres of the richest land on the continent. The visitor reaches for analogies. Senator Kennedy remarked that what he saw on our visit to the Mississippi Delta was as bad as anything he encountered in Latin America. A former British Army doctor with extensive experience in Africa told us that what he saw in Mississippi was comparable only to what he had observed in primitive parts of Kenya. Another doctor who worked for the World Health Organization in Asia told me, "I've been in India and I've seen famine and starvation. What we have seen in Mississippi and places in the north is slow starvation."

Yes, the North, too, allows its citizens, including its children, to waste away with hunger and to starve. Hunger, we discovered, is no respecter of area or region. No state is free of hunger any more than any state is free of poverty and deprivation. There is hunger, for example, in prosperous Illinois, which admits that 1,281,100 people, or twelve per cent of the state's population, have incomes below the poverty line.

The Subcommittee recently reported that in a small Appalachian town, near the border between Virginia and Tennessee, five small children tore apart and devoured a chicken before it could be cooked. It was the first meat the family had eaten in three months.

"In the San Joaquin Valley of California," our report continued, "fifty yards off a seldom-traveled road, a migrant family of seven, the youngest child not yet two, were living in a pick-up truck abandoned by a small stream. They had had no breakfast and did not know where they would find food for lunch. In other years they could have fished, but the stream had dried up."

As such specific cases as these came increasingly to the attention of the Subcommittee, we were struck by the discovery that these instances could not be projected against an overall picture of malnutrition and hunger in the United States. The fact is we simply do not know the extent of severity of malnutrition in this country today. Newspapermen were shocked when the U.S. Surgeon General told the Subcommittee that

we know more about malnutrition in Pakistan and other poor countries than in the United States. He said such studies have not been made in this country and, if they were to be made, he was not sure which agency should make them.

How vague our information is can be judged by the fact that the Subcommittee was forced to report, after soliciting the best opinion available, that "estimates of the number of American citizens in serious need of food vary from as few as 400,000 to more than 4,000,000." Twelve years ago a Federal study estimated that twenty-three per cent of America's poor—those with incomes under \$3,000—had "poor diets." In 1955 that meant 7,500,000 Americans had insufficiently nutritious diets.

Nor do we know with any degree of accuracy the minimum cost of an adequate diet. An Office of Economic Opportunity official told me a tentative conclusion had been reached that an average of \$16 a month or \$192 a year would provide one person with a "minimum low standard diet—enough to hold body and soul together."

On the basis of other figures compiled by the Department of Agriculture, it seemed more realistic to assume an annual minimum food cost per individual of \$225, about twenty-one cents a meal.

Manifestly what is needed before the Government can deal decisively with hunger and malnutrition is a comprehensive and incisive study of the problem. We must know the number of Americans who suffer from malnutrition and, next, what can be done to correct their inadequate diets.

Let us return to Mississippi because here surveys and studies have been made, and possibly they may provide clues to the nationwide dimensions of the hunger problem.

A study this year by the Department of Agriculture covered 509 poor families in two wealthy Delta counties. At least sixty per cent of these families had diets providing less than two-thirds of the *minimum* dietary requirements recommended by the National Research Council. Moreover, these family diets were seriously deficient in milk, vegetables, and fresh fruits. The value of all the meals consumed by the average individual in the study was a miserable four dollars a week, or fifty-seven cents a day, including the foods distributed free by the Federal Government.

A spot-check study in seven Delta counties was made by the Mississippi Council on Human Relations and reported to us by its Executive Director, Kenneth L. Dean. Here are brief excerpts from the report:

"Using an economic standard, Mississippi is the poorest state in the republic. The fact that we receive more Office of Economic Opportunity poverty program funds per capita than any other state, and that during the month of March, 1967, 405,000 people received food assistance, indicate that there is a widespread problem of poverty that could, at any given moment, turn into acute hunger or a slow starvation if Federal programs are not upgraded in keeping with population trends . . .

"The most acute problem of hunger, and the most common situation, is the middle-aged mother, without a husband, in a small two-room shack, caring for somewhere between four and fifteen children. Most of the children will be of school age but many will not be attending school. . .

"The diet of such a family usually consists of a breakfast of grits, molasses, and biscuit. For lunch the adults will eat nothing, and the children who are at home will be given a piece of bread and a drink of Kool-aid or water. The evening meal usually consists of boiled beans and corn bread. Sometimes boiled rice, dry peanut butter, or a canned meat substitute from the commodity program will supplement the evening meal.

"These people, while not starving in the

extreme sense of the word, are suffering from acute hunger. This hunger could be called starvation in that people's bodies actually are being denied proper sustenance, which causes the mortality rate of the [Negro] children to be much higher than that of whites, and which also shortens the life span of adults considerably. Medical doctors who work among these people say they never know the depth of their hunger for, from the time of birth on, they never have enough to eat."

Any consideration of hunger, in Mississippi or elsewhere, must take cognizance, as does the Council's report, of the distribution of surplus foods. One-fifth of Mississippi's entire population is now being fed through the Federal food distribution programs. But the too-seldom recognized fact is that surplus foods were never intended to comprise full meals or adequate diets. Nevertheless, they have become almost the only source of food for hundreds of thousands of Americans. The meaning of this for nutrition and health can be perceived in the fact that the total value of the commodities distributed amounts to about five dollars per person per month. They consist chiefly of flour, cornmeal, dry milk, and shortening. Only recently was the one can of meat per person per month added to the diet.

Appalling as this situation was it became worse when a shift from surplus commodities to food stamps in just eight Mississippi counties in one year's time deprived 36,000 poor residents of their commodity allotments. The result simply had to be more hunger and more malnutrition since these people could not afford to buy food stamps to exchange for groceries.

By far the most impressive testimony on hunger was given to the Senate Subcommittee by a group of six doctors who made a first-hand investigation of malnutrition and starvation in the Delta. Sponsored by the Field Foundation, the doctors comprised a distinguished panel of medical experts: Dr. Joseph Brenner, Medical Department, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Dr. Robert Coles, Harvard University Health Service; Dr. Alan Mermann, Department of Pediatrics, Yale University; Dr. Milton J. E. Senn, Sterling Professor of Pediatrics, Yale University; Dr. Cyril Walwyn, Medical Adviser to Friends of the Children of Mississippi and a private practitioner in Mississippi; and Dr. Raymond Wheeler, a private practitioner of Charlotte, North Carolina.

Their report emerged as a unique document, unique in its fusion of professional and humanitarian shock and profound concern. Here is part of their findings on hunger among the Delta's children:

"We saw children whose nutritional and medical condition we can only describe as shocking—even to a group of physicians whose work involves daily confrontation with disease and suffering. In child after child we saw evidence of vitamin and mineral deficiencies; serious untreated skin infections and ulcerations; eye and ear diseases; also unattended bone diseases; the prevalence of bacterial and parasitic diseases as well as severe anemia with resulting loss of energy and ability to lead a normal active life; diseases of the heart and lung—requiring surgery—which have gone undiagnosed and untreated; epileptic and other neurological disorders; severe kidney ailments that in other children would warrant immediate hospitalization; and finally, in boys and girls in every county we visited, obvious evidence of severe malnutrition, with injury to the body's tissues—its muscles, bones, and skin as well as an associated psychological state of fatigue, listlessness, and exhaustion.

"We saw homes with children who are lucky to eat one meal a day—and that one inadequate so far as vitamins, minerals, or protein are concerned. We saw children who don't get to drink milk, don't get to eat

fruit, green vegetables, or meat. They live on starches—grits, bread, Kool-aid. They are living under such primitive conditions that we found it hard to believe we were examining American children in the Twentieth Century.

"In some we saw children who are hungry and who are sick—children for whom hunger is a daily fact of life and sickness, in many forms, an inevitability. We do not want to quibble over words, but 'malnutrition' is not quite what we found; the boys and girls we saw were hungry—weak, in pain, sick, their lives are being shortened; they are, in fact, visibly and predictably losing their health, their energy, and their spirits. They are suffering from hunger and disease and directly or indirectly they are dying from them—which is exactly what 'starvation' means."

The charge of starvation was supported by all six of these eminent doctors.

In their individual testimony before the Senate Subcommittee, the doctors presented other observations and conclusions, some of them almost heartbreaking.

Dr. Wheeler: "Only one of the [Delta] families I visited ever had milk at all and this was reserved for 'the sickliest' ones. One mother summed up the question of diet in a single, poignant sentence: 'These children go to bed hungry and get up hungry and don't ever know nothing else in between.' Thin arms, sunken eyes, lethargic behavior, and swollen bellies were everywhere to be seen."

Dr. Wheeler: "Only one of the [Delta] Negro children so vulnerable to diseases that ordinarily are no longer considered killers in the United States? These children are vulnerable because their bodily resistance is so low they don't have ability to cope with infections the way healthy children have. The main cause of lack of resistance is malnutrition. The food available to them lacks the vital components that are necessary to build healthy bodies that can develop resistance against disease . . . I would estimate that among the many families that I saw and I visited, with 150 or 160 children, at least three-quarters of them get less than the vital amount of animal protein per day—at least three-quarters, and I think I am being very conservative. Increasing evidence has come from different countries to suggest that infants both before birth and after birth, deprived of the kinds of foods which are necessary for normal bodily growth, suffer not only visible damage to their bodies but also to the central nervous system, to the brain."

Dr. Coles: "I would like to speak briefly about the psychiatric aspect of my work . . . I am describing in detail what it means for a child and his or her parents to be sick, more or less all the time, and hungry, more or less regularly. From all that one can learn, the aches and sores of the body become, for a child of four or five, more than a concrete physical factor of life; they bring in the child's mind a reflection of his worth and a judgment upon him and his family by the outside world. They ask themselves and others what they have done to be kept from the food they want or what they have done to deserve the pain they feel.

"In my experience with families in the Delta, their kind of life can produce a form of withdrawn, sullen behavior. I have seen some of the families I knew in the South go North and carry with them that state of mind and I am now working with them in Boston. They have more food, more welfare money, and, in the public hospitals of the Northern city, certain medical services. But one sees how persistently sickness and hunger in children live on into adults who doubt any offer, mistrust any goodness or favorable turn of events.

"I fear that we have among us now in this country hundreds of thousands of people who have literally grown up to be and

learned to be tired, fearful, anxious, and suspicious. . . . The children need food, the kind of food that will enable their bones to grow, their blood to function as it should, their vital organs to remain healthy, and their minds to stay alert. It is inconceivable to us that children at this stage of American history, and in the context of American wealth, continue to live like this in Mississippi, in Alabama, in Kentucky, in West Virginia, in the Southwest, and, indeed carry this condition of life to all of our Northern cities."

Later I asked Dr. Coles a vital young psychiatrist who has not become insensitized by repeated trips into the most poverty-stricken areas of the Deep South and Appalachia, how many children suffering from malnutrition live in the Delta region today.

"There is no way, at present, of knowing for certain," he replied. "There are thousands and thousands of children in the Delta we didn't see, out of sight, out of reach, out of mind, out of access to white doctors and Negro doctors. There must be between 50,000 and 100,000 children suffering from malnutrition in the Delta."

Dr. Coles agreed on the use of the word "starvation" rather than "malnutrition." "The kind of starvation we observed," he said, "is the kind of starvation in which the body is slowly consuming itself. The body is victimized by diseases which definitely can shorten life. We saw severe malnutrition, hunger, and starvation in the sense that the body is irremediably going downhill."

I am convinced from what I saw that among the great number of Negroes who have moved from the Deep South to Northern ghettos are some who knew starvation in the South as children, and that this bitter experience makes some of them potential recruits for the riots in cities.

I wish to reemphasize, as would the doctors, that hunger, malnutrition, and slow starvation are not confined to the Deep South nor to any other part of the country. There is, certainly, widespread hunger and malnutrition in all the Negro ghettos, north and south.

Washington, D.C., for example, is no better nor any worse than any other American city, although undoubtedly, as the center of Federal Government, it should be better. One-third of the population of the nation's capital exists at little more than subsistence level.

Under the District of Columbia's Headstart program, for example, 4,200 children recently received physical examinations. Between forty and fifty per cent of these youngsters were found to have low hemoglobin counts, a condition (when not caused by infection) reflecting a food deficiency which produces nutritional anemia.

Deficient diets among Washington children are also indicated in the School Free Lunch Program which provides free lunches in elementary and secondary schools *only on application by the family, certifying need*. Nationally, a total of eleven per cent of all school children receive free school lunches, but in Washington they are provided to fifty-one per cent of all school youngsters.

Another index of deficient diets in the nation's capital is found in Public Assistance payments which provide a maximum of \$417-a-month for a family of thirteen, including \$228 for food, which comes to nineteen cents-a-meal for each member of the family.

The Subcommittee's disclosures—preliminary as they are—of hundreds of thousands, perhaps millions, of hungry Americans have had two early results. The first was an unexpected public response; the second was the Subcommittee's success in effecting a quick change in the Department of Agriculture's food stamp policies and in moving emergency legislation through the Senate.

Perhaps we should have anticipated the

public's warm, sympathetic response to the revelations of hunger, but actually members of the Subcommittee were surprised by the letters and telephone calls they received from concerned citizens. Some of the letters contained checks; mostly the writers inquired (as did the callers) where money and collections of food and clothing could be sent. Frequently the letters combined expressions of heartfelt solicitude with indignant comments on the affluent society that allowed penury and hunger to persist.

The way in which the food stamp program operated, particularly the cash payments required of poor families, was seen by the Subcommittee as a major obstacle to alleviating hunger. Time and again, in Mississippi and in Washington, the Subcommittee was told that many families could not afford the two dollars per person a month that would buy them desperately needed food stamps worth much more when exchanged for commodities. A family of six, for example, would have to pay twelve dollars a month for coupons exchangeable for \$72 worth of food. Many families, we were told, went "months on end without seeing twelve dollars all together."

Finally, after an impatient exchange of letters between the Subcommittee and Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman, and appeals to the White House, the Department of Agriculture was induced to cut the cost of food stamps from two dollars to fifty cents. This meant that the family of six that previously paid twelve dollars for \$72 worth of food would now pay three dollars. With other members of the Subcommittee, I hope that even the fifty cents charge can be eliminated and stamps be made available to the needy free of cost.

In addition, the Subcommittee persuaded Sargent Shriver's Office of Economic Opportunity to institute an emergency \$1,000,000 four-month Food Stamp Loan Program in twenty counties in seven Southern states. This provides the needy with cash loans ranging from two dollars to twelve dollars a month, depending on the size of the family. It now makes possible the purchase of food stamps by thousands of families that previously could not afford them. By the end of the year it is expected that 30,000 families (with an average of four to a family) will have obtained OEO loans for food stamps in these Deep South counties.

Emergency legislation was the next step, and for once the normally laggard machinery of the U.S. Senate moved with dispatch. On Friday, July 21, Senator John Stennis, Mississippi Democrat, introduced a bill proposing a \$10,000,000 appropriation to provide, on an emergency basis, "food and medical services to any individual in any state whenever such action is required to prevent the loss of such individual's life or to avoid suffering caused by lack of food or medical attention." By late afternoon, seven other Senators and I, all members of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, had joined as co-sponsors of the bill and had pledged the speediest possible action on the proposal.

On the following Tuesday the bill was unanimously approved by the full Committee but not before the \$10,000,000 appropriation was increased to \$25,000,000 for the first year and \$50,000,000 for the second, and an amendment added to initiate the first comprehensive study in the nation's history "of the incidence and location of serious hunger and malnutrition and health problems incident thereto. . ." The bill sailed through the Senate the next day without a single dissenting vote.

I am hopeful that the new war on poverty legislation—which includes additional funds of \$2.8 billion approved by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare for a series of improving amendments to the existing Economic Opportunity Act—will make a major contribution toward the abolition of

poverty and hunger. By strengthening the Job Corps, the Neighborhood Youth Corps, adult work-training, aid to small business, community action programs, assistance to migrant workers, rural loans, Headstart, and VISTA—by making these programs more effective, I believe we can do much to raise American living standards and begin the long-overdue eradication of poverty, hunger and malnutrition.

As the long hot summer of 1967, with its unprecedented civil disorders, bloodshed, and looting, recedes into history, the nation and its leaders find themselves reassessing their goals and priorities. Remembering the devastated neighborhoods, the burned-out homes and shops, in nearly thirty cities across the country, I found the words of the philosopher Seneca, 2,000 years ago, echoing meaningfully down to our day: "A hungry people listens not to reason, nor cares for justice, nor is bent by any prayers."

Now, as never before, reason and justice dictate that we devote our purpose and our nation's resources to the goal that there shall no longer be hungry people in an America of overflowing abundance.

OMAHA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE STUDY TOUR

Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. President, the mayor of Omaha, Nebr., Hon. A. V. Sorensen, has arranged a study tour in Washington, D.C., for members of the Omaha Chamber of Commerce. Included in the group are members of the Omaha City Council, members of the Douglas County Board of Commissioners, the Honorable Kenneth G. Jensen, mayor of Council Bluffs, Iowa, and members of the Council Bluffs City Council.

These gentlemen and ladies are here for 3 days to receive, firsthand, information as to the type, number, and characteristics of Federal programs available to local government. The group is also privileged to listen to Senator PROUTY, Congressman GERALD R. FORD, and a representative of Senator PERCY, concerning legislative proposals in the area of housing, poverty, and taxation.

Mr. President, these men and women are to be commended for taking part of their valuable time to become better acquainted with possible solutions to problems facing local government. I ask unanimous consent that the names of these civic, business, educational, and political leaders be listed in the RECORD.

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

Mrs. Douglas Abbott, Mr. C. D. Anderson, Mr. Fred G. Arkoosh, Mr. Alden Aust.

Mr. Robert O. Beno, Mr. Douglas Bereuter, Director, Mr. Donald F. Bock, Mr. Paul Bolton, Mr. Arthur D. Bradley, Mr. Don Burden, Mr. C. Howard Burnett.

Mr. C. B. Calandra, Mr. Hubert C. Carden, Mr. S. L. Cate, Mr. Harold Cherniack, Mr. Warren D. Chiles, Mr. Charles M. Christiansen, Mr. Robert F. Coats.

Mr. Robert Cunningham, Mr. Irving R. Dana, Mr. Coyle A. Davis, Mrs. Joann Dickey, Mr. J. D. Disinger, Mr. Howard B. Dooley.

Mr. Charles W. Durham, Mr. Jack R. Eakin, Mr. Erhart D. Edquist, Mr. Travis Evans, Mr. Jack H. Fernley, Mr. Don W. Franksen, Mr. Herman Goldstein, Mr. D. K. Gordon, Mr. Dan Gordan, Mr. Charles Graham, W. R. Hathaway, M.D., Mr. William Heavey.

Mr. Richard H. Hiller, Mr. Robert L. Ingles, Mr. Gene Jacobson, Mrs. Madeline Jacobson, The Honorable Kenneth G. Jensen.

Mr. Richard W. Johnson, Mr. Ronald Kiger,

Mr. O. A. Kinney, Jr., Mr. William E. Korbitz, Mr. Norman Korney, Mr. Gary Kotyza.

Mr. Donald G. Lamp, Mr. Clarence L. Landen, Jr., Mr. David A. Lemen, Mr. Robert G. Lueder, Mr. Daniel C. Lynch, Mr. J. Allan Mactier.

Dr. C. C. Madsen, Mr. John Markel, Mr. Ephraim L. Marks, Col. Anson D. Marston, Mr. John S. Marshall, Mr. Francis P. Matthews.

Mr. Fred J. Matthies, Mr. John E. McCann, Mr. Ray B. McMartin, Mr. Stanley A. Michael, Mr. Kirk P. Miller.

Mr. Morris F. Miller, Mr. George C. Mit-tauer, Mr. William T. Monahan, Mr. J. Robert Mullen, Mr. James W. Murphy, Dr. Kirk Taylor.

Mr. Floyd F. Nebergall, Mr. John W. Neuberger, Mr. Julius I. Novak, Mr. Robert O'Keefe, Mr. John A. O'Malley, Dr. A. B. Pittman.

Mr. Wayne E. Putnam, Mr. William C. Ramsey, Mr. Willis Regier, Mr. W. A. Richardson, Mr. James D. Richter, Mr. R. E. Runice.

Mr. H. L. Sampson, Mr. Kenneth Shearer, Mr. Robert C. Schropp, Mr. Marvin G. Schmid, Mr. E. E. Schwalm, Mr. Everett Shockey, The Honorable A. V. Sorenson.

Mr. Harry W. Springer, Mr. Ray E. Stanley, Mr. Warren Swigart, Mr. W. A. Richard-son, Mr. Dale T. Kolste, Mr. D. D. Ulfers.

Mr. Sam Vacanti, Mr. M. J. Warren, Mr. S. M. Watson, Mr. Alex Weinstein, Mr. J. Leroy Welsh, Mr. Joe Williams.

Mr. O. E. Willmann, Mr. Charles A. Wil-son, Jr., Dr. Cecil L. Wittson, Mr. Robert R. Baxter, Mr. L. W. Gregg, Mr. Ralph O. Heflinger.

ALASKA AND HAWAII—SISTER STATES SHOULD BE PARTNERS IN TRADE

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, last Friday I introduced a bill (S. 2454), cosponsored by the distinguished Senators from Hawaii (Mr. FONG and Mr. INOUE), to amend section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1920 to permit a very desirable development of trade relationships between the 49th and 50th States—Alaska and Hawaii. The same bill has been introduced by all members of the Alaska and Hawaii delegations in the House of Representatives. The benefit of mutual trade for both States is now, unhappily, hindered by the existence of unnecessarily high water transportation costs resulting from necessary dependence on American-built ships. The advantages to both States available from utilization of foreign carriers plying the Pacific with cargo exchanged between the United States and countries of the Far East are so great we must act to remove barriers to this now existing.

As I mentioned in my remarks at the time I introduced S. 2454, a forceful argument for allowance of the use of foreign carriers in trade between Alaska and Hawaii has developed with the plans, now in process of execution, for construction in Alaska, on the Kenai Peninsula, of a large plant for the production of liquefied natural gas which will be shipped to Japan in tankers built in Sweden. The use of low-cost carriers makes this an economic trade relationship between the United States and Japan, bringing benefits to both countries. It could provide similar benefits to the States of Alaska and Hawaii—allowing fuel-short Hawaii to enjoy the benefits of low-cost natural gas produced in Alaska.

I am informed by a communication from Honolulu that it is anticipated that the volume of gas which could be used in Hawaii is estimated to amount to a quantity measured in value in the magnitude of \$2.5 to \$3 million annually, escalating annually at an estimated rate of 10 and 20 percent. This would be an extremely important contribution to the economy of Alaska while, at the same time, providing the people of Hawaii with supplies of fuel at a lower cost than others now available. In addition, the development in Alaska of another new plant, now well under construction, to produce chemical products, including urea and anhydrous ammonia for fertilizer, could also be the source of reciprocal benefits for Alaska and Hawaii. Hawaii's agricultural economy needs these products and could buy them at less cost than is now possible—again if we change the cabotage laws to allow use of low-cost shipping.

Alaskans and Hawaiians have long been aware of the interests they share in common and the potential benefits that can be gained from close cooperation with each other. Throughout the long years of the battles for statehood for Alaska and for Hawaii we enjoyed the constant support and valuable help of our Hawaiian friends in working for a common purpose. Now that we have achieved that objective and the beneficial results of the status of statehood are becoming clear to all, Alaskans and Hawaiians hope to consolidate our gains by finding more and more ways in which reciprocal assistance will lead to joint benefits.

In addition to improving feasibility of ocean transportation between Alaska and Hawaii by the use of foreign-built carriers, direct airline connections between the States are being actively sought. Now before the Civil Aeronautics Board, in connection with the giant Transpacific Route Case, are applications from two carriers to provide direct service between Alaska and Hawaii. Approval of this could bring increased tourist activity for both States with the use of such a route by European vacationers to enjoy a combination sea—in Hawaii—and ski—in Alaska—holiday. The beautiful fruits and flowers of Hawaii could be flown to Alaska in the winter when such exotic treats can make a welcome contribution to the quality of life of Alaskans.

These are but some of the changes in transportation patterns between Alaska and Hawaii that will surely come and will surely enrich the lives of both States. Together we will achieve our mutual objectives.

As an indication of the earnestness with which the two States are pursuing them, an Alaska trade delegation, headed by Governor Walter Hickel, visited Hawaii on the return trip from a trade mission to Japan earlier this month. Common interests and common problems were discussed with Hawaiian leaders and now we are pursuing the course indicated to solve those problems.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD the text of newspaper articles from Hawaiian newspapers commenting on the legislation intro-

duced last week to amend the Jones Act and on the recent Alaska trade mission to Hawaii.

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

[From the Honolulu Advertiser, Sept. 26, 1967]

HAWAII, ALASKA SEEK SHIPPING EXEMPTION

WASHINGTON.—Reps. Spark M. Matsunaga and Patsy T. Mink yesterday joined Alaska Republican Howard W. Pollock in offering a bill aimed at lowering costs of materials needed in Hawaii.

The bill proposed by the two Hawaii Democrats and the Alaskan is similar to a measure sent to the Senate by Hiram L. Fong and Daniel K. Inouye of Hawaii and Ernest Gruening of Alaska on Friday.

The measure would exempt Alaska and Hawaii from the 1920 Merchant Marine Act provisions prohibiting shipments of merchandise between domestic ports in vessels under foreign registry.

"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," Gruening told the Senate last week.

"How ironical that oriental country 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," Gruening said.

"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," Gruening said.

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, Sept. 25, 1967]

HAWAII, ALASKA URGE LOWER FREIGHT COST

Hawaii and Alaska lawmakers joined today to introduce a bill aimed at lowering costs of some building materials and fuels in Hawaii.

The bill is a suggested amendment to the Merchant Marine Act of 1920, popularly known as the Jones Act. This law's provisions prohibit shipments of material between domestic ports in ships under foreign registry.

Sen. Ernest W. Gruening, D-Alaska, who introduced the bill in the Senate Friday, said the purpose was "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."

A similar bill was introduced today in the House by Reps. Spark M. Matsunaga and Patsy T. Mink of Hawaii and Alaska Republican Howard W. Pollock.

The Senate bill was cosponsored by Hawaii's Sens. Hiram L. Fong and Daniel K. Inouye.

No regularly scheduled direct freighter service—foreign or domestic—exists between Hawaii and Alaska.

"Hawaii needs the mineral, timber and fuel resources abundant in Alaska and lacking in Hawaii while Alaska could be the beneficiary of fruits, vegetable and other products of Hawaii," Gruening told the Senate last week.

As an example of possible saving for consumers, Gruening said it was planned to ship 139 million cubic feet of Alaskan gas per day to Japan, but unless the Jones Act is changed, Hawaii couldn't get any of this low cost fuel because the tankers are scheduled to be constructed in Sweden.

"How ironical that Oriental countries can receive an American product at a far lower price than in American areas, especially one which lies nearer the source of supply than are the Asian countries," Gruening said.

It is most likely that an American shipping firm would build ships specifically to carry liquefied gas from Alaska to Hawaii, he said.

"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 sought them should not and need not be mobilized against this legislation," he added.

"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," the Senator said.

Hawaii Lt. Gov. Thomas P. Gill, who headed the Governor's Committee on Food Prices and who is often quoted on consumer matters, said a change in the maritime law could be a great advantage in fuel distribution to Hawaii.

"But I wouldn't want to bet too much on fruit and vegetables; they could be handled better by air freight," Gill said.

"There's certainly a tremendous need for some interchanges of fresh fruits and vegetable from Hawaii in exchange for fresh seafood from Alaska. However, Alaska's biggest market is Anchorage and that's not to big.

"Building materials might be cheaper here if the law were changed, but Alaska itself seems to get a lot of wood from Canada and the other 48 states," Gill said. He was a recent Alaska visitor.

[From the Pacific Business News,
Sept. 18, 1967]

**HAWAII AND ALASKA: ANYTHING IN
COMMON?—PLENTY!**
(By Jim Weatherly)

Hawaii and Alaska are as different from each other as their symbols, the palm tree and the iceberg. But as a discussion between business and government officials from the two states were on at the Chamber of Commerce of Hawaii last Tuesday, it became apparent they have more in common than meets the eye.

The Alaska Trade Mission to Japan headed by Governor Walter J. Hickel took a long route home through Hawaii to discuss mutual interests, and the men were reminded that:

Both States are miles away from the continental U.S. (Hawaii beats Alaska on this score.)

Both are dependent to a great extent on air and sea transportation. (Hawaii, of course, is totally dependent on these two modes of travel.)

Both have their own brand of romance that's appealing to tourists.

And both have more than casual ties with Japan. The Japanese have made a greater capital investment in Alaska than all the other 49 states put together.

These common interests, plus the potential of trade between the 49th and 50th states, could drive their business and government leaders together into a body with some muscle.

The feeling among the men in attendance at the discussion was that together the nation's newest states could make aloud enough voice to be heard all the way to Washington, D.C. And that's where most of the answers to their mutual problems seem to lie.

Topping the list of gripes is the inequity of the Jones Act as it pertains to the two states.

With both so far away from the Mainland, the added convenience of being able to use foreign ships under certain circumstances to handle cargo between two U.S. points is obvious.

But the law, written to protect American shipping companies on both coasts, prohibits any such move.

By deliberately defying the law, Alaska has won some exemptions. But it wants more. Hawaii has more than once been inconvenienced by the Act, but it's never made any concentrated effort to find an exemption.

An air link between Anchorage and Hono-

lulu appears no less important than doing something about the Jones Act.

Both states have favored taking the proposed route out of the complicated trans-Pacific route investigation now before the Civil Aeronautics Board for more immediate action, but the CAB won't budge.

Governor Hickel is particularly enthusiastic about the route.

He sees the unique features of Alaska and Hawaii being sold in a tour package to Western Europeans.

With five international airlines now jetting over the North Pole from Europe to Anchorage on their way to Tokyo, the air link to Hawaii would provide an alternate direct route to the South Pacific.

European visitors to Hawaii and points south are now slowed down by longer routes through Los Angeles, San Francisco or Seattle.

The new air route would, of course, provide a fast way to move cargo between Alaska and Hawaii as well.

The conference attendants were very optimistic about the potential for trade between Hawaii and Alaska, providing there are more direct transportation links.

It's obvious, though, that the trade would be anything but balanced. The simple facts are, Alaska is rich with natural resources. Hawaii has practically none.

The few flowers and tropical fruits we could return for things like liquefied natural gas, lumber and seafood are a pittance.

The most sought after Alaskan resource for Hawaii at the present time is liquefied natural gas.

Japan will be the major market for the gas. The nation is now building two specially built tankers in Sweden to haul the energy source.

Honolulu Gas Co. is very interested in the Alaskan product, but again, the problem is transportation.

The Japanese vessels will be the only ones capable of handling the gas, and they're prohibited from calling at Honolulu from Alaska because of the Jones Act.

Alaska's lumber resources have a potential market for Hawaii, too.

Hawaii lumber experts say the present indirect transportation from Alaska would up the cost compared to the lumber Hawaii now gets from California, Oregon and Washington.

Also, the public here would have to be educated on timber that's different from what they've been buying, though not inferior.

One Hawaii seafood wholesaler is already getting 1,000 pounds of live Alaskan crabs each week via Seattle.

With the influx of Hawaii's visitors demanding all the delicacies they're used to back home, the demand for prime Alaskan seafood will increase.

At present because of the time between flights at Seattle, the mortality rate for crabs has been rather high.

Their chance for survival would be made more possible with direct flights to Hawaii from Anchorage.

With all the potential, trade between Alaska and Hawaii won't be ignored.

A possible joint venture between the gas and lumber interests to build barges for direct service between the two points was suggested at the conference.

A more immediate get together possibility is an Hawaiian delegation to Alaska for further talks.

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, Sept. 13,
1967]

ISLE, ALASKA TRADE LEADERS THINKING BIG

King crabs and clams, flown live to Honolulu from Alaska, are already being served in restaurants here.

But this is only a small part of the huge trade between the 49th and 50th States now being planned.

Here are some of the possibilities if moves discussed yesterday by Hawaii and Alaska business leaders come to fruition:

Fresh Hawaiian pineapple and papaya would brighten tables throughout Alaska, while fresh-cut flowers from the Islands would be available every day.

Using techniques and equipment developed in Hawaii, underwater miners would reap a harvest of gold from the sea floor, washed there over centuries from Alaskan gold fields.

Honolulu housewives would turn on their gas stoves to cook with natural gas shipped here from Alaska in liquid form and distributed by Honolulu Gas Co.

Hawaii's growing wood-working industry would use Alaskan timber.

Members of a trade mission from Alaska raised these suggestions when they met Honolulu businessmen at the Chamber of Commerce of Hawaii.

Led by the governor of Alaska, Walter J. Hickel, the group spent two days here before heading home after a visit to Japan.

The Alaskan delegation impressed on the local representatives of business and government the need for concerted action to gain loopholes in federal shipping regulations, if a number of these trade opportunities are to materialize.

Gov. Hickel, who said Alaska had to deliberately break federal law to bring its plight to the notice of the authorities, said equally strong action is going to be required from Hawaii.

The problem is presented in the Jones Act, which prohibits the movement of U.S. cargo between U.S. ports in foreign ships.

Hickel said the liquefied natural gas, for example, can only be moved in tankers now being built in Sweden.

These foreign carriers will not be able to service Hawaii as the law stands now.

[From the Honolulu Advertiser, Sept. 13,
1967]

ISLE-ALASKA LINKS URGED

Hawaii and Alaska should join forces immediately to press for an amendment to Federal law to permit transport of their products between the two in foreign ships.

They also should coordinate their efforts to obtain immediate consideration of a direct Hawaii-Alaska air link.

This was the consensus developed here yesterday during a discussion between members of an Alaska trade mission and a dozen leading Hawaii business and government officials.

"If you are going to get the cost of living down and you are going to compete (in trade), you have to get the Jones Act amended," the Hawaii group was told by Gov. Walter J. Hickel of Alaska. "This is a case where you really have to push."

The Jones Act prohibits the transport of goods and materials between any two states in a foreign ship.

To get some relief, Alaska has challenged the Federal law with two deliberate violations of the act.

"I don't think Hawaii is fully aware of what Alaska has done about the Jones Act," commented Paul Joy of Honolulu Gas Co. He suggested that perhaps Hawaii "has been asleep and not taken the necessary action" to obtain the amendments she needs.

Honolulu Gas has been working in recent years to find a way to obtain liquefied natural gas from Alaska at a cost that would be competitive.

It has been pointed out that without a change in the law an American natural resource will provide a great benefit to a foreign country—Japan—while the same benefits are denied an American state which could use them.

Hickel said liquefied natural gas production at a multimillion-dollar plant is expected to start in 1969. It will be carried to

Japan in two tankers of 79,000 tons each now under construction in Sweden.

It has been suggested that one of these ships could call in Hawaii at regular intervals—if it weren't for the Jones Act.

Besides the natural gas potential for Hawaii, the State might be able to obtain less expensive supplies of lumber and fertilizer.

While most of the discussion on the transportation problem centered around an amendment to the law, it was suggested by James Read, manager of Ultramar Chemical Co., that the two states should take a look at a possibility of transporting their own materials, possibly via barge:

"I don't think Hawaii is ever going to have any relief from the Jones Act," Read said.

The situation regarding direct air routes is considerably different than shipments by sea.

Both states were rebuffed by the Civil Aeronautics Board in efforts to get the Hawaii-Alaska route decision removed from consideration with the complicated Transpacific Route Case.

We have probably moved without collective effort," said Hickel. "We should go to the CAB and ask them to show justification for not doing it. We should get on this right away, go right to the CAB and proceed to a decision."

Don Dickey, general manager of the Alaska Chamber of Commerce, emphasized that the CAB "won't come calling" to the two states involved. "It will take some head knocking," he said.

Al Harris of the Chamber of Commerce of Hawaii staff noted that the proposed Hawaii-Alaska air route "has great potential for growth."

"The potential," said Hickel, "is in what is not happening now. With a little romance, we could sell sea and ski vacations to Europeans and save them at least three hours' flying time to Hawaii."

He said that about 100,000 Europeans are flying across the North Pole via Anchorage, through which five foreign airlines operate. To reach the south Pacific areas, they must continue either to the U.S. Mainland or to Japan.

In some instances, Hickel pointed out, an extra 14 hours of flying time is required to get to Hawaii from Anchorage. As an example he cited Air France, which carries its passengers to Los Angeles before they make the Pacific flight.

Anchorage is a few miles closer to Hawaii than Seattle, but today it is necessary to at least go via that Washington city while traveling between the two Pacific states.

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, Sept. 12, 1967]

RISE IN ISLE-ALASKA TRADE FORECAST

The governor of the State of Alaska, Walter J. Hickel, predicted in Honolulu yesterday that big business will develop between the 49th and 50th states.

A major trade boost will come from sales of Alaska produced liquefied natural gas to Hawaii, he said.

And an Alaska-Hawaii air route would be a logical extension of over-the-pole flights from Europe, creating a "whole new marketing area" for the airlines.

Hickel is in Honolulu as the head of an Alaskan trade mission, now on its way home after a visit to Japan.

The Honolulu Gas Co. has already indicated interest in the possibility of tapping Mainland natural gas resources by shipping the gas here in liquefied form.

LARGEST PLANT

Hickel said Alaska will soon have the largest plant in the world to do the liquefying.

It would take three years to convert the gas facilities here to handle it, but Hickel said the Alaska plant will not be in operation until 1969.

At that time Alaska will begin supplying the gas "in big quantities" to Japan.

A major obstacle in supplying Hawaii is the Jones Act, drawn up to protect U.S. shipping, which prevents foreign carriers from moving cargo between American ports.

He said:

"It will be necessary to get a waiver from the law so that the foreign carriers taking the gas to Japan will be able to service Hawaii, too.

"The Jones Act should not apply to Hawaii and Alaska."

AIR LINK

Hickel described proposals for a direct air link between Alaska and Hawaii as "excellent."

He said:

"Flights land every day at Anchorage after an over-the-pole hop from Europe.

"They should be allowed to fly on to the South Pacific through Hawaii.

"The travel industry would then be able to offer complete sea and ski packages, using Alaskan snows and Hawaiian surf and sunshine."

OPPORTUNITIES

He said the Alaskan group found huge opportunities for trade between Alaska and Japan.

He said:

"Japan has a tremendous interest in the vast natural resources of Alaska.

"There is already more Japanese capital invested in our state than in all the others put together, and we expect this to double within a few years.

"The natural resources of Alaska and the commercial resources of Japan naturally complement each other."

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 548, S. 2388, the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The ASSISTANT 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from West Virginia.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER].

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. SPONG in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

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

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

TRIBUTE TO PRESIDENT JOHNSON FOR HIS APPOINTMENTS TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CITY COUNCIL

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this morning at the White House swearing in ceremony of Walter E. Washington as mayor, and Thomas W. Fletcher as deputy mayor of the District of Columbia, President Johnson announced the names of the new nominees for the District of Columbia City Council. These nominees will serve the District of Columbia City Council subject to their confirmation by the Senate.

These outstanding individuals will bring to our city government the kind of wisdom, leadership, and understanding that will provide a meaningful voice for all citizens in the Nation's Capital.

Mr. President, I highly commend President Johnson for the choices he has made.

I have worked on the Senate District of Columbia Committee for a great many years. I have come to know each one of these nominees. And I stand before the Senate today to vouch for them as dedicated citizens of the Nation's Capital.

This is a great day for our new mayor and for all those who have worked long to create a truly modern and efficient government.

The following nominations have been made by the President: Max Kampelman, Chairman; Mr. Fauntroy, Vice Chairman; Stanley Anderson, Mrs. Margaret Heywood, John Nevius, William Thompson, J. C. Turner, Polly Shackleton, Joseph Yeldell.

Mr. President, my boss really, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], chairman of the District of Columbia Committee, is present in the Chamber. I am sure I bespeak our mutual views when I say that these nominees, once they are confirmed, and the mayor and the deputy mayor, will receive from the Senate District of Columbia Committee its enthusiastic help and support as the city council takes up the very great responsibility that the President has imposed upon it.

The outstanding qualifications of each one of the persons whom the President has nominated for the city council are shown by biographical data which I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the close of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the President of the United States delivered an elegant statement this morning when he presented Mr. Walter Washington and Mr. Thomas Fletcher to take their oath of office in their capacity as mayor and

deputy mayor, respectively, of the District of Columbia, under the new Reorganization Act.

I ask unanimous consent that the President's remarks on that occasion be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT SWEARING IN OF WALTER WASHINGTON, COMMISSIONER, AND THOMAS FLETCHER, DEPUTY COMMISSIONER OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, EAST ROOM, SEPTEMBER 28, 1967

Mr. Justice Fortas, Mr. and Mrs. Walter Washington and family, Mr. and Mrs. Thomas Fletcher and family, distinguished Members of the Cabinet, Members of the Congress, Members of the Court, Ladies and Gentlemen:

More than ceremony summons us here to the East Room this morning.

We celebrate a new era for the Capital City as we meet here to swear in Walter Washington as Washington's first Mayor, and Thomas Fletcher as his deputy.

The citizens of the District have waited almost a century for this day to come, and all that it symbolizes.

This is the day—and this is the year—that the District emerges into the world of the 20th Century government.

With the recent reorganization plan, the Nation's Capital was liberated from the outworn practices of past years. That reorganization plan equips the city with new machinery to let its government serve the needs of its people.

But the best machinery can function effectively only in the hands of the best men.

I looked across America to try to find these men. And I think we found them—men with the strength and the character and the vision to deal with tough problems. Now, this morning, we commit those problems to their capable hands.

No one here, for a moment, minimizes these problems.

The District's new day comes at a time of real crisis for every American city. And Washington, D.C., the Capital City, represents the American city.

It is alive with promise. And more than any other, it houses the heritage of our history.

But beyond the monuments, urban erosion eats at a city's heart and at a city's hope.

The needs are clear to all of us: Safety on the streets and in our homes; driving crime from our midst; health and education for our children; a decent roof over every family; a good job for every person who is willing to take it. Then every resident can share the pride that stirs every visitor to our Capital.

The leaders who will help to solve those problems know the challenge. They are uniquely qualified to act because their careers have been spent in action, in meeting the needs of cities and the needs of their people.

Together, this team has the energy and the experience to deal responsibly with the great urban and human problems of our time. Together, they will focus those talents on our national capital city.

Mr. Fletcher wrote an outstanding and distinguished record as City Manager of San Diego, California. He brings to his task a deep knowledge of how modern city administration and fiscal planning can work to the benefit of the people.

Mr. Washington brings unsurpassed skills as a city executive. He is taking a very large reduction in salary and making sacrifices to come here to accept this draft from his President. He is an authentic leader and he has devoted a lifetime of effective and inspired work in the cause of good housing, one of our most critical urban needs—to say nothing about what he has done for beautifica-

tion in the District of Columbia. He has lived and worked on the streets of his home city. And he has said that he is going to travel those streets again, in pursuit of the progress that the people want and the people need and the people desire and expect.

Mr. Mayor, your walk will be long and arduous, but I believe it will be rewarding.

You will walk with the eyes of the Nation on you.

Everything you do will be known. You will live in a goldfish bowl as most of us public servants do. But, Mr. Mayor, and Mr. Deputy Mayor, we wish you well—and bid you god-speed.

Mr. Mayor, and Mr. Fletcher, you won't be walking alone. I am sending to the Senate my recommendations for the District of Columbia City Council.

In filling this Council, it was our goal to find among the 800,000 residents of the District of Columbia nine exceptional men and women to work with you, to work on the team, to assist you in leading the government of the Nation's Capital, to represent the people at all times in this new venture in government that we are undertaking.

We have spent weeks in considering recommendations made to us by organizations, in searching and consulting with the best authorities that we could talk to. We have reviewed hundreds of records and files. We have sought and obtained not only your recommendations, Mr. Mayor and Mr. Fletcher, but those of civic, labor, religious and other leading non-political groups.

Today I am happy to announce the names of those that I recommend to serve on the Council. And if the Senate is willing, they will serve on the Council.

As Chairman, a distinguished Washington attorney, a political scientist, a teacher, a wise counsellor, a leader in bringing educational television and modern transportation to the Nation's Capital, Council Chairman Mr. Max Kampelman.

As Vice Chairman, a crusader for effective government, for broader opportunities, for better housing for all the people, the Pastor of the New Bethel Baptist Church—the Reverend Walter Fauntroy.

Very deeply involved in the life of the city, honored as an outstanding citizen, an innovator in the field of programs for the young people of the District and Director of one of Washington's most successful youth projects, the Roving Leaders—Mr. Stanley Anderson.

A leader in church activities, a fighter against discrimination, an eminent attorney, Mrs. Margaret A. Haywood.

A second-generation Washingtonian, a leader in the District's Head Start Program, a worker for better housing, Mr. John Nevius.

President of the Washington Urban League, a respected member of the community, an outstanding lawyer, a past President of the National Bar Association, Mr. William Thompson.

A labor leader who knows the problems of the workingman, who fought for the minimum wage, who has spent a lifetime of service in the cause of labor, a man who has made many contributions to helping his fellowman and to improving his city, Mr. J. C. Turner.

One of 13 children, a lifelong resident of the District, and at present an executive at IBM, he finds the time to teach high school dropouts at night, Mr. Joseph Yeldell.

A long-time Washington resident, an editor, a civic leader, active in the District's family and child welfare programs, Mrs. Polly Shackleton. Mrs. Shackleton this morning is observing conditions in Montreal as a background for what she is going to be called on to do here and cannot be present.

These nine citizens, we believe, will be a genuine voice for the people of Washington. We think they represent this city. We believe they know and understand and will certainly learn all about its urgent problems.

I hope the Senate will act promptly so that the new city government can move rapidly from promise to performance.

With them, Mayor Washington, you and your Deputy Mayor Fletcher can now show America what concerned and aroused municipal leaders can do. You can improve the lives of your fellow citizens. You can transform this city into a proud home for all the people.

Some of the most enlightened Members of the Congress, who at great sacrifice to themselves, have fought for years for a better government for the District of Columbia, are here this morning. We are grateful to all of you for having come.

Now, Mr. Mayor and Mr. Deputy Mayor and City Councilmen, it is up to you to get with it. And you had better learn these Congressmen and Senators.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, following the swearing in ceremony that inaugurated into office Mr. Washington and Mr. Fletcher, the President then announced the appointment of his nominees for the Washington, D.C., City Council. It, too, in my judgment, was a very brilliant speech and a symbolic speech, from the standpoint of the future of the government processes in the District of Columbia.

I ask unanimous consent that this speech of the President be printed in the RECORD.

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

Mr. Mayor, Mr. Fletcher—you won't be walking alone.

I am sending to the Senate my recommendations for the D.C. City Council.

In filling this Council, our goal was to find—among the 800,000 residents of the District—nine exceptional men and women to assist you; to represent Washington's people in this new venture in government.

We have spent weeks in searching and consulting. We have reviewed hundreds of records and files. We have sought and obtained not only your recommendations, but those of civic, labor, religious and other leading groups.

Today, I am happy to announce the names of those we recommend to serve on the Council:

As Chairman, a distinguished Washington attorney, a teacher, and wise counsellor, a leader in bringing educational television and modern transportation to the Nation's Capital—Mr. Max Kampelman.

As Vice Chairman, a crusader for effective government, broader opportunities and better housing for all people, pastor of the New Bethel Baptist Church—Reverend Walter Fauntroy.

Deeply involved in the life of the city, honored as an outstanding citizen, an innovator in the field of programs for the young people of the District and director of one of Washington's most successful youth projects, the Roving Leaders—Mr. Stanley Anderson.

A leader in church activities, a fighter against discrimination and an eminent attorney—Mrs. Margaret A. Haywood.

A second generation Washingtonian, a leader in the District's Head Start Program, a top lawyer, and a worker for better housing—Mr. John Nevius.

President of the Washington Urban League, a respected member of the community, an outstanding lawyer, and past President of the National Bar Association—Mr. William Thompson.

A labor leader who knows the problems of the working man, who fought for the minimum wage, and who has spent a lifetime of service in the cause of labor, a man who has made many contributions to improving this city—Mr. J. C. Turner.

A long time Washington resident, an editor, a civic leader active in the District's family and child welfare programs—Mrs. Polly Shackleton.

One of thirteen children, a life long resident of the District and an executive at IBM, he finds the time to teach high school dropouts at night—Mr. Joseph Yeldell.

These nine citizens, I believe, will be a genuine voice for the people of Washington. They truly represent this city. They know its urgent problems.

I hope the Senate will act promptly so the new city government can move rapidly from promise to performance.

With this team, Mayor Washington, you and Deputy Mayor Fletcher can show America what concerned and aroused municipal leaders can do. You can improve the lives of your fellow citizens and transform this city into a proud home for all the people.

EXHIBIT 1

BIOGRAPHIC DATA FOR MAX M. KAMPFELMAN

Kampelman, Max M.: Age 47 (born November 7, 1920, New York, New York). Home: 3154 Highland Place, N.W., Washington, D.C. Present position: Attorney with the firm of Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank and Kampelman.

Education: Ph.D., Political Science, University of Minnesota, 1951.

M.A., University of Minnesota, 1946.

LL.B., New York University, 1945.

A.B., New York University, 1945.

Previous experience:

Associated with the law firm of Phillips, Nizer, Benjamin & Krim, 1941-43.

Civilian Public Service, American Friends Service Committee, 1943-46.

Vice Chairman—Mayor's Committee on Charter Reform, Minneapolis, 1947-48.

Instructor in Political Science, University of Minnesota, 1944-48.

Industrial Relations Lecturer, University of Wisconsin, Summer, 1956-58.

Professor of Political Economy, Bennington College, Vermont, 1948-50.

Visiting Professional Lecturer, Department of Government, Howard, 1954-56.

Also:

Member, Advisory Committee on Finance, National Capital Transportation Agency, Vice Chairman, Greater Washington Educational Television Association, Chairman of the Executive Committee and member of the Board of Directors, D.C. National Bank; American Bar Association, Federal and District Bar Associations, American Judicature Society, American Political Science Association.

Publications, Decision-Making in Defense.

Family data: Married; four children.

BIOGRAPHIC DATA FOR WALTER E. FAUNTROY

Present Position: Pastor, New Bethel Baptist Church, Washington, D.C.

Education:

A.B., Virginia Union University, cum laude, 1955.

B.D., Yale University, 1958.

Graduate School, Catholic University, 1958-59.

Catholic University, Sociology, 1959-60.

Previous experience:

D.C. Coordinator for August 28, 1963, March on Washington, 1963.

Director, Washington Bureau, Southern Christian Leadership Conference, 1964.

Also:

Member, Council of Churches of Greater Washington, Washington Action for Youth, Junior Citizens Corps, Washington Urban League Project, Citizens Committee on Homes and Highways, Howard University Service Project, Inter-religious Committee on Race Relations, Leadership Conference on Civil Rights.

Trustee Boards, United Planning Organization Washington Center for Metropolitan Studies.

Family data: Married, one child.

Born: February 6, 1933, Washington, D.C.

BIOGRAPHIC DATA FOR STANLEY J. ANDERSON

Anderson, Stanley J., Age 40 (born September 24, 1927, Washington, D.C. (Anacostia)). Home: 2604 Stanton Road, S.E., Washington, D.C.

Present position: Deputy Director, Neighborhood Centers Division, Department of Recreation.

Education:

Armstrong High School, Washington, D.C.; B.S. Howard University.

Graduate Studies: Howard University School of Social Work, Catholic University School of Social Work, Hull House Training Center course in Delinquency Control, Michigan State University course in Police and Community Relations 1965.

Previous experience:

Director, Roving Leaders, D.C. Department of Recreation 7 yrs.

Director of Recreation Program in S.E. Washington

Administrator of Trall Blazers Project

Also:

Newspaper Columnist: Afro-American 1947-56.

Washington Post Sports Column 1949-54 on High School and College athletics.

Past President of District Chapter American Recreation Society.

Vice Chairman, Greater Anacostia Peoples Corporation—Association to work on community problems.

Chairman of Youth Problems Committee of the American Recreation Society 1964-65.

Member, Administrative Council American Recreation Society.

Former Chairman, President Citizens Advisory Committee.

Former member Southeast Settlement House Board of Directors.

Vice Chairman of the Anacostia Neighborhood Museum Advisory Committee.

National Director of Athletics for the Elks.

Awards:

1962 received Melvin C. Hazen Award for outstanding young man in District Government.

1965 received John F. Kennedy Memorial Award presented by the Catholic Youth Organization of D.C. for outstanding service.

1966 received a National Pacemaker Award from Parade Magazine and NEA for outstanding creative programs in the field of recreation.

1963 received Howard University Alumni Award for outstanding service in the field of recreation.

1965 received a Fellowship Award from the American Recreation Society for outstanding service in recreation.

Family data: Married; 2 children (one boy Stanley, Jr. 9 and one girl Stanice 17).

BIOGRAPHIC FOR MARGARET A. HAYWOOD

Haywood, Margaret A. Age 55 (born October 8, 1912, Knoxville, Tennessee). Home: 4424 Hunt Place, N.E., Washington, D.C.

Present position: Engaged in the private practice of law in the District of Columbia since April 1942.

Education: Robert H. Terrell Law School, Washington, D.C., 1940.

Previous experience: Office secretary, Washington Urban League, Inc., 1939-1942. Taught law at Robert H. Terrell Law School, 1943-1949.

Also:

Chairman, Commission on Community Life, Washington Federation of Churches.

Second Vice President, Board of Directors, Washington Urban League.

Member, Freedmans Hospital Nursing School Council.

Member, Executive Board, National Council of Negro Women.

Member of the legal committee of the D.C. branch of the NAACP.

Attorney for coordinating committee for the enforcement of the D.C. anti-discrimination laws.

Member of the Washington Bar Association, American Bar Association and admitted to practice before the Supreme Court in 1945.

Member, Board of Trustees of Peoples Congressional Church and past President of Woman's Fellowship of the Church.

Past National Grand Basileus, Lambda Kappa Mu Sorority, Inc.

Awards:

NAACP trophy from Federation of Civic Associations for outstanding individual civic activity, 1950.

Cited by Sigma Delta Tau legal fraternity for outstanding legal service, 1961.

Elected to Afro-American Honor Roll and awarded plaque, 1954.

Family Data: Widowed; one daughter and one granddaughter.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF JOHN A. NEVIUS

Address: 1639 19th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C.

Born: 1920, Washington, D.C.

Career: Practiced law in Washington since 1950; Clark and Nevius, since 1961; General Counsel, Federal Services Finance Corporation 1955 to 1961; General Counsel, National Independent Automobile Dealers Association 1963 to present.

Community activities:

Chairman, Woodrow Wilson House Council, National Trust for Historic Preservation.

Program chairman and former finance chairman, Committee for Forward-looking Republicans.

Director, Republicans for Progress.

Vice chairman and director, Washington Home Rule Committee.

Vice chairman and director, Community Organization for Improvement of Neighborhoods.

Director, Capital Head Start, Inc.

Chairman, Legislative Committee, D.C. Health and Welfare Committee.

Member, D.C. Republican Committee.

Director, YMCA of Metropolitan Washington.

Citizens Committee for Minimum Wages for D.C.

Membership also in American and District Bar Associations, Chevy Chase and Metropolitan Clubs, St. Patricks Episcopal Church (former vestryman), Princeton Club of Washington (former president), Northwest Washington Fair Housing Association, Episcopal Housing Corporation Committee, Potomac School Fathers Association, Washington Urban League.

Education: Princeton University, 1942; Georgetown University, law degree 1950.

Military Service: U.S. Naval Reserve 1943-46.

BIOGRAPHIC DATA FOR WILLIAM S. THOMPSON

Thompson, William S. Age 56 (born November 21, 1911, Mebane, North Carolina). Home: 4343 Blagden Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C.

Present position: Partner, law firm of Thompson, Evans and Dolphin.

Education:

B.S., Howard University, 1934.

LL.B., Terrell College, 1939.

Previous experience: Attorney with various law firms in the Washington area, 1954-64.

Military data: Served in U.S. Army; was discharged as a Corporal, 1932-44.

Also: Past President, National Bar Association; Past President, Local Bar Association.

Member: American Bar Association, Bar Association of Kentucky and local, Secretary-Treasurer, World Peace through Law Center—Geneva, Secretary, Draft Board #10, Metropolitan Police Department, Community Board, Board of Directors, D. C. Bar Association, Board of Directors, National Bar Association.

ciation, President, Washington Urban League.

Family data: Married January 4, 1947; one son.

BIOGRAPHIC DATA FOR J. C. TURNER

Turner, J. C., age 51 (born November 4, 1916, Beaumont, Texas). Home: 6961 32nd Street, N.W., Washington, D.C.

Present position: Business Manager, Operating Engineers, Local 77, Washington, D.C. Education: Graduate of Catholic University; attended American University.

Previous experience: 1934—now the Operating Engineers, Local 77, now Business Manager.

Also member:

National Vice-President, International Union of Operating Engineers.

President, Greater Washington Central Labor Council, AFL-CIO.

D. C. Unemployment Compensation Board. 2nd Vice-President, Maryland State, D. C., AFL-CIO.

Board Member and former officer of Washington Housing Assn.

Board Member and former officer of Washington Criminal Justice Assn.

Board of Trustees, D. C. Public Library.

Treasurer, National Capital Area Chapter, American Assn. for the United Nations.

Washington Urban League.

Member, Board of Directors, Boys Club, Metropolitan D. C. Police.

D. C. Citizens for Better Housing.

1st Vice-President, D. C. Metropolitan Area Highway Users Conference.

Advisory Council, D. C. Manpower Training and Development.

Board of Trustees, United Planning Organization.

Executive Committee, D. C. Citizens for Better Public Education.

Advisory Committee, D. C. Board of Education Model School System.

Labor Member, D. C. Minimum Wage & Industrial Safety Board, 1944-48.

Labor Counselor to International Labor Organization, 1950-51.

Member of Commissioners' Citizens Advisory Council, 1952-57.

Family data: Married; five children.

BIOGRAPHIC DATA FOR POLLY SHACKLETON

Shackleton, Polly, Age 57 (Born June 19, 1910). Home: 3232 Reservoir Road, N.W., Washington, D.C.

Present position: Editor, bi-weekly Newsletter, public relations activities as member headquarters staff, American Institute of Architects.

Education: Student Simmons School of Social Work, Boston University, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, New School for Social Research.

Previous experience:

Editor, reference books, American Federation of Arts, Who's Who in American Art, American Art Annual, 1939-41.

Information Specialist, picture editor O.W.I., Department of State, Department of the Army, 1942-48.

Also Member: President's Georgetown Neighborhood House; Public relations advisory committee, Health and Welfare Council; Family and Child Services of Washington; Advisory Committee for D.C. Home Rule Committee; Washington Housing Association; National Committeewoman.

Delegate, Democratic National Convention, 1956.

Delegate, Democratic National Convention, 1960.

Member, D.C. Democratic Central Committee; Women's National Democratic Club.

BIOGRAPHIC DATA FOR JOSEPH P. YELDELL

Yeldell, Joseph P., 35 yrs. (born September 9, 1932, Washington, D.C.). Home: 1727 S Street, S.E., Washington, D.C.

Present position: Marketing Representative with IBM Corporation.

Education: B.S., D.C. Teachers College; M.E., University of Pittsburgh, 1961.

Previous experience:

Teacher, Pittsburgh Public School System, John Conroy Jr. High, 1958.

Teacher of Mathematics at Calvin Coolidge High School, 1961-62.

Mathematical Statistician, Division of Data Systems Research and Development, U.S. Department of Labor, 1962-64.

Sales Trainee, IBM Corporation, Washington, D.C., 1964-65.

Marketing Representative with IBM Corporation, 1965-now.

Military data: Airman First Class, with the U.S. Air Force, 1954-58.

Also Member: National Education Association, Pennsylvania State Education Association, Mathematics Council of Western Pennsylvania, D.C. Education Association, University of Pittsburgh Alumni Association, D.C. Teachers College Alumni Association, NAAAP, YMCA, Urban League; Entrepreneur, Incorporated.

Family data: Married; two daughters.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CITY COUNCIL

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to the announcement by the President today appointing a City Council for the District of Columbia, and the appointment of Max M. Kampelman, as a New Yorker, at least of New York origin, who will be the chairman of this new city council.

I wish to call attention to the distinction of this relatively young lawyer who has, for some years, been a teacher and instructor in various colleges and universities. He got his education at the bar in New York City.

I would say that we are very proud the President has chosen so outstanding a man of New York origin for this new post, which will be of such interest to the whole country.

The appointment of the vice chairman is also of interest to me. The Reverend Walter E. Fauntroy is well known to me, and to many other Senators, as a leader in the struggle to gain recognition for the Negro people, and equal opportunity under the law and under the Constitution. He is a man of distinction, high quality, and great patriotism. He is a distinct credit to this country, as he will be to the District of Columbia.

The President tried to make these appointments bipartisan in nature. I wish to commend him on his choice of those from the Republican side; namely, John A. Nevius, who is not only a member of my party but also one of those identified within my party who believes in the progressive concepts with which I have been associated all my life.

I take great pleasure, too, in commending the appointment of Margaret A. Haywood and William S. Thompson, the other nominees from my party.

I think these appointments are most auspicious and are of a quality with that of Walter E. Washington, who is now the Commissioner, or "Mayor" of the District of Columbia. He is also a New Yorker.

We have every reason for great satisfaction in the announcements made by the President today. This is long overdue recognition of some element of self-government—at least, autonomous local government for the District of Columbia.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

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. MILLER. Mr. President, I have an amendment pending at the desk. I have modified the amendment, and I should like to have the amendment read, as modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment as modified.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 7 strike all after the period in line 20 and all of lines 21 through 25, of lines 1 and 2 on page 8, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

In the case of an individual with a history of serious and violent behavior, or a history of repetitive or serious law violation or delinquent acts, such determination must be supported by a signed statement from an official of the individual's community, such as the appropriate prosecuting attorney or his deputy, sheriff or his deputy, chief of police or his deputy, parole or probation officer, or chief executive officer, certifying that the individual, if selected, is likely to participate successfully in the program and is unlikely to engage in activities or behavior that would impede other enrollees from receiving the benefit of the program or be incompatible with the maintenance of sound discipline and satisfactory relationships between any center to which he might be assigned and surrounding communities.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, there has been widespread concern and criticism over the inadequate screening of prospective enrollees in the Job Corps. The majority leader of the Senate well expressed the problem on April 28 last year when he said:

It was not my intention to support the establishment of three reformatories in my State.

He went on to describe the criminal activities of a Job Corps enrollee in his State and concluded by saying:

I cannot stress too strongly the need for a more careful selection of Job Corps men.

In the April 18 issue of the Oakland Tribune, an article on the Camp Parks Job Corps states that of the 7,591 young men enrolled since April 26, 1965, only 2,000 completed one or more of the courses; and of these, 1,567 have gone to work, back to school, or into the military service. Only 1,026 actually graduated from the Job Corps. The article reports:

There is violence on the base—knifings, beatings, extortion, frequent thefts, vandalism, drugs, fear, and repeated muggings. . . . The climate of terror that exists has been confirmed during many interviews with Corpsmen, counselors, teachers and even administrators for the Job Corps. . . . the director of community affairs for Camp Parks concedes that girls have been smuggled into some of the dormitories as well as liquor and marijuana.

On March 12 of this year, the Job Corps Director, William P. Kelly, reported that one in 10 of the men enrolled in the Job Corps had been convicted of some serious crime; and 37 percent had some record of misbehavior. It is this group which, in my judgment, has not been properly screened.

There has been recognition of this screening problem; and, in all fairness, I want to say that it has been my observation that under Director Kelly there has been some tightening up. The bill pending before the Senate, particularly the section to which my amendment is offered, attempts to cope with this problem.

Let just a few of these bad apples in, and they will disrupt the entire program and discourage many other enrollees from staying in the program. My best information is that a good many of the dropouts—and the dropout problem has been serious—have been the result of violence and other activities of some of the improperly admitted Job Corps enrollees.

Nearly half the Job Corps enrollees, nationwide, have left or been discharged before completing their course, and most of these left within 3 months after enrollment. The dropout rate in some Job Corps centers has been much higher. Certainly, a better job of screening would have prevented this.

I think it should be understood that these Job Corps centers are operated by private industry under contract with the Federal Government. Naturally, profit is involved, and there should be. But the desire to make a profit should not be such as to cause lax screening of prospective Job Corps enrollees.

Administration would naturally play an important part in discipline at a center. But there is a limit to what sound, tough discipline can do. It can only work with the people screened through to the center, and if screening is lax, discipline will break down.

Another aspect of this problem, quite apart from the Job Corps center and the other Job Corps enrollees is the local community.

An article in the August 10 issue of the Wall Street Journal points out that hostility in communities near Job Corps centers toward these centers has been widespread. Referring to the center at Camp Atterbury, the article points out that troublemakers at the camp had driven out boys who wanted to learn. A new director kicked out 250 of the offenders. This is all to the good, but the question is, Why did not screening keep most of these 250 out in the first place?

All of us have seen articles reporting on problems at Job Corps centers for girls, involving allegations of prostitution, drunkenness, fights, theft, and

truancy. Individuals involved in such activities need help—but that help should not be provided by Job Corps centers. Where it has been tried, it has spoiled the program for most of the other enrollees and made for bad relations with local communities.

In today's edition of the New York Times is an article entitled "Antipoverty Office Suspends Coast Project for Rehabilitation of Gang Youths." The article describes a quarter million dollar grant for a demonstration project in California's San Fernando Valley which was announced last August 10, although the money has not yet been released for the project. The idea of the project is to channel gang energies into social services, led by one of the gang's idols. But the proposal has stirred up great controversy in the community and the refusal of police to support it. Apparently the idol who had been selected to lead the gang members in these social services was arrested on a charge of holding up a liquor store, and had a record of 14 previous arrests. War on poverty officials say that the project is not "dead," but merely "suspended."

I recognize that there is a problem with gangs, but it seems to me that in trying to cope with the problem, we must bear in mind two things: First, we should not discourage young people who abide by the law by giving leadership recognition to people who are law violators; and second, we must take into consideration the need to maintain good relations with the local communities where war on poverty projects are located.

As I have said, the pending bill has sought to do something in the case of the potential troublemaker. The amendment I offer seeks to go a little further. I believe that if the types of officials who are listed in my amendment have to certify, as provided in the amendment, the prospective Job Corps enrollee will probably make a go of it, will probably not cause disciplinary problems or problems in connection with relationships with the local community, and the program will be benefited. If they are not able to certify, if they are not willing to certify, then probably the individual involved should not go to the Job Corps.

It may be that at the particular time an official would not be willing to certify. He might say, "Let's wait a little while and see how this individual gets along for the next 3, 4, or 5 months; and if he performs all right, then I'll certify."

However, as it is now, I do not believe that the pending bill provides an adequate certification. Who is a "professionally qualified person" can mean many things to many people. Moreover, a professionally qualified person in a community may have absolutely no responsibility to the community. An official such as a local prosecuting attorney or his deputy, or the local chief of police or his deputy, or the mayor, or somebody comparable, in an official capacity, has a responsibility to the community. I believe that certification from such an official would be more meaningful.

I wish to make clear that I recognize the problems of obtaining such a certifi-

cation in certain cases. For example, in a large metropolitan area, such as Chicago, Los Angeles, or New York City, it is pretty difficult for a prospective Job Corps enrollee to obtain a certification from the chief of police or the deputy chief of police. That is the reason why the amendment was worded to point out the types of officials from whom we would require the certification, rather than to make it all-inclusive. That is the reason for the phrase "such as."

I believe that flexible and prudent administration would permit obtaining certification from some other type of official of a relatively high standing in the community, without forcing all applicants possessing a questionable record to obtain a certification from one of the particular officials listed in the amendment.

I wish to make that very clear.

There is another matter that should be made clear and that is that the Job Corps Director would still retain discretion in accepting an applicant. There may be a Job Corps applicant who has obtained such a certification from the local mayor, but that would not tie the hands of the Director. The Director would not have to admit the applicant.

Mr. President, I have discussed this matter with the junior Senator from New York and I believe this amendment will be acceptable to him. I have also discussed this matter with other Senators, including members of the committee from my side of the aisle. We have spent quite a bit of time trying to refine the amendment. I hope the Senator will accept the amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Iowa that I think the modification of the amendment, as we have worked it out, is acceptable to us and will be accepted by the committee. Prior to that, I might point out that this was a matter that was taken up within our committee, as the Senator knows. We went into the matter in considerable detail. My colleague from New York, who is now in the Chamber, participated in trying to write some language to protect the Job Corps, but also the individual. We wrote in the language:

Before selecting an individual who has a history of serious and violent behavior against persons or property, repetitive delinquent acts, narcotics addiction or other major behavioral aberrations, the Director shall obtain a finding from a professionally qualified person who knows his individual situation that there is reasonable expectation that the opportunity provided by the Job Corps will help him to overcome his problem.

We felt that dealt with the matter. The Senator from Iowa refined that language to put in:

In the case of an individual with a history of serious and violent behavior, or a history of repetitive or serious law violation or delinquent acts, such determination must be supported by a signed statement from—

Would the Senator clarify what that statement would be in accordance with his modification?

Mr. MILLER. The statement would be a signed certification from an official from the local community. Then, as I

pointed out, I used the phrase "such as" to indicate that the intention is not to limit the officials by the language in the bill, but that the language would be broad enough to meet problems that might arise in a large city, such as the city of New York, where it would be difficult to obtain a certification from the chief of police.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I appreciate the fact that the Senator recognizes that individual difficulties might arise in particular communities in this matter. It is possible under certain circumstances that if the Director of the poverty program made a determination that none of the individuals so listed would be appropriate, that in unusual circumstances and special circumstances he might go to some other official; such as the superintendent of education, or an official of the schools.

Mr. MILLER. That is correct. I would add a footnote to what the Senator said. I do not wish to depreciate the effort made by the committee to improve this matter by urging the use of a professionally qualified person, but it would seem to me that prudence would dictate that one of these local officials could contact someone who knows the applicants' individual situation, if he were in doubt. I think prudence would dictate that he contact a professionally qualified person, possibly a local school principal, to find out something about the individual before deciding to certify or not certify.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I might say to the Senator that it is the intent of the Senator from Iowa and the floor manager of the bill that that be done before the certificate is forwarded to the Director of the Job Corps; that the individual is making a study or the finding that other individuals within the community are being contacted who know more about the boy or girl.

Mr. MILLER. I am sure that is our mutual intention in that respect.

I wish to emphasize that we are not talking about the typical Job Corps enrollee, although we are talking about a good segment of the Job Corps enrollees.

The statistics show that in one Job Corps center 37 percent of the enrollees had records of a previous law violation; one out of 10 had a record of a serious law violation. We are talking about this area and probably not all of that 37 percent would be regarded as having repetitive law violations. We are talking about the tough cases. We have to be concerned about the tough cases. If they can make it in a Job Corps center this is all to the good; but if they are going to serve as troublemakers to make it difficult for others to make a go of it we should take precautions to have them screened properly so they do not get in.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I agree with the Senator on that point. I believe the Senator made the point that the director of the Job Corps must first make the determination himself that the individual boy or girl falls in this category and thereafter has to make this request from the official in the community.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Then, the second point the Senator made is that

even then, if the certificate is given to him, he does not have to accept it. He can accept or reject the boy or girl.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator is correct, but I would suggest this:

While, as the Senator points out, the law leaves the matter up to the discretion of the director as to whether or not an individual falls in the category of violent behavior, repetitive law violation and the like—although this is up to his discretion to make that determination in the first instance, I think it only prudent that he would bend over backwards to be on the safe side, because he should not wish troublemakers getting into the Job Corps who are going to deprive others of the opportunity that the Job Corps offers them.

I can understand that in certain situations discretion might be necessary in order to avoid local discrimination. However, here again, this is a matter of prudence, and we can be confident that the director will prudently exercise that discretion.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I wish to say, in closing, that the Senator has properly pointed out the high percentage of those who do not finish in the Job Corps. I think that all of us might be concerned about that. We must also remember that a high percentage of these same boys and girls are boys and girls who come from these groups that never finish school. Three out of 10 go through high school and 40 percent drop out. In some areas the percentage is up to 80 percent of the students we get to the eighth grade.

We are dealing with a group which has already had a difficult time. If we are going to condemn the Job Corps—and I am not saying that the Senator meant to condemn the Job Corps; I think they have done a remarkable job under the circumstances—and if we are critical of them we should put it in the context of realizing that we would be critical of the educational system as a whole and the fact that these boys and girls did not finish school and did not remain in school in order to graduate from school, and because of their background or outlook, they have special problems with which the Job Corps can deal, in many areas, very effectively.

Mr. MILLER. I do not particularly wish to discuss this aspect of the matter because the Senator knows there has been much criticism of the dropout rate. I have been critical of it also. I felt for a long time that this situation could be improved with certain action.

The point I wanted to make in bringing out the statistics is that these are rather serious statistics and that the problem has at least been aggravated and, I think, in substantial part caused by, the troublemakers who have been admitted into the Job Corps centers, and who made it so tough on the other Job Corps trainees that they dropped out. If we can prevent that, we would have a better program; and we can do so by better screening.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Iowa.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

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.

AMENDMENT NO. 357

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 357, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 110, line 7, before the period, insert the following:

The assignment of such volunteers in any State shall be terminated by the Director when so requested by the Governor of such State not later than thirty days after such request has been made by the Governor to the Director.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the amendment I have offered refers to a situation with respect to the assignment of VISTA volunteers and volunteers selected by organizations which are funded by OEO. This matter has been brought to my attention by a situation which has arisen in my own State.

May I have the attention of the manager of the bill?

May I ask who is managing the bill at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I beg the Senator's pardon. Some of our colleagues have been engaging my attention.

Mr. COOPER. I understand.

Amendment No. 357 is fairly simple in its purpose. I believe I can explain it in a few minutes, and I hope the Senator will accept it.

As the Senator knows, the act provides that when volunteers who are selected directly by VISTA—the Director—and assigned to a State, or are proposed to be assigned to a State, they will not be so assigned unless the Governor of the State assents.

That is also the situation, I am informed, with respect to volunteers who have been selected by an organization which is funded by OEO; and in such a situation, if the Governor does not consent, they will not be assigned to the State.

Recently, a problem arose in Kentucky, which I will not discuss in all its aspects, but solely as it relates to this question. There are VISTA volunteers assigned to Kentucky who have been selected by the Director. In addition, there are also volunteers working in Kentucky who were selected by an organization known as the Appalachian Volunteers, which is funded by OEO. Some difficulties arose in Kentucky, and the Governor of the

State asked that no additional volunteers, either those selected directly by the director or those selected by the sponsor, Appalachian Volunteers, be assigned to Kentucky.

Because I had received a number of inquiries from my State as to the response of the Director, I requested a meeting with representatives of OEO who were in charge of the VISTA program. They informed me that VISTA would not assign volunteers to a State without the consent of the Governor. Furthermore, they stated that it was their view that the law was not clear as to whether VISTA is required to recall previously assigned volunteers to a State when the Governor requested that they be removed.

It seems to me that the intent is not to assign volunteers to a State unless the Governor agrees. Should a situation arise where their work in the State—at least, in the opinion of the Governor and the people—is found not compatible with the best interests of OEO, then the volunteers should be withdrawn at the Governor's request.

I wish to be factual in what I have to say. I have spoken with officials of OEO about this question and I called a meeting of representatives of VISTA. They manifested no deep opposition to my proposal. They were of the opinion that the present law is not clear. I believe it should be made clear in the bill.

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

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, it seems to me that one thing the Senator would not wish to do himself—and the manager of the bill will inform the Senator as to whether it is acceptable, and I shall not speak until then on the subject—would be to tie it down to not later than 30 days in statutory language.

I would suggest that the Senator have it read: "thirty days or at a time thereafter agreed upon by the Governor and Director." Because a situation may arise in which they may not wish to be bound by the 30 days themselves.

Mr. COOPER. I believe that is a good suggestion. I shall be glad to accept it.

Mr. CLARK. Does the Senator modify his amendment to that extent?

Mr. COOPER. I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is so modified.

Mr. CLARK. If I may have the attention of the Senator from Kentucky for a moment, I believe there is a technical defect in his amendment on line 1, where I believe the phrase should be "after the period" and not "before the period".

Mr. COOPER. The Senator is correct.

I modify my amendment by striking the word "before" in line 1 and substituting for it the word "after".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is so modified.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I have discussed this amendment with the Senator from New York, the ranking minority member of the committee, and it seems to me that it is not objectionable, and I am prepared to accept it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. JAVITS. 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. 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.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 113, between lines 19 and 20. Insert the following new subsection:

"(c) Persons serving as volunteers under this section or under section 821 shall provide such information concerning their qualifications as the Director shall prescribe and shall be subject to the same procedures, to the extent practicable, for selection and approval as the Director requires under Part A of this title. The Director may fix such procedures for the selection and approval of persons who are low income residents of the area to be served by the project and who wish to become volunteers as he determines will contribute to carrying out the purposes of this title."

On page 113, line 20, strike out "(c)" and insert in lieu thereof "(d)".

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, this amendment has not been printed but it has been stated. I shall explain the amendment briefly.

I have offered this amendment because of a situation which arose in Kentucky regarding the selection of volunteers by the sponsoring organization, Appalachian Volunteers, which is funded by OEO.

I have discussed this matter with representatives of VISTA and I requested an explanation of their procedures in selecting and approving volunteers for VISTA.

I was informed that the procedures followed were substantially the same as those procedures followed by the Civil Service. When reviewing the submitted application forms, which forms are substantially identical to those used by the Civil Service, and where the application reveals circumstances indicating criminal activity, subversive activity, or other forms of misconduct, VISTA then refers the matter to the FBI, for further investigation as is the case of applicants for positions in the Federal Government.

However, with respect to volunteers who are selected by other agencies funded by OEO, there are no similar procedures or requirements. The Appalachian Volunteers have received several million dollars from OEO, but as far as OEO is aware the Appalachian Volunteers has no procedures to screen and select their applications, and the Director of OEO has no control over their selection or approval.

Mr. President, my amendment would provide that the director shall require the same procedures and information of all volunteer applicants as is required of those who are selected to represent VISTA. The same procedures made ap-

licable to all categories of volunteers would assure the selection of persons with proper qualifications and proper character.

I would make one exception. My amendment would exempt volunteers who are selected from low-income residents of the area to be served who do not have the educational qualifications similar to college men and women who apply for VISTA. The Director is authorized to prescribe whatever qualifications he thought appropriate.

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

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. MURPHY. If I understand the Senator correctly, the Senator wishes to make certain that the general character of the volunteer is known and recorded, and that the individual has been screened before he is taken into the program as a volunteer.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator is correct. I take this position for two reasons. We want the VISTA programs to be successful. If those volunteers who are selected do not have the necessary qualifications or the necessary background I think that this lack weakens the entire program and invites criticism of the program by the people of the State, and if that happens there is lacking the needed community cooperation to make these programs work.

I shall relate certain events that recently took place in Kentucky. There has been a good deal of news coverage given to the situation.

At one time a man named McSurley and his wife were employed by VISTA or OEO in Washington and were let out. They immediately attached themselves to the Appalachian Volunteers, which has headquarters in Bristol, Tenn. For a time they were in the Appalachian Volunteers organization.

After a while, word was received—I suppose from VISTA—that they had been let out in Washington. The charge was made in Kentucky that they had been disseminating literature throughout eastern Kentucky in which they called for, in substance, the overthrow of the Government, the local government, the State government, and the Federal Government. As a result, they were arrested and tried, and under the holdings of our courts they were released.

I do not particularly wish to address myself to these particular individuals or what took place there. I believe my amendment would assure that qualified people are appointed and would insure that the situation which has taken place, bringing widespread criticism on OEO, VISTA, and the volunteers, would not arise again.

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

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. MURPHY. Would the Senator agree with the Senator from California that it might be a good idea if in the rules and regulations selecting these people from now on the OEO and the other Government agencies might be restricted from employing people who are calling for the overthrow of this Government and who expect the taxpayers of this country to pay for their own destruction

at the same time? Would the Senator think this might be a good regulation for the Director to promulgate in running the Office of Economic Opportunity?

Mr. COOPER. I agree. In my discussions with OEO they said it was already their practice. They did not want to employ anyone who advocated the overthrow of the Government. This amendment would give us a test of the applicant's qualifications. It would not prevent anyone from being employed because he had expressed his views on a subject. It would provide for necessary screening procedures. I think the amendment should be adopted.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. What is the number of the amendment the Senator has called up?

Mr. COOPER. I had stated that the amendment was not printed, but that I have given the Senator from Pennsylvania a copy of it.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I have had an opportunity to consider the amendment and to discuss it with the Senator from Kentucky. I think it is unobjectionable. I am confident that it would meet with the approval of the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], who is the ranking minority member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Therefore, I am prepared to accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 359.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with but that the amendment be printed in the RECORD.

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

Amendment No. 359 is as follows:

On page 48, beginning with line 11, strike out all through line 4, page 49, and insert in lieu thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 213. (a) Each community action agency shall be established and maintained so as to assure broad, continuing, and effective community participation in all phases of the community action program for which it is responsible, and to assure that the program, as developed and implemented, is fully responsive to community needs and conditions. Each such agency shall have, for this purpose, a governing board whose members shall include the chief elected official or officials of the community, or on the failure of any such official to serve, a person designated by such official and other appropriate public officials or their representatives, and representatives of private groups and agencies engaged in providing assistance to the poor, and of appropriate representatives of business, labor, religious, or other major groups and interests in the community.

"(b) At least one-third of the membership of the board shall be persons who are selected by residents of the areas and members of the groups served. Each community action agency shall establish procedures by which

appropriate representation is provided (1) to poor persons living in neighborhoods where poverty is concentrated, and (2) to other poor persons including the elderly and rural residents living outside these neighborhoods. All members of the governing board selected to represent specific geographic areas must reside in the area they represent.

"(c) The Director shall require community action agencies to establish procedures under which community agencies and representative groups of the poor which feel themselves inadequately represented on the governing board may petition for adequate representation."

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I think I can explain the amendment briefly to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the chairman of the subcommittee and manager of the bill. We had a debate about it on the floor of the Senate yesterday. I had a colloquy with the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and a short colloquy with the manager of the bill, the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania, at the time of the adoption of the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTROYA].

My amendment would restore to the bill the language which was recommended by the administration. That language, essentially, is on page 2 of the bill. It would require the governing board of the community action program to include among its members the chief elected official or officials of the community.

I gave my reasons yesterday why I believe this should be the rule and should be mandatory. I believe that if community action programs are to be successful the support of all the community is necessary, not only its private citizens and organizations, but the governing officials of the community, as well. Further, it is necessary to mobilize local resources, including funds, and, we would hope, the abilities and capacities of the community's officials. Those persons have been elected by the people. They enjoy, at least for as long as they are in office, the support of the people. I think it is necessary that the local governments be involved in these community programs. The job of striving for the elimination of poverty will require much more than the resources of the Federal Government. It will require the help of State and local governments as well as the great body of private citizens.

The administration in its recommendations, itself recognizes the need for the mandatory inclusion of local officials. I think their inclusion should be mandatory.

Yesterday, the Senator from New York stated that he felt that if elected officials were on the board their presence might cause some members of the board to be less diligent in presenting their views.

I do not think so, because they present their views very strongly and firmly to elected officials.

Second, it may be thought that in smaller States where there are other problems, such as integration, the addition of a local official might not be helpful. But, as the Senator knows, another section of the bill provides procedures which will enable the director, even

though a project has been vetoed, upon review, if he thinks the veto should be overruled, to initiate and support the program.

That expresses my viewpoint, Mr. President, and I hope that the Senator from Pennsylvania will accept the amendment and take it to conference so that there can be further discussion of this problem.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I have no objection to the first sentence in subparagraph (a) of the pending amendment; nor do I have any objection to subsection (b) or subsection (c).

However, I regret that I cannot accept the second sentence in subsection (a) which reads as follows:

Each such agency shall have, for this purpose, a governing board whose members shall include the chief elected official or officials of the community, or on the failure of any such official to serve, a person designated by such official and other appropriate public officials or their representatives, and representatives of private groups and agencies engaged in providing assistance to the poor, and of appropriate representatives of business, labor, religious, or other major groups and interests in the community.

The principal difficulty I have is with the use of the word "shall" on line 1 on page 2 of the amendment. The committee gave this matter very careful consideration. It thought the administration was wrong in requiring that elected public officials must serve on community action boards. This is largely because of such a wide variety of local experience which has been built up over the 2½ years since the Act came into being. A majority of the committee thought—as a matter of fact, this included most of the minority members—that it was a mistake to put these boards in a strait-jacket and require that the chief elected official must serve.

I say to my good friend from Kentucky that if we could get around that point—and I will explain at greater length why I feel that way—then the remainder of that sentence to which I take exception, I think, might be worked out.

In other words:

Representatives of private groups and agencies engaged in providing assistance to the poor, and appropriate representatives of business, labor, religious, or other major groups and interests in the community.

That is all right. That is fine. That is unobjectionable. So is the first sentence in subsection (a):

Each community action agency shall be established and maintained so as to assure broad, continuing, and effective community participation in all phases of the community action program for which it is responsible, and to assure that the program, as developed and implemented, is fully responsive to community needs and conditions.

That is fine, too. But let me say to my good friend from Kentucky that the mayor of Philadelphia will not serve on the Community Action Board, and I believe he has a right not to serve on it.

The mayor of Philadelphia is strongly opposed to being a member of the Community Action Board. Also, the mayor of New York refuses to serve on it. I do not

think we should put them in a straight-jacket and make them do it.

The mayor of Philadelphia does not wish to participate, and neither does the mayor of New York, by sending a designee to the Board, because they believe—in their cities where they know more about local conditions that do the Senator and I—that it should not be required.

We have accepted the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTROYA] earlier. That, I think, goes about as far as is desirable to go. I would therefore hope that the Senator from Kentucky would not press his amendment to a rollcall vote because the difference between us is so small and the committee has given it very careful attention.

I have mentioned the mayors of Philadelphia and New York, but minority staff counsel has assured me that there are scores and scores of cities all over the country where the mayors do not want to designate anyone to these community action boards.

I can tell the Senator from Kentucky that when I was in Johnstown, Pa., which has a Republican mayor, in a city which has steadily been Democratic—and he is a competent and very decent fellow—he told me that he would not serve on that board for all the tea in China, because they are doing a good job and he did not want to mess it up with politics. Thus, I would hope that the Senator from Kentucky would not press his amendment.

Mr. COOPER. I note that there are sections of my amendment, with the exception of the first section of (a), already in the bill. They were put in because of the Montoya amendment in order to make this a proper amendment.

I thought that I had taken care of a situation in which an official said he would not serve by the following language: "or on the failure of any such official to serve, a person designated by such official."

The Senator says that the official might not want to designate a representative.

Mr. CLARK. That is right. He may not want to take responsibility for the community action agency, and I do not think we should make him.

Mr. COOPER. As I said, my amendment is in line with the administration proposal. My thought in proposing the amendment is based on two grounds: first, that the local officials ought to take some responsibility in this field. If they would not themselves serve, then they should appoint delegates.

There is a growing kind of friction, we have to admit, in some communities in some areas of our country, between the elected or appointed officials of the community and the governing boards of the community action programs. I thought it would be much better if the official's delegate served on the board, so that this kind of trend would be stopped.

I have voted for these programs. I want them to succeed. But I do not think they will succeed unless the Federal Government is able to bring to its assistance—

to the fullest extent—our local governments.

We have, in effect, created a third kind of government. We have the Federal Government, the State governments, and the local governments, which are instrumentalities of State governments. In addition we have the governing boards of these community action programs which, in effect, have established themselves as a form of third government. I do not believe that this trend is beneficial to a community.

I believe that, by not requiring the official to serve, but providing that he may appoint a delegate if he will not serve, that we will eliminate the problem the Senator has raised.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I wish I could agree with the Senator.

I wonder if the Senator will follow me as I suggest some language which might meet my objection. If the Senator will go to line 1, page 2, I would suggest inserting, after the word "shall" the words "if he so desires."

Then, in line 3, after the word "person," the words "may be."

So that the sentence, if it were amended as I suggest, would read, beginning at the end of line 6 on page 1:

Each such agency shall have, for this purpose, a governing board whose members shall, if he so desires, include the chief elected official or officials of the community, or on the failure of any such official to serve, a person may be designated by such official * * *

And so on with the language the Senator from Kentucky used.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I will accept that language.

Mr. CLARK. Will the Senator ask to modify his amendment?

Mr. COOPER. Yes.

Mr. CLARK. Perhaps I had better do it.

Mr. COOPER. Yes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I am informed by the Parliamentarian that the Senator from Kentucky would have to do it.

Mr. COOPER. Very well.

Mr. President, as suggested by the Senator from Pennsylvania—and I think it is a good suggestion—I modify the language of my amendment. I will read it as it would be modified.

Mr. CLARK. The second sentence.

Mr. COOPER. The wording on page 1, at the end of line 6, would read:

Each such agency shall have, for this purpose, a governing board whose members shall—

And this is the new language—

if he so desires include the chief elected official or officials of the community—

Mr. CLARK. If the Senator will stop there, I guess we ought to say "he or they."

Mr. COOPER. Yes. It would read—

whose members shall if he or they so desire the chief elected official or officials of the community, or on the failure of any such official to serve, a person—

And I add the words:

may be designated—

Mr. CLARK. "Or persons."

Mr. COOPER—

a person or persons may be designated by such official—

Mr. CLARK. Then continue with the amendment as presently worded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is so modified.

The amendment, No. 359, as modified, is as follows:

On page 48, beginning with line 11, strike out all through line 4, page 49, and insert in lieu thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 213. (a) Each community action agency shall be established and maintained so as to assure broad, continuing, and effective community participation in all phases of the community action program for which it is responsible, and to assure that the program, as developed and implemented, is fully responsive to community needs and conditions. Each such agency shall have, for this purpose, a governing board whose members shall if he or they so desire include the chief elected official or officials of the community, or on the failure of any such official to serve, a person or persons may be designated by such official and other appropriate public officials or their representatives and representatives of private groups and agencies engaged in providing assistance to the poor, and of appropriate representatives of business, labor, religious, or other major groups and interests in the community.

"(b) At least one-third of the membership of the board shall be persons who are selected by residents of the areas and members of the groups served. Each community action agency shall establish procedures by which appropriate representation is provided (1) to poor persons living in neighborhoods where poverty is concentrated, and (2) to other poor persons including the elderly and rural residents living outside these neighborhoods. All members of the governing board selected to represent specific geographic areas must reside in the area they represent.

"(c) The Director shall require community action agencies to establish procedures under which community agencies and representative groups of the poor which feel themselves inadequately represented on the governing board may petition for adequate representation."

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, under the circumstances, I accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 360.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment (No. 360) is as follows:

On page 56, beginning with "The" in line 6, strike out all through line 11, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "The Director shall make arrangements under which the State bar association and the local bar association in the community to be served by any proposed project authorized by this paragraph shall be consulted and afforded an adequate opportunity to submit, to the Di-

rector, comments and recommendations on the proposed project before such project is approved or funded, and to submit, to the Director, comments and recommendations on the operations of such project, if approved and funded."

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, this amendment will amend the bill at page 56, beginning with the word "The" on line 6. It would strike out the language beginning with the word "The" on line 6 and through line 11.

I must say it is not a tremendously significant amendment, but it relates to another problem which has been raised by my friends in Kentucky. The present language of the bill provides that in assisting in the provision of legal services to the poor, the director shall make arrangements with the principal bar associations in the area. My amendment provides that, in addition, they shall seek the advice and comments of the State bar association. I believe that State bar associations are more broadly based, and they usually have a staff which is better able to provide helpful assistance.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I think bringing the State bar associations into the picture is a useful amendment, and I am prepared to accept it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on adoption of the amendment. The amendment (No. 360) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

URBAN ACTION PLAN OF REPUBLICAN GOVERNORS' ASSOCIATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in our debate on the pending war on poverty amendments it was most important to have before us the most authoritative and informed program prepared under the chairmanship of Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller, of New York, by the policy committee of the Republican Governors' Association and issued in Albany, N.Y., on August 14, 1967.

I ask unanimous consent that the nine-point action plan and the lists of the Governors participating and endorsing it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

ACTION PLAN TO INAUGURATE A NEW ERA OF CREATIVE STATE LEADERSHIP TO MEET THE NATIONAL CRISIS OF SOCIAL INJUSTICE AND LAWLESSNESS

(Recommended by: the Republican Governors Association Policy Committee, Aug. 10, 1967.)

STATE OF NEW YORK,
Albany, August 14, 1967.

HON. JOHN A. LOVE,
Chairman, Republican Governors Association,
State Capitol, Denver, Colo.

DEAR GOVERNOR LOVE: This letter is to formally transmit to you the final document of the Nine-Point Action Plan entitled, "A new era of creative state leadership to meet the national crisis of social injustice and lawlessness" recommended at the meeting of the Policy Committee of the Republican Governors Association on August tenth.

Those participating in the development and endorsement of this Policy Committee program were:

Governor Spiro T. Agnew.
Governor Nils A. Boe.
Governor David F. Cargo.
Governor John H. Chafee.

Governor Daniel J. Evans.
Governor John A. Love.
Governor Tom McCall.
Governor Nelson A. Rockefeller.
Governor George W. Romney.
Governor Raymond P. Shafer.
Governor John A. Volpe.

We are proceeding with the organization of the non-partisan States' Urban Action Center, as called for in the report, to service the governors of all fifty states in developing their respective programs to deal with these critical problems.

Thanks for your untiring efforts in connection with the drafting of this action plan.

Best wishes,

Sincerely,

NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER,
Chairman, Policy Committee.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

The tragic epidemic of riots convulsing the core areas of so many American cities underscores the basic responsibilities of state governments.

We are totally concerned about every aspect of this tragic problem. First, obviously, is maintenance of order under law. On it rests not only any viable society but also all other affirmative programs. We must assure the protection of persons and property in the peaceful and lawful pursuits of life. But relying only on better organized force, as some are advocating, forecasts the unacceptable ultimate result of a society based on repression. If our belief in an open society of freedom under the law is to survive, it must be based on a basic agreement among the people and a dedication to the goal that all shall have a stake in the potential and promise of America.

The time for effective action to meet this crisis of urban chaos is now.

We cannot afford delay.

The states can and must play a leading role both in preserving order under the law and in dealing with the root causes of civil disorder.

The Policy Committee of the Republican Governors Association has met, therefore, to determine a positive course of state action commensurate with the staggering dimensions of the problem.

The times demand a firm national commitment to resolve this leading domestic issue. Each of us must work in our respective states to develop solutions to these problems.

PROBLEMS

The recent outbreaks of lawlessness have placed new demands on state governments to stop civil strife and to maintain law and order. The increasing incidence of crime in the streets plaguing so many cities, aggravated by the riots, has made it clear that many localities cannot combat crime effectively alone.

Many of the urban problems of today, which result in human degradation, transcend the boundaries of local political jurisdictions. Individual cities lack the financial resources necessary to meet these problems. The Federal Government, while it has enacted many imaginative programs, is not providing the financial resources on a scale commensurate with the dimensions of the problem and, in many cases, the effectiveness of federal programs is inhibited by unnecessary inflexibility in their administration.

The states must do their part in providing the creative leadership to achieve the solution to today's urban crisis. This solution must be based on a new kind and degree of cooperative action between the various levels of government and the private sector of the society.

For we are confronted by a problem so pervasive that its solution is not one that can be resolved by governments alone.

We recognize that merely pouring more money into outmoded programs will not do the job. We seek new ways to tap the crea-

tive and constructive forces in society. Government can and must provide incentives, tools, and funds; but, the disadvantaged must be given an opportunity to achieve a stake in our society through the investment of their own aspirations and energy.

AGREEMENT FOR ACTION

We agree that the crisis is not just a city problem but is the inevitable result of indifference throughout our society. We must therefore mobilize public and private sectors in our states on a scale large enough to assure action on a scale necessary to meet the problem.

We recommend the following action plan of state leadership. We recognize that specific elements of this plan will have greater applicability in some states than in others, and that each state must determine the programs and priorities best suited to its situation and its capacities.

The following action plan includes specific measures regarding state action to:

- I. Maintain Order Under Law.
- II. Transform the Physical Environment of Slums and all Neglected Areas into Decent Communities.
- III. Increase Job Opportunities.
- IV. Improve Educational Opportunities.
- V. Improve Public Services to Individuals.
- VI. Expand Cultural and Recreational Opportunities in Neglected Areas.
- VII. Encourage Individual Citizen and Private Institutional Participation.
- VIII. Assure State Government's Capacity to Meet Urban Problems.
- IX. Encourage Flexibility, Speed and Adequate Funding of Federal Programs.

I. STATE ACTION TO MAINTAIN ORDER UNDER LAW AND CONTROL CRIME

The long standing failure of our society to fully enforce laws relating to housing codes, health and sanitary conditions, gambling, narcotics and other social conditions has discouraged confidence and encouraged a disrespect for the law as an instrument for correcting social injustice. Effective law enforcement depends on a just, a firm and an even application of all our laws including those correcting basic social ills as well as those designed to preserve law and order.

When, however, for whatever cause, lawlessness and violence do occur, prompt, firm law enforcement on a sufficient scale is absolutely necessary to prevent isolated incidents from erupting into full scale riots.

We must never lose sight of the fact, when civil disorder threatens, that among those who most need protection of law and order are the resident in the threatened areas, the overwhelming majority of whom are law-abiding, responsible citizens.

Civil disorders

A. *Local Police:* Develop a state program and support legislation providing for interlocking agreements between local law enforcement agencies to permit "pooling" of officers and equipment. In addition, make certain that local officials clearly understand the procedures for utilizing state law enforcement resources.

B. *Local Fire Fighting:* Develop a state program and support for interlocking agreements among local fire departments to permit "pooling" manpower and fire fighting equipment.

C. *State Police:* Strengthen law enforcement capacity at the state level for the purpose of assisting in emergencies.

D. *National Guard:* Request the Federal Government in determining policies for the National Guard, to emphasize now the Guard's responsibility to serve as a tactical force for maintaining order within the states as well as its responsibility in national defense.

Specifically:

1. Urge the Federal Government to provide adequate and more modern and mobile

equipment for all Guard forces to enable them to deal with civil disturbances.

2. Request the Federal Government to review the planned reorganization of the Guard in relation to its tactical role in maintaining civil order, giving particular attention to the number of men available for duty and the availability of high level command forces in each state.

3. Endorse the recent action taken by the President to improve and increase riot control training for all Guard units and urge its immediate implementation.

E. *Federal Troops*: Review federal and state law and procedures pertaining to the timely commitment of federal troops.

F. *Review State Constitutional and Statutory Provisions* to assure adequate authority for the Governor to meet emergency situations. Such a review would consider the powers of the Governor in an emergency situation with respect to various levels of law enforcement agencies, setting of curfews, restricting the sale of guns and ammunition, restricting the sale of liquor, closing streets and other public access routes, and the taking of other emergency steps.

Crime prevention and control

G. *Comprehensive State Crime Control Programs and Plan*: Establish a Governor's Committee on Law Enforcement and Administration of Criminal Justice, including officials responsible for crime prevention and enforcement as well as individual rehabilitation, to develop a comprehensive, statewide plan to strengthen crime prevention and juvenile delinquency controls, and generally upgrade criminal justice. Provide financial assistance to local governments to implement the plan, subject to evaluation and coordination by the Governor's Committee.

H. *Support those portions of the "Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice Assistance Act of 1967"* which would provide for state agency approval.

I. *Training of Police*: State legislation to mandate minimum training requirements for local police and supervisory personnel with appropriate state financial support.

J. *Police Compensation*: Assure just compensation for state and local police, such compensation to be related to the responsibilities which these officials bear.

K. *Encourage community relations programs* to recognize the effective work of the vast majority of dedicated law enforcement officers. Take prompt action against the relative few who derogate law enforcement in the public eye by abuse of authority or by use of excessive force.

II. STATE ACTION TO TRANSFORM THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT OF SLUM AREAS AND ALL NEGLECTED AREAS

A. Mobilize all public and private resources by state action to bring about a complete and basic transformation, rather than piecemeal projects, of slum areas. Comprehensive, well-designed developments, including housing, commercial, industrial, recreational, and community facilities are essential if individuals are to have decent housing and job opportunities.

State action would include the provision of necessary constitutional and statutory authority, and the development of mechanisms to:

1. Finance the development costs and sponsor comprehensive developments in conjunction with private resources.

2. Provide investment capital for projects including housing, commercial and industrial facilities.

3. Pre-finance federal urban development programs.

B. Provide state financial assistance for the development and enforcement of adequate building and housing codes.

C. Encourage home improvements in deteriorating and sub-standard housing by providing tax incentives for such improvements.

D. Propose and implement state legislation regarding prosecution of slum landlords including authorization of "receivers" to collect rents and make repairs.

E. Provide state financial and technical assistance to localities for rat extermination programs.

F. Provide state financial and technical assistance to improve collections and methods of disposal for garbage and other solid waste.

G. Develop a program of state financial assistance to help assure adequate mass transportation throughout urban areas to facilitate ready access to jobs.

H. Support state open housing legislation and its effective implementation so that all citizens may live where their hearts desire and their means permit.

I. State action to encourage zoning policies which overcome social, economic or racial segregation.

J. State action to require that real estate agents make available lists of all openings for rentals and properties for sale to every client.

III. STATE ACTION TO INCREASE JOB OPPORTUNITIES

A. Call State Conferences (1) with industries to increase job opportunities, including across-the-board hiring of the disadvantaged and genuine merit promotions; and (2) with unions to secure removal of discriminatory hiring policies and other restrictive measures prohibiting true equality in job opportunities.

B. Provide a state manpower training program to supplement federal programs and meet particular needs of each state.

C. Support state legislation to grant tax incentives to business to locate in slum areas and train workers.

D. Provide state technical assistance to small businesses in urban areas.

E. Expand apprenticeship training programs in cooperation with unions.

F. Promote apprenticeship training in small establishments.

G. Provide state subsistence allowances for job trainees.

H. Inaugurate state programs for recruiting, training and hiring slum area residents for public employment.

I. Establish a State Manpower Training Academy for training of staff needed in job counseling programs.

J. Develop special summer employment programs including a state beautification program employing youths in the community.

K. Provide state financial assistance to local child day-care services to help parents who want to have gainful employment.

L. State action to provide incentive for welfare recipients to undertake training and gainful employment by permitting income plus welfare benefits to total more than the amount they could receive under welfare benefits alone.

M. Action by state government to promote and enforce equal employment practices in both public and private employment. Contract Compliance Programs should be vigorously implemented.

IV. STATE ACTION TO IMPROVE EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES

A. Provide state assistance for pre-kindergarten programs.

B. To promote excellence in education, assure that state aid to education formulas recognize special problems of slum area schools including the need for smaller classes.

C. Establish a "community school program" to make the local school a year-round focal point for programs for all residents of slum areas and to encourage the interest of parents of school children in their children's education, health and recreation. The "community school program" would also provide

ample social and health services for the children.

D. Establish a statewide Teachers Reserve to encourage trained but inactive teachers to return to teaching on either a full or part-time basis.

E. Establish a vocational education system which would have no entrance requirements and would provide work-study programs so that students could study and earn money at the same time.

F. Assure that vocational education courses reflect current labor market conditions.

G. Provide state financial assistance for Urban College Centers in slum areas to make available special academic and vocational training.

H. Provide adequate state scholarship and student loan programs to assure that no youth is denied the opportunity for a college education because of the lack of financial resources.

I. Develop special state programs to identify talented youngsters who need special help to meet college entrance requirements.

V. STATE ACTION TO IMPROVE PUBLIC SERVICES TO INDIVIDUALS

A. Develop an Interstate Cooperative Training and Orientation Program which would be available to those who have moved or are planning to move from a rural area in one state to an urban area of another state.

B. Establish a State Urban Extension Program to utilize successful agricultural extension techniques and to apply research conducted in universities to the solution of urban problems.

C. Support state legislation to assure adequate consumer protection and education programs.

D. Provide state financial assistance to meet the unique health and mental health needs of slum dwellers.

E. Develop a state program for comprehensive one-stop government service centers to provide convenient and coordinated services.

F. Provide state support for local human rights commissions so that effective human relations programs, and civil rights enforcement can be implemented so far as possible at the local level.

VI. STATE ACTION TO EXPAND CULTURAL AND RECREATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES IN ALL NEGLECTED AREAS

A. Develop a state program of financial and technical assistance for the development of recreational and cultural facilities.

B. Expand programs of State Arts Councils to bring exhibitions and performances to slum areas.

C. Utilize governmental facilities in and near slum areas to provide artistic and historical exhibitions.

D. Provide technical assistance to community and civic groups who wish to sponsor cultural events.

E. Encouragement by states of the use of private resources to develop neighborhood centers for civic and recreational programs.

VII. ENCOURAGE INDIVIDUAL CITIZEN AND PRIVATE INSTITUTIONAL PARTICIPATION

A. State leadership to encourage participation by leaders of private organizations, churches, service clubs and civic groups in shaping creative and cooperative new programs in dealing with urban problems.

B. State action to establish an effective link on a continuing basis between the people of disadvantaged areas and government.

C. Organize and promote programs which bring together volunteers who want to help, with people who need help.

D. Organize programs using college and high school students as volunteer tutors for children who need special educational assistance.

E. State action to assure an effective

dialogue, at the community level, between people of different races.

F. Work with private transportation and recreation enterprises to make their facilities more available to disadvantaged groups.

G. Work out cooperative arrangements between the state and news media to publicize job opportunities.

H. Provide incentives and facilitate the investment of private capital into urban development on a scale commensurate with the magnitude of the problem in order to accelerate necessary action to accomplish the objective as quickly as possible.

VIII. STATE ACTION TO ASSURE STATE GOVERNMENT'S CAPACITY TO MEET URBAN PROBLEMS

A. Strengthen the role of the Governor and provide him with adequate staff including appropriate central staff agencies such as planning and budgeting offices so that the Governor can effectively plan, mobilize and coordinate the use of federal, state, local and private resources to meet today's urban problems.

B. Develop a comprehensive environmental plan under the direction of the Governor for the social, economic and physical development of each state and its urban areas.

C. Provide state financial and technical assistance to local governments for planning.

IX. STATE ACTION TO ENCOURAGE FLEXIBILITY, SPEED AND REALISM IN FEDERAL PROGRAMS

A. Urge federal legislation authorizing states to pre-finance federal programs.

B. Support action by the Federal Government authorizing block grants and revenue sharing to help assure a comprehensive, flexible approach to problems and make the most effective use of separate but related federal, state and local programs.

C. Encourage realistic assessment by the Federal Government of available financial resources to fund federal programs in order to avoid the turning of hopes into frustrations.

This then is the Action Plan recommended by the Policy Committee of the Republican Governors Association for confronting the crisis in our cities. The steps necessary to implement elements of this program will vary from state to state depending on existing administrative, fiscal and statutory authority. Some steps will require enabling state legislation and special sessions of state legislatures may be required in some states.

The adoption of this program by Republican Governors represents a powerful commitment by leaders of state government to meet this towering domestic challenge of our time through creative state leadership.

Accordingly, we have agreed to establish a States' Urban Action Center to serve all Governors to:

Provide a team of experts in the various program areas to help tailor specific programs to the needs of individual states.

Receive and disseminate information on actions taken by the states to implement this Nine-Point Action Plan so that all states will have the benefit of the experience in each state.

Applications have already been made to foundations to finance the State's Urban Action Center.

The objectives of this program are non-political. It is a program to provide opportunity. The true national interest can only be served through complete cooperation at all levels of government on a bi-partisan basis with the full support of private citizens.

Mr. CLARK. 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. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unan-

imous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. CLARK. I ask that the Senator from California be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

TEMPORARY HOUSING

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I should like to invite, if I may, a colloquy on a phase of the subject under discussion before the Senate. I refer to temporary housing, which has been part of the overall plan to help migrant workers, under the FHA part of the plan that has been taken over by OEO. As the chairman will recall, I offered an amendment which the committee accepted adding "temporary housing" as one of the authorized III (B) programs.

One of the great examples of OEO's sometimes unfortunate administration and complete disregard for the wishes of the local and State people has to do with the temporary housing program in the State of California.

Members of the Poverty Subcommittee who were able to attend the California hearings and field trips saw the State's temporary housing program. The committee viewed, I believe, as I did a housing project at Harney Lane, which is in the Stockton area in California's famous San Joaquin Valley.

This delightful development surprised most of the members of the subcommittee and made a very favorable impression on all Senators present. These same Senators have endorsed the temporary housing program and have expressed their displeasure and opposition to the Office of Economic Opportunity's termination of this worthwhile project. This project, part of the overall California migrant master plan, is one poverty program which is demonstrating visible, practical, and successful accomplishments.

It has obviously accomplished one of the main purposes which we desired and which, at the outset, was one of the established priorities of the entire OEO program. It created an attitude of pride among the migrants themselves, and all with whom it was discussed, and all spoke very enthusiastically about the successful project. It should also be pointed out, Mr. President, that the project at Harney Lane, in addition to providing adequate housing, offers programs in health, in education, in day care, and in sanitation. All in all, it is a first-class practical application of what I believe we in Congress have been trying to do. I was most pleased to be a member of the committee of the host State when the Senators had a chance to view this program.

I was particularly impressed with one of the school programs which I had the good fortune to observe. Since some of the youngsters spoke English and others Spanish, a real challenge was presented. This apparent language barrier was overcome by teaching the English-speaking youngsters Spanish and the Spanish-speaking youngsters English.

We found the English-speaking youngsters had as much interest and enthusi-

asm for the chance to learn to speak Spanish as did the Spanish-speaking youngsters to learn English. In other words, what was at first viewed as a handicap turned out to be a real resource. Equal interest and enthusiasm was evidenced on both sides, and the language barrier, was successfully overcome.

Mr. President, this temporary housing program has the strong support of everyone that I know of who is knowledgeable in the area of migrants and their problems. Yet, this successful program does not qualify for OEO's priority list. Perhaps it is too successful. It may be that the problem has disappeared, and therefore no help is needed—though I do not think that is the case. Sometimes one is given the impression that OEO's priority list encompasses only those activities which have not been tried, or have been tried and have not proved successful or possible. For these there seems to be unlimited funds and unlimited resources.

Dr. Paul F. O'Rourke, former State poverty director under Governor Brown, characterized OEO's actions in refusing to fund temporary housing programs in the following manner:

One of the decisions which recently has distressed me is an OEO decision not to permit the State of California to continue its temporary housing program and support for the families you saw today . . . it just got rolling in California. This is an example where the central authority does something inimical to what we have been trying to accomplish in the state.

Mr. President, I believe bureaucrats in Washington should not be permitted to do that which is contrary to the interests of the local people and certainly to the interests of the migrants. I offered, in committee, an amendment which includes the temporary housing as part of the programs that can be funded under title III (B). I want to make the legislative record absolutely clear that within the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare there is now the strongest support for the continuation of this temporary housing program which the committee had a chance to view and examine while they were in California. I want to make the record as clear as possible, Mr. President, that it is the intent of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare that the temporary housing program in California will be continued, that its continuation will be made possible, and that its priority will be reestablished high on the list of the programs of the OEO.

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

Mr. MURPHY. I am happy to yield.

Mr. CLARK. I commend the Senator for the statement he has just made. He and I and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] went through the San Joaquin Valley, I believe it was last spring—

Mr. MURPHY. Last spring.

Mr. CLARK. At the time the cherry crop was almost ready to be picked, and we saw the temporary migrant housing which had been built to take care of the workers who followed the fruit crops from south to north during the course of the year.

Like the Senator from California, I was very much impressed with these

temporary housing programs. We found in one camp—which actually was a camp for single men, a sort of bachelors' and widowers' camp—an extremely competent cook from Pittsburgh, who was giving these migrant workers—some of whom were younger fellows but most of them veterans of the fruit and vegetable picking—two good meals a day; and they had a chance to get a cold lunch.

The barracks, as one might call them, or dormitories, were clean and neat, and gave adequate protection from the weather, and I was very much impressed with them. Where that sort of facility does not exist, the migrant people often live in squalor.

We went from there to another area where they had temporary housing for families. And they practically had a Headstart program going among the kids there in a sort of classroom which had been set aside for that purpose.

The mothers were doing a lot of the teaching, and a number of volunteer girls had come in from the neighboring town of Stockton to help give these kids the normal educational processes.

These children were, to be sure, in the kindergarten and the earlier grades. And the houses, although temporary, were neat and clean, and they were well kept up by the migrant families. I was very much impressed.

Then, we went out, I suppose not more than 10 miles away, and saw a family of five or six living in an automobile under a bridge over a dry ditch. There was another family—my recollection may be inadequate, but I think there were six or seven in that family—living in a sort of pup tent with a kerosene stove. The conditions were really deplorable. The reason was that there was not enough temporary housing.

I was depressed when we heard testimony from the OEO officials to the effect that they were planning to phase out this temporary housing for migrants. Their reason was that they felt in due time all migrant labor was going to be phased out and disappear, that the picking would be taken over to a certain extent by new agricultural equipment, and that local labor would pick the rest. They did not want to encourage the continuation of migrant labor by giving them adequate housing.

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

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. MURPHY. This is another phase of the long, continuing discussion that we have had in this Chamber. It is further proof that sometimes the people 3,000 miles away do not understand the actual condition.

I know of the program designed to phase out the use of migrant labor. I think it would be a wonderful thing if this could be brought about, but I do not really see any progress, or very little progress, if any, at the present time.

In my remarks this morning I pointed out that the Secretary of Labor himself had made the statement last week that there were 40,000 to 50,000 green card workers in the State of California at the present time.

My information from the Bureau of Immigration would lead me to believe

that since Public Law 78 went out of existence, there have been thousands of illegal wetbacks in California.

It is my hope that as soon as this condition is corrected, the people who are actually necessary as agricultural workers in California will be quickly provided under the law and properly brought in and properly examined and, may I say, properly housed under conditions such as the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania and I saw in the particular instance to which we referred.

I was very pleased that the old housing project that used to be displayed in California was not displayed any longer and that there was public housing for the migrant worker that we could be proud of. That housing was comfortable, clean, adequate, and perfectly acceptable.

That is why I made my remarks today, in the hope that the members of the committee who were present with me would urge the Senate to restore the funds with which to keep the project going until these workers would no longer be needed. This type of housing is very badly needed today.

I thank my esteemed friend, the Senator from Pennsylvania, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, for his concurrence in the remarks I have made in regard to this matter.

Mr. CLARK. I think the Senator will recall that when the adverse position on temporary housing was brought up in the hearings before the subcommittee, several of us indicated our disapproval of cutting back these programs.

There is in the report a recommendation from the committee to continue and, indeed, to expand temporary housing. And we have \$3 million extra in there for that purpose.

I find myself completely in accord with the Senator from California. I am glad that he made the comments he did on the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] offers an amendment, as follows:

Strike out all of Title II, beginning on page 120, line 1, down through and including line 11, page 126, as follows:

"TITLE II—EMERGENCY EMPLOYMENT ACT

"SHORT TITLE

"SEC. 201. This title may be cited as the 'Emergency Employment Act of 1967'.

"FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

"SEC. 202. (a) The Congress finds that certain communities and areas in the Nation are presently burdened by severe unemployment and underemployment. Such areas contain large concentrations or proportions of persons who are unable to obtain jobs in regular competitive employment because of lack of education, occupational skill, or work experience and because of artificial barriers to employment and occupational advancement. This situation is aggravated by migration of unskilled rural residents to urban

areas. Many of the affected areas are doubly handicapped by the lack of sufficient jobs for all the potential labor force. This condition is destructive of human dignity and results in a loss of national productivity. In many localities the problem has reached crisis proportion by contributing to social unrest and civil disorder.

"(b) At the same time there is a huge backlog of need for additional public services and public facilities in such fields as those which (1) contribute to the development of human potential, (2) better the conditions under which people live, learn, and work, and (3) aid in the development and conservation of natural resources.

"(c) Therefore, it is the purpose of this title to provide meaningful employment opportunities in public service and other activities which will relieve severe unemployment in urban and rural areas and contribute to the national interest by fulfilling unmet needs.

"ELIGIBLE AREAS

"Sec. 203. The Secretary of Labor (hereafter referred to as the 'Secretary') shall designate urban and rural areas to be eligible for assistance under this title. Such areas shall contain a high concentration or proportion of low-income families and individuals and shall have severe problems of unemployment and underemployment. They may be defined without regard to political boundaries.

"FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

"Sec. 204. (a) The Secretary is authorized to provide financial assistance to public agencies and private organizations for part or all of the costs of programs which create meaningful public service and other employment opportunities. He shall adopt procedures to assure (1) that there is maximum emphasis on local initiative and responsibility with full participation of and maximum cooperation among local public officials, residents of eligible areas, and representatives of private organizations in the establishment of programs under this title, including, without limitation, the determination of areas and participants eligible for assistance and the selection of projects under subsection (b) of this section, and (2) that such assistance is fully coordinated with programs operated under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966, and other relevant Federal Acts.

"(b) Jobs created or made available under this title may include services and supporting facilities in such fields as health, public safety, education, recreation, streets, parks and municipal maintenance, housing and neighborhood improvement, conservation and rural development, beautification, and other fields of human betterment and public improvement. Such jobs shall include (1) those which can be made available immediately to persons who are otherwise unable to obtain employment, (2) those which provide placement resources for persons completing training under titles I and V of the Economic Opportunity Act and other relevant manpower training programs, and (3) those which use the skills of unemployed persons in areas with a chronic labor surplus. Priority shall be given to projects which are labor intensive in character.

"(c) The Secretary is authorized to provide financial assistance to assure that (1) persons employed in jobs created by this title are provided opportunity for further education, training, and necessary supportive services, including those provided by other relevant Acts, so that they may be prepared to obtain regular competitive employment in the future; and (2) that maximum effort is made to encourage private employers to adopt innovative approaches which create

additional jobs and new types of careers for low-income and disadvantaged persons.

"LOANS

"SEC. 205. (a) The Secretary is authorized to make loans to public and private agencies for the purchase of supplies and equipment which support and supplement projects carried out by participants under section 204.

"(b) Loans authorized under this section may be made without interest and under such other terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe.

"ELIGIBLE PARTICIPANTS

"SEC. 206. Participants in programs under this title must be unemployed or low-income persons who reside in eligible areas and who meet other criteria prescribed by the Secretary. Low income shall be defined in terms of section 125 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

"SPECIAL CONDITIONS

"SEC. 207. (a) The Secretary shall not provide financial assistance for any program under this title unless he determines, in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe, that—

"(1) no participant will be employed on projects involving political parties, or the construction, operation, or maintenance of so much of any facility as is used or to be used for sectarian instruction or as a place for religious worship;

"(2) the program will not result in displacement of employed workers or impair existing contracts for services, or result in the substitution of Federal for other funds in connection with work that would otherwise be performed;

"(3) wages paid a participant shall not be lower than, whichever is the highest of (A) the minimum wage which would be applicable to the employment under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 if section 6 of such Act applied to the participant and he was not exempt under section 13 thereof, (B) the State or local minimum wage for the most nearly comparable covered employment, or (C) the prevailing rate of wages in the area for similar work.

"(4) the program will, to the extent appropriate, contribute to the occupational development or upward mobility of individual participants.

"(b) For programs related to physical improvements preference shall be given to those improvements which will be substantially used by low-income persons and families in urban neighborhoods or rural areas having concentrations or proportions of low-income persons and families.

"(c) The Secretary shall prescribe regulations to assure that programs under this title have adequate internal administrative controls, accounting requirements, personnel standards, evaluation procedures, and other policies as may be necessary to promote the effective use of funds.

"(d) Programs approved under this title shall, to the maximum extent feasible, contribute to the elimination of artificial barriers to employment and occupational advancement, including civil service requirements which restrict employment opportunities for the disadvantaged.

"REPORTS

"SEC. 208. The Secretary shall submit to the Congress a report on the progress made in implementing this title and suggestions for improvements on or before May 15, 1968, November 15, 1968, and on or before May 15 and November 15 of each year thereafter.

"AUTHORIZATIONS

"SEC. 209. (a) For the purposes of carrying out the provisions of this title, except the provisions of section 205, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$1,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending

June 30, 1968; and \$1,500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

"(b) For the purpose of making loans under section 205, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated \$300,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968.

"(c) Appropriations authorized by this section shall remain available until expended."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield to the majority leader.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on the pending amendment the vote occur at 3 o'clock Monday next.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I was detained by a colloquy with other Senators and did not hear the reading of the amendment.

Do I correctly understand that the pending amendment would, if agreed to, strike title II?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am not making this statement to object, but to be constructive. A Senator sometimes will withdraw a request when I ask him to yield. I do not want him to do that.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I will not.

Mr. JAVITS. There are perhaps other amendments which Senators may like to have considered which could come between now and Monday. And Senators, for strategic reasons, may choose to have votes contiguous to and immediately preceding the 3 o'clock time. So that we may understand the situation, there may be other votes in addition to the vote set at 3 o'clock on Monday next.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator has an excellent idea. The distinguished Senator from West Virginia did raise that question and did ask me to consider the possibility of laying aside his amendment from time to time to take up other amendments.

I think it would be agreeable and would fit in with the suggestion of the senior Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Senators might decide that they would like a vote at the same time for strategic reasons.

Mr. MANSFIELD. We can accommodate them.

Mr. CLARK. Do I correctly understand that we can set the pending amendment aside almost immediately to take up the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma, or perhaps other amendments and try to dispose of them before Monday?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, if a motion to recommit were in order, perhaps that would have to fit into this picture. If a motion to recommit with instructions were made on Monday, that naturally in the course of parliamentary procedure would take priority over other votes.

There would be authority for such motion to be made if it were to come up?

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is my understanding that it would be taken care of. It is privileged.

If my recollection of parliamentary procedure is correct, one can offer an amendment to recommit after third reading.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct. Or, even after having consented to vote at 3 o'clock on Monday, as I understand it, a motion to recommit, if made, would become the immediate business and would be voted on even prior to the vote on the amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the request of the Senator include not only the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia but also all other amendments thereto?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Not exactly. The request is that the pending amendment be laid aside temporarily for the purpose of taking up other amendments if they become available.

Could the Chair rule on the question raised by the distinguished Senator from Delaware? I think he stated it correctly, but I would like a confirmation.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The question raised was that assuming on Monday we are proceeding toward a unanimous-consent time to vote, and a motion to recommit with instructions were made, which automatically would take priority over any other vote, would such a motion be in order at any time if it were offered during the course of the debate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not unless it is excepted now; because if there were a motion to recommit and it were agreed to, there would be nothing to vote on at 3 o'clock.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I temporarily withhold my unanimous-consent request.

Mr. JAVITS. May I make a suggestion to the majority leader to accommodate this situation? It is just a suggestion, and Senator CLARK may not consent to it.

Could it also be part of the unanimous-consent request that if any motion to recommit is made in the interim, it will be voted prior to the vote on the Byrd amendment on Monday at 3 o'clock?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, so that we may discuss this matter without it being in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Oregon yield for that purpose?

Mr. MORSE. I do not yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPONG in the chair). The Senate will be in order.

The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill

(S. 602) to revise and extend the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, and to amend title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1320) to provide for the acquisition of career status by certain temporary employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 1862) to amend the authorizing legislation on the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia).

THE PROPOSED 10-PERCENT SURTAX

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, unless the majority leader has objection, I shall proceed with a short speech I wish to make, a copy of which I have already sent to the Press Gallery. This is a speech in which, for the first time on the floor of the Senate, I announce my present position on the proposed 10-percent surtax. My final vote will depend on whether or not a course of action is followed by the administration along the lines that I outline in the speech.

Mr. President, as the war in Vietnam continues without sign of ending, and as its cost continues to burden the national budget at the rate of some \$29 billion a year, Congress and the taxpaying public are being compelled to come to grips with the fact that there is no such thing as a cheap war. The list of American casualties has reached the 100,000 mark, over 13,000 of them dead. The human price is unmeasured. The sacrifice these men have made can never be calculated; it can never be repaid.

What Congress does have to deal with is the financial cost. The Defense Department spending will total around \$75 billion. On top of that, I understand that sometime early next year, Congress will be asked for an additional, supplemental appropriation to take care of Vietnam war costs that were not covered in the earlier budget estimate.

That is why some members of the Military Affairs Committees in Congress believe the cost of the war will be around \$35 billion in the current fiscal year.

This is the first war in history that we have tried to wage without any wartime financial measures on the home front. There has been no tax increase; there have been no wage and price controls; there has been no allocation of scarce materials to keep prices down. We have done it all by borrowing. The result of this has been a sharp rise in interest rates and a considerable rise in the general price level.

The administration is increasing the pressure on Congress for a 10-percent

surtax on personal and corporation income taxes to raise \$7½ billion toward the cost of the war. The administration estimates that it can cut another \$7½ billion out of nondefense spending. By these means, it hopes to reduce the deficit to \$14 billion.

We know that the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives is now engaged in a kind of test of nerves with the administration; it wants to see the budget cuts before it acts on the surtax. The administration wants Congress to pass all the appropriation bills first, and says that then it will decide where to impound money.

The heart of the issue is this: If all the cuts are to come in nondefense spending, where are they to be made? The interest on the debt amounts to over \$14 billion, and that cannot be cut. Veterans' benefits are statutory and amount to some \$7 billion. They cannot be cut. That leaves such expenditures as highway construction, space exploration, the poverty program, education, agricultural programs, public works by the Corps of Engineers, conservation, water pollution control, and health resources among which to make these cuts. And these are only some of the domestic programs. Many people think the war on poverty should be cut back. But it could be eliminated altogether and we would save less than one-third of the target, because the war on poverty is budgeted at less than \$2 billion.

It is the opinion of the senior Senator from Oregon that if a cut is made in the poverty program, we will spend many times the amount of money cut in meeting the crises that will develop in the metropolitan areas of the country, where tens of thousands of fellow Americans are below the poverty line. We can have all the law enforcement available—and I am for law enforcement—but no amount of law enforcement will stop the direct action protests of Americans who see their children suffering from malnutrition, recognizing the want and the degradation that the present occupant of the chair and I and 180 million people like us are imposing upon fellow Americans who are suffering the pangs of poverty and hunger and deprivation in the Republic.

Therefore, to talk about cutting any of these needed domestic programs, in my judgment, does not make sense and cannot be reconciled with congressional duties to our country.

That is why I shall make a suggestion before I finish this speech as to where, in my judgment, the cuts must be made.

Moreover, most of these programs were already reduced below authorized amounts in the January budget. Another cut would reduce to impotence such activities as water pollution control and many of our education programs, at a time when the problems in both are growing. Many public works projects urgently needed in Oregon—and in all States, for that matter—have already been omitted from the current budget; more of them stand to be cut under this procedure. The same is true of many agricultural development programs.

I cannot accept the idea that this \$7½

billion should all come out of nondefense spending. It could come out of non-Vietnam spending. That is where it should come from. Let the senior Senator from Oregon make that statement again. The \$7.5 billion cut should not be made in the domestic programs so badly needed in this country in order to provide for the necessary welfare of the people who are entitled to those programs. The \$7.5 billion cut should be made in non-Vietnam defense spending. It should come out of the defense budget of \$75 billion, which apparently has become sacrosanct in the Republic. Apparently, we have already marched so far down the road to military domination of the budget of the Republic that any suggestion to cut \$7.5 billion out of a \$75 billion defense budget is not acceptable to many.

But I shall warn the Senate this afternoon where it is acceptable. It is acceptable to the American taxpayers. I warn the Senate this afternoon, before it is too late, that \$7.5 billion out of needed domestic programs may get by Congress, but it will not get by the country. We shall be held to an accounting, and we should be held to an accounting at the polls next November, because the taxpayers will not, in my judgment, accept those reductions in the domestic programs; they will consider it a betrayal of the public interest.

But the Defense Department continues to spend billions of dollars in places like Europe, which have no connection with the war in Vietnam. We continue to spend billions of the taxpayers' dollars in connection with non-Vietnam defense items all around the world.

I propose this afternoon that the \$7.5 billion be cut out of the \$75 billion defense budget for those expenditures that have to be postponed until we get out of the mess in South Vietnam and until we meet the dire needs of millions of our people who are entitled to have their needs met under a domestic appropriation bill.

I, therefore, cannot support a budget program that sacrifices the development of our country's human and natural resources in order to maintain 350,000 American soldiers in Germany, among other countries, when Germany herself will not fulfill her military manpower commitment to NATO; when Great Britain will not fulfill her military manpower commitment to NATO, but instead is talking about reducing her already undercommitted ratio to NATO. There is not a single member of NATO, except the United States, that has ever fulfilled its military manpower commitment to NATO.

There are those who would have us believe that the military budget is sacrosanct. We know if we do finally get into that war with Communist Russia—and God forbid—it will not be fought with conventional weapons; it will be a nuclear war, and that will be the end of both countries and many countries in between.

If ever there was a time for us to come to our senses in regard to the fiscal policies of this Republic, it is now. Of course, we will have to spend whatever amount of money is necessary to honor-

ably disengage ourselves from the war in Southeast Asia. And we all know the turn that is taking in public opinion. There is not a Member of this body who does not know that public opinion is turning against the war because they recognize that we cannot set ourselves up as the policeman of Asia. The rest of the world has made clear we will have to go it alone, and I speak of the major countries of the world.

Mr. President, you could not get the President of Italy, when he was in this country, to give us encouragement or support for our position in Vietnam; you could not get the Chancellor of Germany, who was in this body not so many days ago, who appeared before the Committee on Foreign Relations, who spoke before the Washington Press Club, and conferred with the President, to say words in support of our program in South Vietnam.

The sad fact is that month by month we are standing more isolated in the world because all the world recognizes we cannot justify the military course we are following in South Vietnam.

Mr. President, it is obvious from what has been said on this floor this week by other Senators, by Members of Congress of both political parties, that they are growing restive as these hard financial choices have to be made.

More of them are going to have to face up to the fact that it is the Vietnam war itself that is responsible for these hard choices. I think we are going to hear even more about the war in days ahead in terms of stopping it, or reducing its scope rather than continuing to escalate the manpower, the casualties, the deaths, and the cost.

For a long time, a majority in Congress went along with the idea that we could have both guns and butter. Now, they are finding out that we cannot. For myself, I shall not support a tax increase that seeks to maintain every military program everywhere in the world, while cutting back only on domestic programs. Nor shall I support a tax increase that perpetuates loopholes for the oil industry, whereby everyone else pays for the war but that one big business, or that permits escapees to avoid taxes that are clearly their patriotic duty to pay on the basis of equality of tax liability and obligation.

I am not going to vote for an increase in taxes until this Congress is first willing to plug the tax loopholes, and every Senator knows where they are. There are so many that they make our tax structure look like a Swiss cheese.

A surtax raises taxes only for those already paying taxes. If we are to have a war tax, it should be levied on everyone, and if we are to have budget cuts because of the war, they should be imposed upon every governmental activity—including defense—that is not related directly to the war itself.

A large proportion of the \$7½ billion spending cut should come out of the Defense Department. It has far and away the most non-Vietnam expenditures of any department or activity of Government. Let the budget cuts start there.

A serious issue is developing in the domestic field of taxes to pay for the war.

The House Ways and Means Committee has responded to the President's request for a 10-percent surtax by asking to see the budget cuts first.

But in a budget where defense spending of \$75 billion is considered untouchable, and interest on the debt and veterans' benefits are also untouchable, only some \$20 billion in funds for public works, education, urban development, space exploration, the war on poverty, highway construction, and agricultural programs is cuttable. How \$7.5 billion can be taken out of \$20 billion in domestic programs is the financial question Congress wants answered before it imposes a tax increase.

But the administration sets aside drastic cuts in the defense budget, and tries to mislead the American people into believing that when the senior Senator from Oregon and other Senators who have been urging cuts in the defense budget do so, we are somehow, in some way, weakening our stance in Vietnam. This is a non sequitur. The cuts we are talking about in the defense budget have nothing to do with Vietnam. The figures given us show that out of that \$75 billion in the defense budget, only \$22 billion is related to Vietnam.

CONGRESS MUST DECIDE BUDGET PRIORITIES

Mr. President, we have to make a reply to the President in regard to the matter of taxes and budget cuts. The President wants to get the appropriations and then he wants to decide where the appropriations will be spent, which again gives to him the discretion that I think we cannot afford to give to the President—and I am not talking about a President as Mr. Johnson. I am talking about the Office of the Presidency of the United States. But it does not make any difference to me who occupies that Office with respect to this particular issue at this time.

We are close to being told that if Congress designates a billion dollars for highway construction, and the President signs the measure into law, his Budget Bureau may still take it upon itself to decide that the money shall not be spent. It is one thing to give the President statutory discretion in how much he may spend upon a given program; but it is quite another to make the specific appropriation and then have it impounded.

Here is an area where Congress will indeed have lost one of its great checks upon arbitrary executive action if it permits its power over the purse strings to be overridden by the Budget Bureau.

That is why I have been urging, in connection with foreign policy matters, that we exercise the check of the purse strings, and that we insist the money be administered in accordance with the exercise of the purse strings, and not permit a President of the United States to exercise an arbitrary discretion in regard to the expenditure of the money.

So, too, do I hope that Congress will continue to reject all recommendations that the President be authorized to fix tax rates. If the time ever comes when we delegate the tax power to the executive branch, the precious system of check and balance whereby our Constitution

sought to protect our liberty will indeed be destroyed.

There is nothing in anything I have said that is directed at the President, or his Budget Director, or his Treasury Secretary, or his Defense Secretary, as individuals. We are confronted with the culmination of a long trend that has continued since World War II. It has seen Republican Congresses and Democratic Congresses delegate one function after another to the President and his Cabinet officers, and they, too, have been Democrats and Republicans.

I take some pride in the fact that I am the only Member of Congress who has voted against every undated war power delegated to the President since 1954. That period has encompassed the terms of Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson. I also take pride in a comment made by one of my friends from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] who has had a great deal to do also with these issues. On August 22, during a discussion of Vietnam policy in the Senate, I was interrupted by Senator FULBRIGHT, who said:

The Senator referred to his having voted against every step of our involvement there. I pay the Senator tribute. I had occasion within the last few days to reread the debate on the Tonkin Gulf Joint Resolution that took place in August 1964. I pay tribute to the Senator for his part in the debate on that measure. The time that has elapsed since then has proven him to be practically the only one who was correct in the position he took with regard to that resolution in August 1964. And, in spite of the sadness and tragedy that has afflicted the country, as a Member of the Senate he ought to be very proud of his foresight at that time.

My colleague gave me undue credit, for it was not my foresight upon which my decision rested, but upon the foresight of the authors of the Constitution. They knew that unless each department of the Federal Government were given specific powers in foreign affairs, to be exercised by that department exclusively, our Government would be no different from all previous governments which have foundered along with the freedom of their people upon the shoal of unchecked executive authority.

Mr. President, I have pled time and time again, and plead again this afternoon, that the Senate stop delegating legislative prerogatives and responsibilities to the executive branch of the Government.

I am pleading again that the Senate return to the checks-and-balances system of the Constitution and exercise the check of the purse strings. The issue which is being raised over the tax issue and budget cuts, and over the choice between non-Vietnam defense spending and necessary domestic spending, goes right back to the basic constitutional concept as to whether we are going to carry out the trust of our oath that we would uphold the Constitution.

The Constitution puts in the hand of Congress, not the Executive, the authority to spend money.

Nor have we in Congress been "brain-washed." We have none to blame but ourselves. Too often we have found it easier to accept at face value what we are told, without asking questions, with-

out finding out the whole picture for ourselves, without accepting our constitutional responsibility to make the decision of war, of spending, of foreign commitments.

The way in which our Constitution was written was designed to guard us, and the American people, from such errors.

There is some belated evidence now that Congress, at long last, is beginning to awaken and to recognize that it cannot slough off its duties in one area without jeopardizing its own freedom of action in other areas. That reawakening should continue. It should not move into reverse by delegating away the authority to appropriate or the authority to tax.

That is why I hope the Senate will soon take up the resolution now before the Foreign Relations Committee which has been offered by the great chairman of that committee, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. In it, he seeks to get the Senate to restate, for its own thinking, may I say—and it is needed—that Congress will insist upon taking back the reins which our constitutional fathers put into our hands to check an administration when it seeks to follow a course of action that cannot be reconciled with the responsibilities of Congress in the field of foreign policy.

Mr. President, it does not make me happy to make the remarks I have made this afternoon—because, of course, I would much prefer to find myself in agreement with my administration on matters of such vital concern as the tax bill or a budget cut. But, Mr. President, I cannot join the administration in its proposal for a tax increase or upon its recommendations as to where the budget cuts shall be made, because I think that Congress owes it to the American taxpayers to take all, or most all, of that \$7.5 billion cut out of the defense spending elsewhere than Vietnam.

Therefore, unless evidence can be presented to me that has not been presented to me by the administration to date, that justifies, on the merits, not on the politics, but on the merits, the type of cut that spokesmen for the administration are urging upon Senators these days, I shall vote against their recommendations.

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. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move to recommit S. 2388, with instructions to report forthwith with title II, beginning on page 120, line 1, down through page 126, line 11, stricken out.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, is that motion debatable?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Certainly.

Mr. JAVITS. Is that motion amend-

able in this way: Can the instructions to the committee to report back be amended?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will say that all instructions are amendable.

Mr. JAVITS. May those instructions include instructions with respect to changes to be made in the very item of the bill which would be stricken by the motion to recommit?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Such amendments would be in order as long as they relate to the bill itself, and are instructions to the committee.

Mr. JAVITS. As the bill stands now? The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Chair. Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has called up a motion which has not been printed, but which I hold in my hand, he having had the courtesy to hand it to me. It reads:

I move to recommit S. 2388, with instructions to report forthwith with title II—

I think we are in trouble. I am going to ask the Senator to read it.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I move to recommit S. 2388, with instructions to report forthwith with title II, beginning on page 120, line 1, down through page 126, line 11, stricken out.

Mr. CLARK. It is clear enough. Mr. President, is that the pending motion?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That will be the pending motion as soon as it has been stated by the clerk.

Mr. CLARK. It is my understanding it is debatable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is debatable.

Mr. CLARK. Since I have to leave pretty soon, I hope we can agree there will be no unanimous-consent agreement with respect to limitation of debate on this motion until we can confer tomorrow.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there will be none.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MURPHY. Is it proper for the Senator from California to ask that the call for the yeas and nays be included in the unanimous-consent request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no unanimous-consent request before the Senate. There is a motion before the Senate.

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

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, once the Senator gets the yeas and nays, the motion cannot be amended by any other Senator.

I am told that is not correct. What is the rule which says once the yeas and nays have been ordered, a Senator cannot modify his motion?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A Senator loses his right to modify the amendment.

Mr. CLARK. But any other Senator can modify it or amend it?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He could amend it.

Mr. MURPHY. And the Senator may not modify it, but may withdraw?

Mr. MANSFIELD. He may not withdraw it once he gets the yeas and nays.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask that the clerk state the motion.

Mr. MURPHY. I have asked that the yeas and nays be ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, is that a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. MURPHY. No.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion will be stated by the clerk. Then the Senate will act on the request for the yeas and nays.

The legislative clerk read the motion of Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, as follows:

I move to recommit S. 2388, with instructions to report forthwith with title II, beginning on page 120, line 1, down through page 126, line 11, stricken out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second for the yeas and nays?

There is a sufficient number, and the yeas and nays are ordered.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, another parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JAVITS. Where an effort is made to amend the instructions which are contained in the motion to recommit, in accordance with the previous rulings of the Chair, does the vote on each such amendment occur before the vote on the motion to recommit?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Chair.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I did so only to request that the floor be cleared and that only those who are supposed to be on the floor remain on the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair instructs the Sergeant at Arms that all unauthorized persons be cleared from the floor. The Chair would remind the attachés that this is the third time that we have had to do this this afternoon.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, may I say, in extenuation of my suggestion, that I am finding it extremely difficult to differentiate between Senators and the staff.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today it stand in adjournment until 12 noon tomorrow.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

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. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask that the pending business be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the pending business.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] moves to recommit S. 2388, with instructions to report forthwith which title II, beginning on page 120, line 1, down through page 126, line 11, stricken out.

PROGRAM

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I believe the majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD] feels there will not be a vote on the pending motion before Monday next. The Senate will meet tomorrow at noon, and it is hoped that action can be taken to dispose of several amendments on tomorrow. There may be roll-call votes; I cannot be sure.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE— ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 13026) to extend through March 1968 the first general enrollment period under part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act (relating to supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged), and for other purposes.

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 previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.) the Senate

adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, September 29, 1967, at 12 noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate September 28, 1967:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Walter N. Tobriner, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Jamaica, vice Wilson T. M. Beale, Jr.

OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PLANNING

Price Daniel, of Texas, to be Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, vice Farris Bryant.

IN THE AIR FORCE

William B. Duty, FR5739, for reappointment to the active list of the Regular Air Force, in the grade of lieutenant colonel, from the temporary disability retired list, under the provisions of sections 1210 and 1211, title 10, United States Code.

The following persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grades indicated, under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code, with a view to designation under the provisions of section 8067, title 10, United States Code, to perform the duties indicated, and with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

To be captains (Medical)

- Birkemeyer, Eugene J., [REDACTED]
- Myers, John E., [REDACTED]

To be first lieutenant (Medical)

- Munn, William C., II, [REDACTED]

To be captains (Dental)

- Barton, Ralph T., [REDACTED]
- Kincaid Louis C., [REDACTED]
- Winkley, Donald F., [REDACTED]

To be first lieutenants (Dental)

- Logan, John L., [REDACTED]
- Smith, Robert N., [REDACTED]

To be first lieutenants (Judge Advocate)

- Gooding, Theodore J., [REDACTED]
- Pribula, Stephen J., [REDACTED]

The following Air Force officers for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grades indicated, under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

To be captains

- Abel, Franklin G., [REDACTED]
- Adams, Richard R., [REDACTED]
- Adams, Robert R., [REDACTED]
- Adelman, Philip J., [REDACTED]
- Albrecht, Peter H., [REDACTED]
- Allen, Archie G., [REDACTED]
- Alspaugh, James D., [REDACTED]
- Amrhein, Robert L., [REDACTED]
- Anderson, Harold W., [REDACTED]
- Anderson, Jackie L., [REDACTED]
- Ashley, Edward L., [REDACTED]
- Axakowsky, Harry I., [REDACTED]
- Bacheller, Burton P. C., II, [REDACTED]
- Baggette, Harold D., [REDACTED]
- Bailey, Glenn B., [REDACTED]
- Bailey, James E., [REDACTED]
- Bailey, William G., [REDACTED]
- Baker, Kenneth N., [REDACTED]
- Barr, Charles R., [REDACTED]
- Barrett, Thomas A., Jr., [REDACTED]
- Bartlett, Robert R., [REDACTED]
- Batton, James L., [REDACTED]
- Beasley, James R., [REDACTED]
- Beekman, Ralph E., [REDACTED]
- Benfield, Garland W., [REDACTED]
- Bennett, Russell H., [REDACTED]
- Berg, John O., [REDACTED]
- Bessette, Duane G., [REDACTED]
- Bester, Joseph D., [REDACTED]
- Bielstein, Lawrence E., [REDACTED]

- Billingsley, James T., [REDACTED]
- Bizly, Russell J., [REDACTED]
- Black, Maurice, [REDACTED]
- Blake, Douglas L., [REDACTED]
- Bogard, Clarence R., [REDACTED]
- Bomis, Andrejs, [REDACTED]
- Booth, John F., [REDACTED]
- Booton, Harley D., [REDACTED]
- Borchardt, Curtis W., [REDACTED]
- Borg, Brewster E., [REDACTED]
- Bowen, Danny M., [REDACTED]
- Bozarth, Gerald W., Jr., [REDACTED]
- Bradshaw, John A., [REDACTED]
- Brandt, William H., [REDACTED]
- Brawley, Horace M., [REDACTED]
- Brinegar, Don E., [REDACTED]
- Brock, Floyd J., Jr., [REDACTED]
- Broome, Donald W., [REDACTED]
- Brown, Franklin W., [REDACTED]
- Brown, Larry K., [REDACTED]
- Brown, Marvin R., [REDACTED]
- Brumble, Buck R., [REDACTED]
- Brummund, Dale R., [REDACTED]
- Brunner, Richard A., [REDACTED]
- Buckenmyer, David W., [REDACTED]
- Budge, Ronald J., [REDACTED]
- Bukovec, Donald J., [REDACTED]
- Burkhart, Frederic A., [REDACTED]
- Butler, Tommy D., Jr., [REDACTED]
- Butt, David W., [REDACTED]
- Callahan, James E., [REDACTED]
- Campbell, John F., [REDACTED]
- Caponecchi, August J., [REDACTED]
- Carpenter, Robert A., [REDACTED]
- Carpentier, Robert A., [REDACTED]
- Carson, George A., [REDACTED]
- Carter, Grey L., [REDACTED]
- Cassidy, Charles P., [REDACTED]
- Cauthorn, Frank E., [REDACTED]
- Chadd, Billy R., [REDACTED]
- Chandler, Robert G., [REDACTED]
- Clark, Rufus M., [REDACTED]
- Clausen, Lee R., [REDACTED]
- Cleland, Fred D., [REDACTED]
- Clifford, James E., [REDACTED]
- Cloyd, John L., [REDACTED]
- Coble, Walter M., [REDACTED]
- Cocke, Robert E., Jr., [REDACTED]
- Coffin, Bruce R., [REDACTED]
- Cohen, Howard, [REDACTED]
- Conder, Jimmie L., [REDACTED]
- Conley, Robert J., [REDACTED]
- Connolly, Alle B., II, [REDACTED]
- Conway, Bernard M., [REDACTED]
- Corbett, John G., [REDACTED]
- Coughlin, Joseph A., Jr., [REDACTED]
- Courtney, Daniel H., [REDACTED]
- Crane, Robert M., [REDACTED]
- Crews, Charles P., [REDACTED]
- Crews, Gordon W., [REDACTED]
- Crocker, Billy H., [REDACTED]
- Crown, Jerry E., [REDACTED]
- Curran, Robert B., [REDACTED]
- Curtis, Jack M., [REDACTED]
- Cyganek, Roger L., [REDACTED]
- Dahle, Larry F., [REDACTED]
- Darrow, William K., [REDACTED]
- Davidson, Nora A., [REDACTED]
- Davis, James R., [REDACTED]
- Decarlo, Louis N., [REDACTED]
- Deming, William J., [REDACTED]
- Denison, Robert D., [REDACTED]
- Dennis, Clyde T., [REDACTED]
- Desplegler, Gale A., [REDACTED]
- Dickens, Paul M., [REDACTED]
- Dillon, James S., [REDACTED]
- Donaldson, Jack L., [REDACTED]
- Donley, David L., [REDACTED]
- Donnelson, Kirk D., [REDACTED]
- Dorgan, Charles E., [REDACTED]
- Dorn, Stuart R., [REDACTED]
- Dumont, Douglas G., [REDACTED]
- Dunn, Billy C., [REDACTED]
- Dykes, Conley H., [REDACTED]
- Eady, Malcolm J., [REDACTED]
- Earl, David J., [REDACTED]
- Eckert, Clifford C., [REDACTED]
- Eckhoff, Herbert F. O., [REDACTED]
- Edney, Robert A., [REDACTED]
- Edwards, Reginald N., [REDACTED]
- Elliott, Lawrence K., Jr., [REDACTED]

Elsasser, Robert L., XXXXXXXX
 Engren, Douglas G., XXXXXXXX
 Erler, William F., XXXXXXXX
 Esparza, Enrique, XXXXXXXX
 Fahey, Omer D., XXXXXXXX
 Farren, Michael F., XXXXXXXX
 Fedor, William P., XXXXXXXX
 Fegley, Ronald A., XXXXXXXX
 Fey, Gerald P., XXXXXXXX
 Flalko, Leonard D., XXXXXXXX
 Finamore, Ronald P., XXXXXXXX
 Flandreau, Donald H., XXXXXXXX
 Fogg, Jerome D., XXXXXXXX
 Fontaine, Philip C., XXXXXXXX
 Ford, Charles C., XXXXXXXX
 Ford, David W., XXXXXXXX
 Forinash, Carlen W., XXXXXXXX
 Forsgren, Bruce R., XXXXXXXX
 Fowler, Edward E., XXXXXXXX
 Fox, Dell H., XXXXXXXX
 Frady, William D., XXXXXXXX
 Freeman, David L., XXXXXXXX
 Frisbee, Donald A., XXXXXXXX
 Fruehauf, David E., XXXXXXXX
 Fry, Chester G., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Fulkerson, Clarence L., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Gagnon, George A., XXXXXXXX
 Galante, Leonard T., XXXXXXXX
 Gamble, Gary L., XXXXXXXX
 Garver, Richard B., XXXXXXXX
 Gasper, Jay E., XXXXXXXX
 Gentry, Billy C., XXXXXXXX
 Gerac, Louis P., XXXXXXXX
 Geron, Billy M., XXXXXXXX
 Geron, John D., XXXXXXXX
 Giampietro, Ronald L., XXXXXXXX
 Gilbert, Donald E., XXXXXXXX
 Glen, Steven V., XXXXXXXX
 Godin, Raymond E., XXXXXXXX
 Goins, Richard T., XXXXXXXX
 Goodell, Frank S., XXXXXXXX
 Gordon, Sidney H., XXXXXXXX
 Grable, Robert T., XXXXXXXX
 Gray, Jack E., XXXXXXXX
 Greenway, George R., XXXXXXXX
 Greenwood, Frederick R., XXXXXXXX
 Gregory, Hugh R., XXXXXXXX
 Gresco, Alfred J., XXXXXXXX
 Griffin, Richard L., XXXXXXXX
 Grittner, Robert L., XXXXXXXX
 Grossman, James H., XXXXXXXX
 Groves, Lynn W., XXXXXXXX
 Gundrum, Edward H., XXXXXXXX
 Gunther, Carol D., XXXXXXXX
 Gyauch, Charles P., XXXXXXXX
 Hackett, Robert D., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Haggerty, James A., XXXXXXXX
 Hall, Mortimer J., XXXXXXXX
 Hancock, Thomas P., XXXXXXXX
 Hanna, Dennis W., XXXXXXXX
 Hanna, Sidney T., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Hanratty, John F., XXXXXXXX
 Hansen, Richard C., XXXXXXXX
 Hansen, Wynn S., XXXXXXXX
 Harder, John D., XXXXXXXX
 Harris, Donald G., XXXXXXXX
 Harris, Ronald B., XXXXXXXX
 Harris, William G., XXXXXXXX
 Harrison, Robert H., XXXXXXXX
 Hart, Herbert W., XXXXXXXX
 Hartman, Alfonse A., XXXXXXXX
 Hartsock, David C., XXXXXXXX
 Harvey, James B., XXXXXXXX
 Hays, Gary R., XXXXXXXX
 Heal, Earl H., XXXXXXXX
 Heath, Terry E., XXXXXXXX
 Heinrich, David F., XXXXXXXX
 Heiss, Frederick C., XXXXXXXX
 Hembree, James M., XXX
 Henderson, Kenneth P., XXXXXXXX
 Henry, David C., XXXXXXXX
 Henry, Jerry L., XXXXXXXX
 XXXX Delbert M., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Hill, Lincoln, Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Hill, William H., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Hinchberger, Lawrence J., XXXXXXXX
 Hinrichs, Hayes T., XXXXXXXX
 Hodnik, Richard J., XXXXXXXX
 Hoffman, Kenneth O., XXXXXXXX
 Hollabaugh, Raymond, XXXXXXXX
 Holmes, Durwood P., XXXXXXXX
 Holmes, James L., XXXX
 Hols, Wilbert G., XXXXXXXX
 Hoover, Dale A., XXXXXXXX
 Hoppe, Lawrence G., XXXXXXXX
 Horsfield, William C., III, XXXXXXXX
 Hothem, Bernard L., XXXXXXXX
 Hotter, Frank D., XXXXXXXX
 Hubacher, Phillip, III, XXXXXXXX
 Hudson, James L., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Hudson, Royce L., XXXXXXXX
 Hughes, Robert D., XXXXXXXX
 Hunzeker, William A., XXXXXXXX
 Hyde, Fritz C., III, XXXXXXXX
 Iwersen, Alfred, Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Jackson, James R., XXXXXXXX
 Jacoby, Gary M., XXXXXXXX
 Jaeckel, Robert J., XXXXXXXX
 Janosky, Henry, XXXXXXXX
 Jones, Lowrey G., XXXXXXXX
 Karins, Joseph J., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Kashiwabara, Merrill K., XXXXXXXX
 Kashouty, Anthony W., XXXX
 Keller, Marvin R., XXXXXXXX
 Kenfield, Jack L., XXXXXXXX
 Kenney, Merle D., XXXXXXXX
 Keskinen, Kenneth B., XXXXXXXX
 Kinch, William V. K., XXXXXXXX
 King, Richard E., XXXXXXXX
 Kliz, Richard T., XXXXXXXX
 Koddick, John, XXXXXXXX
 Korte, Mike A., XXXXXXXX
 Korus, Charles J., XXXXXXXX
 Kosko, Walter, XXXXXXXX
 Krieg, Oscar P., XXXXXXXX
 Kronbergs, Paul O., XXXXXXXX
 Kyle, Franklin L., XXXXXXXX
 Labosky, Andrew, Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Lafollette, John P., XXXXXXXX
 Lagergren, Frederick G., XXXXXXXX
 Lane, Edward S., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Lane, W. J. Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Lanigan, Morris J., XXXX
 Larsen, Donald K., XXXXXXXX
 Leazer, Donald W., XXXXXXXX
 Lee, William C., XXXXXXXX
 Liehs, Donald L., XXXXXXXX
 Lighty, Larry G., XXXXXXXX
 Loeff, Donald L., XXXXXXXX
 Loving, Den A., XXXX
 Ludwig, Francis J., XXXXXXXX
 Lund, Richard R., XXXXXXXX
 Mack, Richard T., XXXXXXXX
 Maddock, Joseph, XXXXXXXX
 Malorka, Philip S., XXXXXXXX
 Maloney, Donald E., XXXXXXXX
 Maness, Stony F., XXXXXXXX
 Manning, Robert L., XXXXXXXX
 Marchand, Maurice R., XXXXXXXX
 Marcus, Sidney M., XXXXXXXX
 Markow, Nicholas M., XXXXXXXX
 Martin, Edward W., XXXXXXXX
 Martin, Gary D., XXXXXXXX
 Mattasolio, Donald J., XXXXXXXX
 Maurer, Lewis R., XXXXXXXX
 Mazzel, Alfred A., XXXXXXXX
 McDonald, Travis E., XXXXXXXX
 McDowell, Jerry W., XXXXXXXX
 McGlohon, Robert A., XXXXXXXX
 McGuinness, Michael T., XXXXXXXX
 McGuire, Thomas F., XXXXXXXX
 McLelland, Philip R., XXXXXXXX
 McMahon, John E., XXXXXXXX
 McReynolds, James S., XXXXXXXX
 Meerdink, Warren L., XXXXXXXX
 Mentler, John S., XXXXXXXX
 Meyers, Ronald C., XXXX
 Miller, Darold D., XXXXXXXX
 Miller, Robert C., XXXXXXXX
 Miner, Robert R., XXXXXXXX
 Mockler, David F., XXXXXXXX
 Molly, Kenneth R., XXXXXXXX
 Moon, Henry C., XXXXXXXX
 Moore, James W., XXXXXXXX
 Moore, Richard W., XXXXXXXX
 Moores, Lee S., XXXXXXXX
 Moran, Keith R., XXXXXXXX
 Moran, Robert C., XXXXXXXX
 Morgan, Robert G., XXXXXXXX
 Morrison, Reginald C., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Morrow, Richard F., XXXXXXXX
 Mulligan, Thomas C., XXXXXXXX
 Mundie, Bruce F., XXXXXXXX
 Murrell, Kenneth W., XXXXXXXX
 Murtha, James R., XXXXXXXX
 Mushkin, Nathan, XXXXXXXX
 Myers, Ronald R., XXXXXXXX
 Myers, Thomas O., XXXXXXXX
 Nance, Francis L., XXXXXXXX
 Neal, James T., XXXXXXXX
 Nef, William T., XXXXXXXX
 Neilson, Neil E., XXXXXXXX
 Nelson, James L., XXXXXXXX
 Nielsen, Charles N., XXXXXXXX
 Nielsen, William D., XXXX
 O'Dell, William R., XXXXXXXX
 O'Leary, Daniel L., III, XXXXXXXX
 Olsen, Gerald E., XXXXXXXX
 Olson, John D., XXXXXXXX
 O'Morrow, John H., XXXXXXXX
 Orr, Thomas B., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Orsulak, Joseph P., XXXXXXXX
 Owens, John E., XXXXXXXX
 Page, Albert L., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Parimore, Roy L., XXXXXXXX
 Parsons, Wallace E., XXXXXXXX
 Pattillo, John T., XXXXXXXX
 Paulsen, Jay G., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Pennington, James C., XXXXXXXX
 Peterson, Gordon E., XXXXXXXX
 Peterson, Larry E., XXXXXXXX
 Phillips, Ronald G., XXXXXXXX
 Pischke, Norman A., XXXXXXXX
 Place, Hubert C., XXXXXXXX
 Planck, Sanford R., XXXXXXXX
 Plucker, Herbert A., XXXXXXXX
 Pollard, Richard M., XXXXXXXX
 Porter, Samuel K., XXXXXXXX
 Powers, Frank L., XXXXXXXX
 Priest, Edward C., XXXXXXXX
 Pritchard, Robert L., XXXXXXXX
 Proudfit, Campbell E., XXXXXXXX
 Provart, Robert W., XXXXXXXX
 Purviance, Charles S., XXXXXXXX
 Pyle, Thomas S., II, XXXXXXXX
 Quimby, Richard F., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Ramsey, Milton H., XXXXXXXX
 Randrup, Ronald E., XXXXXXXX
 Ratner, Solomon, XXXXXXXX
 Reich, James L., XXXXXXXX
 Reid, Richard W., XXXXXXXX
 Reinke, Earl R., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Reiter, Robert E., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Renick, Larry L., XXXXXXXX
 Richard, Harry J., XXXXXXXX
 Rickard, David T., XXXXXXXX
 Ricks, Keith H., XXXXXXXX
 Riley, Michael R., XXXXXXXX
 Riveria, Danny, XXXXXXXX
 Roberson, John H., XXXXXXXX
 Robertson, Edward G., III, XXXXXXXX
 Robertson, Marion D., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Robins, Raymond C., XXXXXXXX
 Roell, Joseph C., XXXXXXXX
 Rogers, Cletius G., XXXXXXXX
 Roger, James H., XXXXXXXX
 Rogers, Mark W., XXXXXXXX
 Rogers, Robert J., XXXXXXXX
 Roof, Robert L., XXXXXXXX
 Rose, Donald E., XXXXXXXX
 Rose, John H., XXXXXXXX
 Ross, Curtis A., XXXXXXXX
 Ross, Eugene E., XXXXXXXX
 Rouse, John P., XXXXXXXX
 Rousey, James E., XXXXXXXX
 Rowland, Drexel O., XXXXXXXX
 Roylance, Jerry W., XXXXXXXX
 Russell, Harvey L., XXXXXXXX
 Saggio, Joseph C., XXXXXXXX
 Sands, David M., XXXXXXXX
 Schaefer, Joseph D., XXXXXXXX
 Schaertl, Ronald, XXXXXXXX
 Schekirke, Daniel S., XXXXXXXX
 Schierman, Wesley D., XXXXXXXX
 Schoonover, Roland P., XXXXXXXX
 Schramme, David C., XXXXXXXX
 Schrufer, Robert J., XXXXXXXX
 Schuler, Ernest F., III, XXXXXXXX
 Schultz, Robert F., XXXXXXXX
 Schuneman, Lloyd T., XXXXXXXX
 Schwartz, Elias E. Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Schwartz, Robert V., XXXXXXXX
 Scott, James W., XXXXXXXX

Seal, William R., XXXXXXXX
 Senft, Charles T., XXXXXXXX
 Shappell, Dwight M., XXXXXXXX
 Sheehan, Brian T., XXXXXXXX
 Shelley, Zack H. Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Sherman, Wiley, Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Sherouse, Lewis E., XXXXXXXX
 Shields, Roger D., XXXXXXXX
 Shiers, Clifford F., XXXXXXXX
 Shirley, Hubert C., XXXXXXXX
 Shock, John H., XXXXXXXX
 Sipes, James L., XXXXXXXX
 Skinner, Robert W., XXXXXXXX
 Slader, Eric L., XXXXXXXX
 Sloan, Charles P. Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Smith, Allan T., XXXXXXXX
 Smith, Elworth E., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Smith, Robert D., XXXXXXXX
 Smith, Wayne H., XXXXXXXX
 Sodoma, Wilford C., XXXXXXXX
 Spaulding, Mark B., XXXXXXXX
 Spear, John W., XXXXXXXX
 Spey, John R., XXXXXXXX
 Spinney, Allan R., XXXXXXXX
 Stadler, John T., XXXXXXXX
 Stallings, Donald F., XXXXXXXX
 Stallings, Malcolm O., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Staples, Robert M., XXXXXXXX
 Starr, Jack E., XXXXXXXX
 Steele, Richard R., XXXXXXXX
 Stephans, Victor G., XXXXXXXX
 Stevenson, Bonnie G., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Stewart, Rex M., XXXXXXXX
 Stipe, Alfred C., XXXXXXXX
 Stocks, Johnnie C., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Stransky, Charles J., XXXXXXXX
 Streitmatter, Larry A., XXXXXXXX
 Strickland, Wilton W., XXXXXXXX
 Sturek, Donald L., XXXXXXXX
 Sukey, Richard D., XXXXXXXX
 Sutter, Franklin G., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Svoboda, Robert J., XXXXXXXX
 Swann, John K., XXXXXXXX
 Sweeney, William L., XXXXXXXX
 Taylor, Richard F., XXXXXXXX
 Teborek, Joseph A., XXXXXXXX
 Tenny, Michael C., XXXXXXXX
 Thedford, Thomas M., XXXXXXXX
 Thomas, Daniel E., XXXXXXXX
 Thompson, Merlin H., XXXXXXXX
 Thompson, Robert E., XXXXXXXX
 Thorne, Carlton E., XXXXXXXX
 Tilton, Norman D., XXXXXXXX
 Timberman, Donald E., XXXXXXXX
 Tindle, Dannie J., XXXXXXXX
 Tucker, Henry L., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Tussing, Frank R., XXXXXXXX
 Underwood, Keith T., XXXXXXXX
 Utley, Roger R., XXXXXXXX
 Valadez, Ernesto E., XXXXXXXX
 Vancamp, Ronald D., XXXXXXXX
 Vanstockum, W. F., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Vatcher, Frederic M., XXXXXXXX
 Velle, Robert N., XXXXXXXX
 Venes, Robert O., XXXXXXXX
 Voge, Dale W., XXXXXXXX
 Vonurff, Noel H., XXXXXXXX
 Voyles, Robert J., XXXXXXXX
 Wagner, James E., XXXXXXXX
 Wagner, Larry L., XXXXXXXX
 Walker, Alan E., XXXXXXXX
 Wallace, Richard P., XXXXXXXX
 Wallace, Robert E., XXXXXXXX
 Walls, W. L., XXXXXXXX
 Walters, Donald R., XXXXXXXX
 Warnick, Loyd J., XXXXXXXX
 Warren, Arthur L., XXXXXXXX
 Waterson, William, XXXXXXXX
 Webber, Dale T., XXXXXXXX
 Werley, Harley D., XXXXXXXX
 West, Eugene R., XXXXXXXX
 Wham, Thomas J., XXXXXXXX
 White, Clarence L., XXXXXXXX
 Whitner, Flippen W., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Whitten, William C., XXXXXXXX
 Whittenberg, Jean R., XXXXXXXX
 Wilkinson, Donald L., XXXXXXXX
 Williams, John J., XXXXXXXX
 Williams, John V., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Willis, Myron E., XXXX

Wilson, James K., A., XXXXXXXX
 Wood, Evan E. Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Woods, David M., XXXXXXXX
 Wright, Richard F., XXXXXXXX
 Yarc, David E., XXXXXXXX
 Yargo, Ralph J., XXXXXXXX
 Yates, Thomas H., XXXXXXXX
 Young, Edward F., XXXXXXXX
 Young, William E., XXXXXXXX
 Zierdt, Jerald F., XXXXXXXX

To be first lieutenants

Alexander, Robb R., XXXXXXXX
 Allan, Ronald J., XXXXXXXX
 Allen, John C., XXXXXXXX
 Alvarez, Humberto H., XXXXXXXX
 Anderson, Paul C., XXXXXXXX
 Anderson, Raymond E., XXXXXXXX
 Andreasen, Clell, XXXXXXXX
 Armenta, Gilbert, XXXXXXXX
 Arner, Lorenz D., XXXXXXXX
 Arneson, Dwyne C., XXXXXXXX
 Artley, Dike D., XXXXXXXX
 Ashman, Jerome P., XXXXXXXX
 Bailey, Gordon D., XXXXXXXX
 Bailey, Richard, XXXXXXXX
 Bajuk, Terence G., XXXXXXXX
 Bale, Don E., XXXXXXXX
 Banks, Ronald W., XXXXXXXX
 Barrett, Melvin R., XXXXXXXX
 Batte, George A., XXXXXXXX
 Beaulieu, Leo J., XXXXXXXX
 Benedict, Carl J., XXXXXXXX
 Bentes, William A., XXXXXXXX
 Berkshire, John H., XXXXXXXX
 Bernard, Albert R., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Bernard, John F., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Bevans, Peter C., XXXXXXXX
 Beverly, Edward J., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Bigelow, James N., XXXXXXXX
 Bigham, Eugene F., XXXXXXXX
 Birnbaum, Moe, XXXXXXXX
 Bittenbender, David F., XXXXXXXX
 Bloom, Philip J., XXXXXXXX
 Blum, Franklin E., XXXXXXXX
 Blythe, Herman E., XXXXXXXX
 Bode, Richard D., XXXXXXXX
 Boecking, William D. G., XXXXXXXX
 Boettger, Albert J., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Boone, Donald, XXXXXXXX
 Boone, Leo D., XXXXXXXX
 Boone, Thomas S., XXXXXXXX
 Boyd, Lawrence E., XXXXXXXX
 Boyd, Raymond G., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Boyle, John J., XXXXXXXX
 Brakeley, Peter W., XXXXXXXX
 Breen, Paul F., XXXXXXXX
 Brown, Leland D. Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Brown, William A. Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Brownfield, Orlean L., XXXXXXXX
 Bruce, Daniel R., XXXXXXXX
 Brzozowski, Thomas S., XXXXXXXX
 Buick, John R., XXXXXXXX
 Burnett, Donovan O., XXXXXXXX
 Burns, John L., XXXXXXXX
 Burrow, Jessie H., XXXXXXXX
 Burrows, Bruce T., XXXXXXXX
 Byrne, Richard L., XXXXXXXX
 Calhoun, Joseph S., XXXXXXXX
 Carey, John J., XXXXXXXX
 Chambers, John A., XXXXXXXX
 Choronenko, Iwan, XXXXXXXX
 Christensen, Carl A., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Clemons, Gerald L., XXXXXXXX
 Coats, James A., XXXXXXXX
 Coble, John E., XXXXXXXX
 Cody, John C., XXXXXXXX
 Collman, Ronald G., XXXXXXXX
 Conner, William B., XXXXXXXX
 Correll, Monte R., XXXXXXXX
 Cotarobles, Amado L., XXXXXXXX
 Coulter, Arthur C., XXXXXXXX
 Cox, Wesley A., XXXXXXXX
 Crofoot, William R., XXXXXXXX
 Cruger, Kenneth J., XXXXXXXX
 Curtis, Arthur W., XXXXXXXX
 Davis, Clifford D., XXXXXXXX
 Davis, Glenn L., XXXXXXXX
 Davis, Ralph L., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Davis, Robert E., XXXXXXXX
 Deeter, Stanley B., XXXXXX

Dibbens, Marvin F., XXXXXXXX
 Dixon, Dale B., XXXXXXXX
 Dodge, Harvey L., XXXXXXXX
 Domuret, Allan J., XXXXXXXX
 Donahoe, James B., XXXXXXXX
 Driscoll, Dennis R., XXXXXXXX
 Dubose, Wesley G., XXXXXXXX
 Dukes, Douglas W., XXXXXXXX
 Dunkelberger, Robert J., XXXXXXXX
 Edge, Thomas H., XXXXXXXX
 Edwards, Melvin P., XXXXXXXX
 Edwards, Ronald G., XXXXXXXX
 Erickson, Stephen C., XXXXXXXX
 Ermi, Keith, XXXXXXXX
 Ernest, Kenneth E., XXXXXXXX
 Evans, Robert G., XXXXXXXX
 Evans, Yarnell C., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Fagley, Richard D., XXXXXXXX
 Faison, Lawrence E., XXXXXXXX
 Farman, Michael S., XXXXXXXX
 Farmer, Robert A., XXXXXXXX
 Farris, James S., XXXXXXXX
 Fiddler, John F., XXXXXXXX
 Fink, Raymond O., XXXXXXXX
 Fischer, Frank C., XXXXXXXX
 Fisher, Neil, XXXXXXXX
 Flinn, Lawrence E., XXXXXXXX
 Floyd, Johnny B., XXXXXXXX
 Folks, Richard L., XXXXXXXX
 Foreman, William L., XXXXXXXX
 Frederick, John P., XXXXXXXX
 French, Teddy B., XXXXXXXX
 Frick, Roland D., XXXXXXXX
 Friedler, Paul S., XXXXXXXX
 Frigyes, Lewis, XXXXXXXX
 Gambrell, Charles E., XXXXXXXX
 Gannon, James P., XXXXXXXX
 Garcia, Robert, Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Gastner, Robert R., XXXXXXXX
 Geubtner, John J., XXXXXXXX
 Goodin, Donald D., XXXXXXXX
 Gowell, Wyewood A., XXXXXXXX
 Graczyk, Donald L., XXXXXXXX
 Graver, Charles D., XXXXXXXX
 Gray, Gary W., XXXXXXXX
 Greene, Richard S., XXXXXXXX
 Greer, George R., XXXXXXXX
 Hall, Lawrence A., XXXXXXXX
 Hamilton, Griford E., XXXXXXXX
 Hannan, Ronald D., XXXXXXXX
 Hanson, Leroy J., XXXXXXXX
 Hanson, Merrill K., XXXXXXXX
 Hardacker, Ralph J., XXXXXXXX
 Hargrove, Wilbur H., XXXXXXXX
 Harrington, Paul E., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Hauschka, Kurt C., XXXXXXXX
 Hawn, James H., XXXXXXXX
 Hayes, Frank M., XXXXXXXX
 Haynes, Emerson L., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Heberlein, Louis H., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Hickman, Raymond L., XXXXXXXX
 Hitchings, Owen L., XXXXXXXX
 Hoberman, Errol S., XXXXXXXX
 Hogan, James J., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Hollingsworth, Charles V., XXXXXXXX
 Howard, James D., XXXXXXXX
 Huestis, James A., XXXXXXXX
 Huffman, Dale B., XXXXXXXX
 Hunter, Gerald D., XXXXXXXX
 Hurst, Claude J., XXXXXXXX
 Irons, Otis E., XXXXXXXX
 Jacobs, Harvey A., XXXXXXXX
 Jangling, Robert G., XXXXXXXX
 Johnson, Albert L., XXXXXXXX
 Johnson, Jimmy L., XXXX
 Jones, Tommy B., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Kahler, Lamonte M., XXXXXXXX
 Kavanaugh, Michael J., XXXXXXXX
 Keefe, Francis D., XXXXXXXX
 Kelly, James J., XXXXXXXX
 Kenworthy, Kay H., XXXXXXXX
 Kidby, William M., XXXXXXXX
 Kimball, Frank T., XXXX
 Kingston, George, XXXX
 Kirschner, Duane W., XXXXXXXX
 Klamt, Darold A., XXXXXXXX
 Kleinrock, Bernard J., XXXX
 Knutson, Donald O., XXXXXXXX
 Kobelt, Richard W., XXXXXXXX
 Kohnke, Walter R., XXXXXXXX
 Konopka, Robert C., XXXXXXXX

Kopka, John S., III, [REDACTED]
 Koverman, William M., [REDACTED]
 Kramer, Bruce M., [REDACTED]
 Kramer, Lloyd R., [REDACTED]
 Krauss, Doyle W., [REDACTED]
 Krouse, Kleth E., [REDACTED]
 Kuczaj, Charles S., [REDACTED]
 Kusumoto, Mikio K., [REDACTED]
 Lancaster, James F., [REDACTED]
 Larochelle, Donald Z., [REDACTED]
 Larsen, Roy M., [REDACTED]
 Laughton, Roy L., [REDACTED]
 Lawler, Harold K., [REDACTED]
 Leclair, James J., [REDACTED]
 Lecroy, Roy C., [REDACTED]
 Leiker, Anthony D., [REDACTED]
 Light, Roger B., [REDACTED]
 Lincoln, Robert F., [REDACTED]
 Lindley, Thompson, [REDACTED]
 Lomas, Thomas R., [REDACTED]
 Long, Leslie C., [REDACTED]
 Lopez, Juan F., [REDACTED]
 Lundgard, Jack P., [REDACTED]
 Macumber, Lorn J., [REDACTED]
 Malberg, Carl H., [REDACTED]
 Mannex, Henry R., [REDACTED]
 Martin, David W., [REDACTED]
 May, Harold D., [REDACTED]
 Mayfield, Earl B., [REDACTED]
 McDonald, Bruce A., [REDACTED]
 McDonnell, Paul J., [REDACTED]
 McElroy, Daniel R., [REDACTED]
 McElwain, Stuart, [REDACTED]
 McIntyre, Sidney G., [REDACTED]
 McLaughlin, Howard A., [REDACTED]
 McNeff, Charles P., [REDACTED]
 McNulty, Richard C., [REDACTED]
 McWilliams, Robert E., [REDACTED]
 Meaux, Chester L., [REDACTED]
 Meese, Edward T., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Meyer, Charles M., [REDACTED]
 Mills, Wesley A., [REDACTED]
 Mollicone, James V., [REDACTED]
 Moore, David E., [REDACTED]
 Morris, Phillip M., [REDACTED]
 Mossion, Francis, [REDACTED]
 Moulton, David W., [REDACTED]
 Mundy, Charles J., [REDACTED]
 Nash, Marshall B., [REDACTED]
 Neale, Carter C., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Nelson, Gordon F., [REDACTED]
 Nutt, Donald G., [REDACTED]
 Ohr, Kenneth J., [REDACTED]
 Orozco, Raymond E., [REDACTED]
 Ostergaard, Ray D., [REDACTED]
 Palmer, Gerald F., [REDACTED]
 Pembleton, Willis E., [REDACTED]
 Perrey, Richard A., [REDACTED]
 Perry, Ben F., [REDACTED]
 Peterka, James A., [REDACTED]
 Peterson, Franklyn J., [REDACTED]
 Philibert, Aaron O., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Phillips, Charles L., [REDACTED]
 Pinson, Jim G., [REDACTED]
 Plectnik, Michael M., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Powell, Robert W., [REDACTED]
 Prah, James R., [REDACTED]
 Preciado, Willie M., [REDACTED]
 Pruss, Theodore, [REDACTED]
 Pugh, James O., [REDACTED]
 Raphael, Joseph, [REDACTED]
 Rhoads, Howard H., [REDACTED]
 Rhodes, Charles E., [REDACTED]
 Richards, James A., [REDACTED]
 Richardson, Robert R., [REDACTED]
 Roberts, John K., [REDACTED]
 Robinson, Michael N., [REDACTED]
 Robinson, Thomas J., [REDACTED]
 Robison, Jimmie J., [REDACTED]
 Roeder, David S., [REDACTED]
 Rogers, Charles E., [REDACTED]
 Rogers, Harry C. III, [REDACTED]
 Roney, Frederick D., [REDACTED]
 Roodzant, Leslie H., [REDACTED]
 Rosenhoover, Donald E., [REDACTED]
 Ruskiewicz, Daniel F., [REDACTED]
 Russin, Robert E., [REDACTED]
 Sasser, George F., [REDACTED]
 Schaub, George A., [REDACTED]
 Scheibe, Richard C., [REDACTED]
 Schnelker, David, F., [REDACTED]
 Schwartz, Steven G., [REDACTED]
 Schweske, Alfred M., [REDACTED]
 Sears, Hayden F., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Semonsky, Leo, [REDACTED]
 Sheppard, William D., [REDACTED]
 Sherlock, Harry A., [REDACTED]
 Shields, Francis S., [REDACTED]
 Shilling, Franklin L., [REDACTED]
 Sidletsky, James J., [REDACTED]
 Simpson, William A., [REDACTED]
 Sissell, Alton H., [REDACTED]
 Skaret, Garry J., [REDACTED]
 Slaven, Onva R., [REDACTED]
 Small, John D., [REDACTED]
 Smith, Dennis E., [REDACTED]
 Smith, Francis J., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Smith, Lawrence E., [REDACTED]
 Somma, Michael T., [REDACTED]
 Sproston, Marvin R., [REDACTED]
 Sproul, Lawrence G., [REDACTED]
 Steele, Russell W., [REDACTED]
 Stelman, Thomas E., [REDACTED]
 Stephens, Carroll J., [REDACTED]
 Stith, Donald D., [REDACTED]
 Stoll, Harold W., [REDACTED]
 Strine, Richard L., [REDACTED]
 Stryker, Blair C., [REDACTED]
 Sundstrom, Bryce M., [REDACTED]
 Talcott, Arnold R., [REDACTED]
 Tatum, Paul V., [REDACTED]
 Taylor, Leroy C., [REDACTED]
 Teitler, Barry M., [REDACTED]
 Thatcher, Chester H., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Thomas, Lowell R., [REDACTED]
 Thornton, Attwood F., [REDACTED]
 Tiffin, Rainford, [REDACTED]
 Tingle, Roy L., [REDACTED]
 Tobin, Louis J., [REDACTED]
 Toney, William E., [REDACTED]
 Traister, Martin S., [REDACTED]
 Tribula, Edward M., [REDACTED]
 Trolenberg, Paul E., [REDACTED]
 Truman, James G., [REDACTED]
 Tuck, Joseph E., [REDACTED]
 Urbano, Carl B., [REDACTED]
 Vanore, Armand R., [REDACTED]
 Vanvoorhis, Harry J., [REDACTED]
 Vaughn, Elmer D., [REDACTED]
 Vettel, John W., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Vickrey, Porter E., [REDACTED]
 Volpicelli, Louis R., [REDACTED]
 Wakefield, Frank E., [REDACTED]
 Walker, Ronald L., [REDACTED]
 Walker, Ronald M., [REDACTED]
 Walleit, William F., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Walters, Gary E., [REDACTED]
 Walton, Dale O., [REDACTED]
 Ward, Omer L., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Warner, Gerald A., [REDACTED]
 Weber, Wolfdieter P., [REDACTED]
 Webster, James K., [REDACTED]
 Weidinger, Lawrence J., [REDACTED]
 Weiss, Jerold L., [REDACTED]
 Welborn, Danny J., [REDACTED]
 Wells, Courtney W., [REDACTED]
 Wesche, Thomas L., [REDACTED]
 White, Farris N., [REDACTED]
 White, Florin W., Jr., [REDACTED]
 White, James M., [REDACTED]
 Whorton, William M., [REDACTED]
 Williams, Charles F., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Williams, Kenneth L., [REDACTED]
 Wilson, Thomas W., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Wilson, William P., [REDACTED]
 Wojnar, Peter J., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Wright, Susan M., [REDACTED]
 Wuehler, James G., [REDACTED]
 Yarbber, Nathan L., [REDACTED]
 Yarrigle, Robert C., [REDACTED]
 Zabel, Albert R., [REDACTED]
 Zanca, Robert F., [REDACTED]
 Zimmerman, George V., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Zingg, John A., [REDACTED]
 Alderfer, Elmer L., [REDACTED]
 Anderson, Monnie F., [REDACTED]
 Anno, Stephen E., [REDACTED]
 Ansell, Julian R., [REDACTED]
 Arner, Eugene O., [REDACTED]
 Arnold, John E., [REDACTED]
 Bailey, Ronald G., [REDACTED]
 Basinger, Jimmy R., [REDACTED]
 Bast, Paul G., [REDACTED]
 Behrendt, John M., [REDACTED]
 Bell, Donald R., [REDACTED]
 Biele, Thomas M., [REDACTED]
 Blatum, Raymond J., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Bouchard, Peter A., [REDACTED]
 Boyer, John P., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Brand, Merle A., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Brandt, William R., [REDACTED]
 Bravinder, Richard W., [REDACTED]
 Brown, Francis L., [REDACTED]
 Buchert, William J., [REDACTED]
 Buck, Richard J., [REDACTED]
 Burghoffer, Leo L., [REDACTED]
 Busico, Roger P., [REDACTED]
 Carroll, Patrick H., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Carter, Don R., [REDACTED]
 Castagno, James R., [REDACTED]
 Chapelle, Conrad A., [REDACTED]
 Cikoski, Thomas R., [REDACTED]
 Clark, Samuel L., II, [REDACTED]
 Coleman, Ronald D., [REDACTED]
 Collins, Kenneth F., [REDACTED]
 Cook, Robert, [REDACTED]
 Converse, Lowell A., [REDACTED]
 Cornish, Jeffrey M., [REDACTED]
 Crafton, Walter D., [REDACTED]
 Delay, Richard D., [REDACTED]
 Delisle, Henry, [REDACTED]
 Dempsey, Dennis T., [REDACTED]
 Domzalski, David W., [REDACTED]
 Elston, Ernest W., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Fahlberg, Keith F., [REDACTED]
 Farrow, James G., [REDACTED]
 Fletcher, John C., [REDACTED]
 Francis, William D., [REDACTED]
 Frindt, Ronald J., [REDACTED]
 Froehlich, John M., [REDACTED]
 Garza, Orlando T., [REDACTED]
 Gibson, Stanley P., [REDACTED]
 Gober, Marcus P., [REDACTED]
 Goldsmith, Maurice L., [REDACTED]
 Graham, Stuart R. G., [REDACTED]
 Greenhaw, Richard C., [REDACTED]
 Griest, Sidney H., [REDACTED]
 Gudebski, John J., [REDACTED]
 Gumble, Bruce L., [REDACTED]
 Hall, Jesse S., [REDACTED]
 Halseth, Michael J., [REDACTED]
 Hamilton, David J., [REDACTED]
 Hardenburg, Charles T., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Harris, James E., [REDACTED]
 Higgins, Michael J., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Howing, Frederick C., [REDACTED]
 Hubbard, John G., [REDACTED]
 Hutchings, Robert L., [REDACTED]
 Johnson, Albert C., [REDACTED]
 Jorgensen, Jon M., [REDACTED]
 Kennedy, Ralph L., [REDACTED]
 Kenner, Ronald P., [REDACTED]
 King, Lawrence A., [REDACTED]
 Lavery, Thomas F., [REDACTED]
 Leaseburg, Floyd E., II, [REDACTED]
 Lentz, Richard A., [REDACTED]
 Lloyd, David E., [REDACTED]
 Longstaff, Thomas W., [REDACTED]
 Luce, James G., [REDACTED]
 Mackin, James A., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Macknik, Louis S., [REDACTED]
 Masterson, Mark W., [REDACTED]
 Mathis, Ronald E., [REDACTED]
 McCallie, Marshall F., [REDACTED]
 Milburn, Michael P., [REDACTED]
 Miller, Larry G., [REDACTED]
 Miller, Theodore W., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Moore, Terry L., [REDACTED]
 Murray, Paul T., [REDACTED]
 Nagurski, Jan S., [REDACTED]
 Ogburn, Calvin M., [REDACTED]
 Olson, Duane L., [REDACTED]
 Parmley, Robert F., [REDACTED]
 Payne, Timothy J., [REDACTED]

The following distinguished graduates of the Air Force officer training school for appointment in the regular Air Force in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

Peterson, Owen K., XXXXXXXX
 Popp, Robert A., XXXXXXXX
 Porter, Charles D., XXXXXXXX
 Proppitt, Gary L., XXXXXXXX
 Przybelski, Richard T., XXXXXXXX
 Puck, Kenneth A., XXXXXXXX
 Rademacher, Richard D., XXXXXXXX
 Rhine, Kimzey W., XXXXXXXX
 Rohlf, Kent J., XXXXXXXX
 Ross, Barry J., XXXXXXXX
 Ross, Robert A., XXXXXXXX
 Rowell, Robert W., XXXXXXXX
 Rugh, Jack S., XXXXXXXX
 Schumann, George M., XXXXXXXX
 Schwabeck, Richard L., XXXXXXXX
 Scott, Francis G., XXXXXXXX
 Scott, James D., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Semegran, Michael D., XXXXXXXX
 Sheehan, Gerald W., XXXXXXXX
 Siders, Stephen R., XXXXXXXX
 Slossberg, Barry S., XXXXXXXX
 Smith, Richard E., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Souk, James E., XXXXXXXX
 Spivey, Robert P., XXXXXXXX
 Stevens, William F., XXXXXXXX
 Stevenson, Jesse R., XXXXXXXX
 Stromm, Lawrence D., XXXXXXXX
 Stump, Francis B., XXXXXXXX
 Tantillo, Donald A., XXXXXXXX
 Tempel, William F., XXXXXXXX
 Thaten, Peter R., XXXXXXXX
 Thompson, Lance L., XXXXXXXX
 Torrey, Paul F., XXXXXXXX
 Townsley, Emory, Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Turner, Ronald G., XXXXXXXX
 Wadsworth, Richard A., XXXXXXXX
 Walters, John C., XXXXXXXX
 Washburn, Carlos D., XXXXXXXX
 Weaver, Peter C., XXXXXXXX
 Wiley, James B., XXXXXXXX
 Winnik, Laurence N., XXXXXXXX
 Witt, Edwin D., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Yeager, James G., XXXXXXXX
 Younger, John R., XXXXXXXX

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC HEALTH OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Public Health of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may be permitted to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

INFORMATION CENTERS ON HOW TO AVOID THE DRAFT

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the remarks of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, I think the Members of Congress are entitled to know of the latest activities by those who would sabotage our war effort and do what they can to prevent us from defeating the Communists in Vietnam. Throughout the United States, on campuses and in cities, the Students for Democratic Society, a radical leftwing anti-Vietnam war group, are setting up draft information centers to advise the young men of America how to avoid the draft.

Competent sources tell me the people who are mixed up in this conspiracy to help our enemies are the same ones who have long been recognized as leaders in the Black Nationalist movement, the W. E. B. Dubois Clubs, the Progressive Labor Movement, and a variety of Communist front organizations. A draft information center has been established in Dallas across the street from the Texas State Fair, and one on the Southern Methodist University campus. Another draft information center is being set up in downtown Dallas.

The culmination of the Students for Democratic Society efforts to undermine our draft laws will be focused during the week of October 16. At the end of this week of planned demonstrations, on October 21, they hope to shut down the Pentagon.

I have asked the House Committee on Un-American Activities to send investigators to Dallas and other cities. I also am asking for a full-scale investigation by this committee.

TO AUTHORIZE PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF REPORT TO ACCOMPANY H.R. 7977, POSTAL REVENUE AND FEDERAL SALARY ACT OF 1967

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 934) and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 934

Resolved, That there shall be printed concurrently with the original press run, three thousand five hundred additional copies of the report to accompany H.R. 7977, the Postal Revenue and Federal Salary Act of 1967, for use by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 283]

Adams	Feighan	Morgan
Anderson, III.	Ford,	Moss
Ashley	William D.	Murphy, N.Y.
Aspinall	Fountain	O'Hara, Mich.
Brademas	Halpern	O'Konski
Brock	Hanna	Rarick
Broomfield	Holland	Rees
Button	Hosmer	Reuss
Celler	Jarman	Seiden
Clausen,	Jones, Ala.	Thomson, Wis.
Don H.	Kazen	Utt
Collier	McEwen	Williams, Miss.
Corman	Mayne	Willis
Dawson	Minshall	Wilson,
de la Garza	Mize	Charles H.
Derwinski	Moorhead	Wolff

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 387 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 478, ESTABLISHING PROCEDURES TO RELIEVE DOMESTIC INDUSTRIES AND WORKERS INJURED BY INCREASED IMPORTS FROM LOW-WAGE AREAS

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, and on behalf of the able gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN], I call up House Resolution 925 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 925

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 478) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to establish procedures to relieve domestic industries and workers injured by increased imports from low-wage areas. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 28, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God and Him only shalt thou serve.—Matthew 4: 10.

Eternal God, our Father, from whom our spirits come, with whom they live and unto whom they go when life on earth is over—in the quiet of this moment we humbly lift our hearts unto Thee in prayer. We believe in Thee with all our minds—do Thou make Thyself real to us in all our hearts. Grant unto us a song on our lips in the morning, strength for the day, good will for one another, a steadfast loyalty to our country, courage to maintain high ideals in our national life, and a faith in Thee that gives us confidence and helps us overcome the evil in the world.

Give to us an inner spirit of hospitality to that which is high in life and send us forth masters of ourselves because we are mastered by Thee. By Thy spirit of truth alive within us may we be among that company of Thy children who lift the world and do not lean upon it, and who leave it a better place in which to live. In the Redeemer's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.