Obviously, any such major change in our present rate-setting environment requires considerable study and experimentation. It may well be that the pressure of the container revolution will not permit us to wait for such major changes. At present, none of the three regulatory agencies, with certain exceptions, accept rate filings for routes which extend beyond their areas of authority. Perhaps the best approach at this moment would be enactment of permissive legislation to allow the regulatory boards to accept through-route, single-rate filings. If this approach were taken, then those members of the transportation industry which want to take full advantage of containerization would be allowed to do so, subject to rate approvals from the proper regulatory bodies.

Clearly the days ahead will require close cooperation between private industry and government if we are to be successful in making the legal adjustment necessitated by the container revolution. Regardless of what proposals eventually come forth, the various segments of the transportation industry must be prepared to face the fact that in their dealings with the regulatory agencies, business will not be done "as usual."

A few minutes ago, I expressed the hope that if and when a maritime program is proposed all interested parties will value the establishment of a sound merchant marine program more than making political points. In the same spirit, I hope that when changes in our rate structures are proposed, all interested parties will submerge any narrow interest to the greater good of making the containerization revolution as successful as possible.

And now, I want to thank you for this opportunity to discuss my "emotional" state. I suppose the persons who suffer most from the malady of mixed emotions are those who find themselves unable to do anything about what is bothering them. As I review my remarks to you, I find that happily I am not in such a predicament. For you in the business end of transportation and for me in the legislative end, this is indeed an exciting era. The problems are not insoluable, and by solving them we will help make the world a better place in which to live. No man, mixed emotions or not, can ask for a better opportunity than that.

SENATE

MONDAY, OCTOBER 2, 1967

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

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

O Thou Lord of life and light, who art the center and soul of every sphere.

Turning aside, for this hallowed moment, from the violence of these embittered days, we would hush the words of the wise and the prattle of the foolish.

In the silence of this Chamber of governance, we would hear the ancient assurance, "Be still and know that I am God."

We ask not that Thou will keep us safe in these dangerous times, but that Thou wilt keep us loyal to the starry ideals of this dear land of freedom.

By a vision of Thy eternal kingdom whose sun never sets, give us the inner strength to serve the present age.

"To be true to all truth the world denies,
Not tongue-tied by its gilded lies,
Not always right in all men's eyes,
But faithful to the light within."

For Thine is the kingdom, and the power and the glory. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, September 29, 1967, be dispensed with.

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

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT, APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on September 28, 1967, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 1657) to extend for 1 year the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to make indemnity payments to dairy farmers who are directed to remove their milk from commercial markets because it contains residues of chemicals registered and approved for use by the Federal Government.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

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

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

WAIVER OF CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the Legislative Calendar, under rule VIII, be dispensed with.

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

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider the nominations on the calendar.

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

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

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

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

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

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

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

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR HAYDEN ON HIS 90TH BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Today is a very special day for the Senate.

Today marks a milestone in the life of one of our most distinguished Members. I refer to the 90th birthday anniversary of the senior Senator from Arizona and our beloved President pro tempore.

CARL HAYDEN has achieved a great many personal milestones since entering pubic service: treasurer and later sheriff of Maricopa County in his home State when a sheriff was the law; Arizona's first Representative to Congress when it received statehood in 1912; a U.S. Senator whose 40 years of service is a record for this body and whose combined House-Senate term of 55 years is a record for Congress.

Now he has reached another milestone. I know that he would rather that the day pass quietly and with no recognition. But the veritable army of friends of CARL HAYDEN will not let it pass without some expression of affection for our senior colleague.

History will record that we do not honor Senator HAYDEN simply for his longevity. Age is a neutral quality. Rather we honor him for what he has done with the many years allotted to him. We honor him for remaining humble, compassionate, and kind when he could have been otherwise. We honor him for the selfless example which he has shown for more than half a century. Above all, we honor him for being a truly great U.S. Senator and a close personal friend.

Happy birthday, CARL.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. I thank the majority leader for his very kind words, and I hope to be around when he attains my age. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Arizona has just indicated what I meant. I thank the Chair.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I endorse everything the majority leader has said about the Senator from Arizona this

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

morning, and I should like to add that it seems pretty good to look at the President's desk and see the Senator from Arizona holding the reins over the Senate as usual. That is about all I have to say—he looks good.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. I thank the Senator.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I wish to join with all the Members of the Senate in paying well-deserved tribute to the President pro tempore of the Senate, the distinguished Senator from Arizona, CARL HAYDEN, on the occasion of his 90th birthday anniversary.

Senator HAYDEN has the great honor and distinction of having served longer in the U.S. Senate than anyone else in history. Through this long tenure, he has held many important assignments and chairmanships, and for many years has been the chairman of one of the most powerful and important committees in the U.S. Senate, the Committee on Appropriations.

Having served on this committee for 20 of my more than 22 years in the Senate, I have become quite close to CARL HAYDEN and have had the opportunity to evaluate his work on the committee. CARL HAYDEN has handled this very difficult assignment in a most capable, efficient, and diligent manner. He has earned the respect of everyone who has served with him.

CARL HAYDEN'S contribution to his State and the Nation during his tenure, the longest tenure of anyone who has served in Congress, has been immeasurable. One of the greatest of all his contributions has been his stanch, steadfast, and powerful support of reclamation for the West. The great empire that has been built in the Western States during his service in Congress would never have been possible had it not been for his effective efforts in bringing all-important water to this vast area.

One really has to know CARL HAYDEN to understand why it was possible for one man to accomplish so much in nearly a lifetime of service in the Senate and why the people of his State have continuously elected him to public office since his youth.

The great respect and loyalty he enjoys from everyone who has come to know him is well deserved. He is completely honest in everything he does. He is a highly intelligent legislator and has a long record of service and good judgment. No Member of this body has been more faithful to his duties as a Senator than he.

CARL HAYDEN has won the admiration and respect of his fellow men as few people in this body have ever been able to do. I count him as one of the best and most respected friends I have ever had. He has helped me to be a better Senator.

I congratulate our friend on this, his 90th birthday. This is a great day for the State of Arizona and the entire Nation—and more especially for the U.S. Senate and CARL HAYDEN.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with other Members of the Senate in extending felicitations and best wishes to our colleague, CARL HAYDEN, on this, his birthday anniversary.

The distinguished Senator from Arizona has through his many years of service in Congress endeared himself to all of us.

He is truly a westerner, and never at any time has he failed or faltered in support of programs effecting that great area. Coming as I do from the Midwest, I personally know of many programs and projects that, as history is written, will carry the CARL HAYDEN label.

Time and again I have gone to the distinguished Senator from Arizona with projects and problems in my own State of Kansas, and on those occasions I always received the most sympathetic consideration. I am deeply indebted to him.

It is a privilege and a pleasure to serve and work with CARL HAYDEN. Congratulations and best wishes.

Mr. HILL. I join with my colleagues in paying tribute to our friend, Senator HAYDEN, the President pro tempore of the Senate.

I was first privileged to know CARL HAYDEN when I came to the House of Representatives in 1923, more than 44 years ago. Through the years, he has given me his friendship, always so kind, always so sympathetic, always so understanding, and always most helpful. In fact, when I think of him and his friendship, I think of the words of Ralph Waldo Emerson: "A friend may well be reckoned the masterpiece of Nature."

Since I became a Member of the Senate, I have been privileged to serve on the Committee on Appropriations, most of the time under his chairmanship. I have seen and I have witnessed his wisdom and his uncommon commonsense. I have seen his vision, his indefatigable work for our country and its people, his dedication and devotion to the cause of our people and our country.

Surely I am proud today to pay tribute to this wonderful man who has a record the like of which I know of no other man in all of the history of our country to have. I do not think that history will show any other man who has served in Congress for 55 years, the length of service of the Senator from Arizona.

It is a great tribute to the people of Arizona that they had the wisdom, the knowledge, and good sense to keep CARL HAYDEN here in the Senate all these many years.

It is an honor and a privilege for me to pay tribute to him and his magnificent service to our country and our people.

It has been said that character is that which draws a man to God and which draws other men to him. Surely no man has displayed or shown greater character than has our friend from Arizona, CARL HAYDEN.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. It gives me a great deal of pleasure at this time to join with Senators in paying tribute to my good friend and colleague, Senator HAYDEN. I have not been a Member of the Senate as many years as other Senators who have spoken and who will speak this morning.

No Member of the Senate has ever come to this body and enjoyed the friendship of other Senators more than has Senator HAYDEN. It has been my privilege to be associated with him on the Committee on Rules and Administration ever since I became a member of that committee. For a good many years I have been the chairman of that committee. The Senator from Arizona is the ranking member of that committee and no other man could have been more helpful or more sympathetic or have used a better guiding hand than he does in helping me to run that great committee.

I am also a member of the Joint Committee on Printing, of which his is chairman. This morning we went to the Government Printing Office to see put into operation a great new printing process which has taken 3 to 4 years to develop and make possible the rapid printing which is taking place in the Government Printing Office.

Through Senator HAYDEN'S wise counsel, and through his foresight, it was made possible to have this process developed and placed in operation. It will save taxpayers hundreds of thousands of dollars in the future, while doing better work more quickly.

Senator HAYDEN is always alert to the needs of the people and he acts quickly and sympathetically.

I wish to join with all of my friends in wishing Senator HAYDEN the happiest of birthdays and that he will be with us for many years in the future.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am happy to join my colleagues today in saluting one of the Nation's most devoted servants as he reaches the ripe young age of fourscore and ten.

As a Senator from Florida, I have had the distinct pleasure of serving on the Appropriations Committee under Senator HAYDEN'S forceful leadership since the beginning of the 84th Congress.

He served in the House of Representatives from February 19, 1912, when the State of Arizona first entered the Union, to March 3, 1927. He did not seek reelection to the House as he became a candidate for the U.S. Senate, being elected to this body in 1926, where he has been a stalwart, devoted to the betterment of the Nation as a whole and of the fine State from which he comes and which he has so ably represented in the Congress throughout the past 55 years.

He has been a member of the Committee on Appropriations throughout his service in the Senate, having served under such able chairmen as Francis E. Warren, Wesley L. Jones, Frederick Hale, Carter Glass, Styles Bridges, and Kenneth McKellar, prior to his assuming the chairmanship of the committee in the 84th Congress, which incidentally was the same time that I was honored by becoming a junior member of the committee.

The respect his colleagues hold for him is indicated by his election as President pro tempore of the Senate in 1957, at the start of the 85th Congress and each succeeding Congress thereafter.

During his fruitful and rewarding career both to the State of Arizona and to the Nation as a public servant, he has served some 55 years in Congress and an additional 10 years as a member of the

Tempe Town Council, treasurer of Maricopa County, or as sheriff.

I might add that this wonderful individual, whom I, and I know my colleagues, one and all, hold in the highest esteem, not only has been my senior in the Senate, but he was commissioned in the infantry during World War I as a major, while I attained the rank of captain.

On this day, Mr. President, I wish to join with my colleagues in the Senate to salute a statesman, a man of courage and convictions, and a man who has earned the gratitude of all America. I wish my distinguished chairman and the President pro tempore of the Senate, the senior Senator from Arizona, CARL HAYDEN, many happy returns on this day which denotes another milestone in his most productive life, and wish him continued happiness in the years ahead.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, it is with great pride and pleasure that I take this occasion to extend my best wishes to the distinguished President pro tempore and senior Senator from Arizona, upon the celebration of his 90th birthday anniversary.

Throughout Arizona statehood, he has served in Congress with unparalled honor and distinction. His record in Congress is a tribute to the people of his State and an honor to a grateful Nation.

CARL HAYDEN is a humble man. He is an extremely honorable and intelligent Senator. I know that no Member of this body has been more respected since I have been a member than has Senator HAYDEN. He is respected because of his character and ability. CARL HAYDEN is one of the great Senators of the 20th century. He has served with honor and distinction both the people of Arizona and the entire American people.

On behalf of the people of Mississippi, I salute a trusted friend, a powerful statesman, and a great American. We wish for him many more years of successful tenure in the Senate.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, there is a great deal that I could add to what has already been said about our longtime friend from Arizona. I could stand here all afternoon and talk about personal recollections in my long years of service with him.

He and I have been neighbors for many, many years in the Senate Office Building. The old first floor in the Old Senate Office Building is becoming known as "Hayden's Haven."

I have been privileged to serve with Senator HAYDEN and to know him personally all these years. I know that everyone today will talk about his long service in the Senate, his service to the Nation, and his many, many accomplishments. However, I shall always remember CARL HAYDEN and always think of him and his work here in terms of what he has done for the West. I know of no man who could point out any one person who has done more for the development of the great natural resources of the West than CARL HAYDEN. On his 90th birthday, I wish him many, many more years.

He has been the father, the author, the sparkplug, the moving factor in much of the great development which has taken place in the West. He never confined himself only to one State. He has been helpful throughout the West in developing many of the resources which have now become facts, more to become facts, and which have added greatly to the wealth and security of our country.

I do not like to admit it, but actually CARL HAYDEN was the father of the Grand Coulee Dam. He would always tell my constituents that I helped him to begin it, but he was the one who got it started. He was the one who aided Wesley Jones, who was mentioned here and who was one of the chairmen of the Appropriations Committee, and former Senator C. C. Dill, who always visits CARL HAYDEN when he comes to Washington. They often talk about the beginning of that great project. But I could go on and on throughout the West and show that CARL HAYDEN has never confined himself. He has been interested in the fields of irrigation and reclamation, and lately in the field of hydroelectric power development, all over the country.

During the long career of CARL HAYDEN—and I wish him a still longer career in the future—there have been some great monuments to him. I do not know what more I could add, but he must feel very proud of them. Rewards in politics are often intangible, but CARL HAYDEN can go around this country and point out literally scores of dams, reclamation projects, flood-control projects, and water-resources developments which are right now in existence. Everyone can look at them.

Mr. President, it must give you great satisfaction to know that you have done such a great job for the people of this country. I salute you on your 90th birthday.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, it is my pleasure today to join with Senators on both sides of the aisle in observing a most significant and happy event: the birthday of our greatly esteemed President pro tempore, CARL HAYDEN.

The Senator from Arizona has the unique distinction of having served in Congress as a representative from Arizona since the State was admitted to the Union in 1912, 55 years ago—longer than any other person has served in Congress.

He has been the dean of the Senate since 1957. Over these many years, he has earned a special place in the hearts of all of us by his unswerving devotion to duty and to the interests of his country.

It is most appropriate and particularly fitting today, at a time when there are those who would cast doubts upon the honor and integrity of the Senate and some of its respected Members, to honor a man of such dedicated purpose, unquestioned integrity, and proven honor.

Mr. President, it has been my great privilege to serve on the Committee on Appropriations with the Senator from Arizona for the past 18 years, and for many of those years under his able chairmanship.

Thus, I proudly join with Senators in saluting a man who is deeply respected and admired by us all.

His friendship, his quiet dignity, his stature as a national figure, and his statesmanship have been an inspiration to me and to all other Members of this body. His record is one which not only we, his colleagues of today, but all who may follow after us as Members of this body, may well and profitably emulate.

Very proudly I join my colleagues in saluting him today. It is my wish for him that he may have many, many more such happy and meaningful occasions.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, this is a remarkable day—in the remarkable life—of a remarkable man. Today marks the 90th birthday in the long, full, and productive life of one of our Nation's greatest statesmen—Senator CARL HAYDEN.

We who have been privileged to serve with Senator HAYDEN can only be thankful we have known this great American. We have been the beneficiaries of his wise counsel and gracious spirit. We have been moved by his steadfast dedication and will.

The Nation is better for the life of CARL HAYDEN. He has served his country with determination in a career that has had no equal. In every corner of the country his imprint has been deeply etched. He has been a constructive force for the betterment of civilization and humanity. Under his leadership, the country has grown strong and our people have enjoyed the fruits of his dedicated labor.

Mr. President, I salute CARL HAYDEN, a great American and a great human being. I hope that he will be with us to share his wisdom and wit, his vision and courage for many years to come.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, almost always a knowledge of history comes from what we read; but here today, on the occasion of the 90th birthday anniversary of the present occupant of the Chair, the President pro tempore, the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], we have history in visible form.

The Presiding Officer, the President pro tempore of the Senate, the senior Senator from Arizona, CARL HAYDEN, entered Congress when we were living in a different kind of world and the problems and the needs were different.

I know of no man who could have adjusted himself with more deftness to the profound changes which have come over the world since he first came to Congress to represent Arizona than he.

His achievements on behalf of his own State and on behalf of the Nation are great. The West bloomed because of him. The country is a better one for his having lived with us.

Mr. President, some people, when they have many more or fewer years than does Senator HAYDEN, have a remarkable memory for events of long ago, but their memory for yesterday is deficient. That is not true of the man we speak about today as he observes his 90th birthday. Once more this year, I had occasion to recognize that fact because, although I was not as faithful in my attendance at the Interior Department Appropriations Subcommittee hearings as was Senator HAYDEN, I nevertheless was there very frequently. Once again I was impressed with the marvelous capacity of this great

man to recognize what had occurred long ago and what had happened last week.

When I first became a Member of the Senate, Senator HAYDEN gave me some advice. He said, "Speak only when it is necessary." I have tried to follow that advice, but today it is necessary to speak, and I do speak.

We salute the distinguished Senator from Arizona as he observes his 90th birthday.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, not much can be added to what has been said about CARL HAYDEN's political career. All will agree that it is a far cry from CARL HAYDEN, Tempe Town councilman, his first elective office, to CARL HAYDEN, President pro tempore of the greatest deliberative body in the world. He has been able to attain this latter distinction of high honor because he was elected and reelected, time and again, by the grateful people of a sovereign State. What greater tribute can be paid to CARL HAYDEN than the fact that he has been elected for seven consecutive terms a Member of the Senate.

He was almost 60 years of age when I was sworn in as a Senator over 30 years ago. I was proud to join with him in the fight to develop, protect, and preserve our two most important natural resources—land and water. He worked through the Interior and Appropriation Committees and I through the Agriculture and Forestry and Appropriation Committees. We saw eye to eye on problems affecting our land and water resources and teamed up to help solve them.

As my good friend from the State of Washington stated, I doubt that any man in the Senate has done more to develop the West, agriculturally as well as industrially, than the man whose birthday we are celebrating today.

CARL HAYDEN fostered legislation in the Congress that made it possible to harness our water resources and make them work for the benefit of the people. No greater tribute can be extended to our colleague, as a legislator, than his work in having Congress authorize the construction of great dams in the Southwest and the Northwest, behind which the waters of our great rivers were impounded and made useful to the people, in the providing of electricity, reclamation, and navigation.

Today I am glad to join all my colleagues in extending to you, CARL, a happy birthday and a wish that you may have many more.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, rather than consider you as something detached in the third person, I thought I would talk to you personally for a minute on your 90th birthday.

First of all, to accomplish 90 years is quite an achievement in itself. The world is so full of bugs and aches and pains and maladies of all kinds that when a man has accomplished fourscore and ten, he has done quite a job. It reminds me of that abbe during the French Revolution. A French friend saw him sometime later, and he said, "What did you do during the Revolution?" He said, "I lived."

And so, you see, you have lived. That is an accomplishment in itself.

Anniversaries are something special. You stand on this pinnacle, and you look back and you look around and you look into the future. Some people do not like to look back. I do.

CARL, you were born in October 1877. You were in the cradle when Rutherford Hayes was President of the United States. I presume your only interest in tactics and strategy was to maneuver a milk bottle into your mouth in that year, when you were born.

I would like to go back and pick up the stitches of history. Sometimes they remind me of the story of the man who went into a restaurant and tied a napkin around his neck, and when the waiter came, said, "What kind of soup do you have?" He said, "Ox tail." He said, "Well, why go back that far?" [Laughter.]

Well, I like to go back that far—1877.

Your life extends over the tenure of 18 Presidents of the United States and, of course, 90 years means that the earth has gone around the sun 90 times. Every time the earth makes a journey around the sun, we call it a year. So this old ball we live on has spun around that sun 90 different times since you came on to this globe.

So I point out that that is an accomplishment in itself. You have been through wars and through depressions and all the economic dislocations of the country, and I am delighted to note that the hand and the chisel of Father Time have dealt so very gently and generously with you. And I think your smile is just as infectious and just as warm as it was when you were probably 40 or 50 or much younger.

Now, as I think back, I think of others, because you have accomplished so much, particularly in the later years of life. So did Adenauer when he became the Chancellor of Germany. So did Winston Churchill, who became the Prime Minister of his country. So did Theodore Green when he was a Member of this body and had a long and very useful tenure.

I am not sure, CARL, that I am going to live that long. I am getting there, of course, but one can never be sure. But for you I wish many other gentle and fruitful years and that same delight of living, that same smile, and that same exuberance of spirit that have been so manifest in the Senate. You have been like a lighted candle in a dark place for a long, long time.

And so, along with my other colleagues, in the Senate, I salute you so warmly, with respect, and, more than that, with affection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I, too, wish to express my congratulations to the Senator from Arizona on his birthday.

It has been my good fortune to be his neighbor. My office is just one removed from his. Nearly every day I walk with him and ride with him to and from the Senate Chamber. I have enjoyed and have been the beneficiary of his counsel, his advice, and his friendship.

I remember that a few years ago, at a convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, a dinner was given in honor of our distinguished fellow Senator. I remember very well his speech. He traced the history of his family, his father, and his grandfather back through the years as they had lived in different areas of the country. As I recall, his father, his grandfather, and his great grandfather spanned the whole history of our Nation.

I remember that he told a story of the time when, as a young boy, he lay on a hill in his native State—not yet then a State—and saw Indian smoke signals on the horizon.

The story of his life, in a significant way, is the story of the America to which he has contributed so much. I remember, a number of years ago, in my home State, reading of the Hayden-Cartwright bill, which was the foundation of the legislation which is responsible for the great highway system of America. Of course, there have been many other bills which bore his name and have contributed much to the development of our country.

So today I express my congratulations and good wishes to him, and my appreciation for the friendship that he has so generously given me.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I want my statement, too, to be a part of the RECORD today. I want to express my congratulations to our distinguished President pro tempore on this, the 90th anniversary of his birth. He has the respect of all of us.

I cannot add to what has been said about his record. I merely wish to pay my tribute to him, to congratulate him, and to wish him a happy birthday.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the remarks that have been made by other Senators in tribute to a man whose career is unique in the history of the United States. Our beloved colleague has the respect of everyone with whom he has served. For he exemplifies spotless character and integrity. During the years that I have served in the executive and legislative branches, Senator HAYDEN has contributed at least as much to the Senate as any American living today.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, CARL HAYDEN is the most envied man in the Senate today. I would expect that practically every Senator would like to arrive at the mature age that Senator HAYDEN has reached, and still be in the Senate, still serving his constituents and his country, as effectively as CARL HAYDEN does.

Our Presiding Officer's life spans the years from the Frontier West to the Space Age. He has taken pains to accumulate and use the wisdom and experience that have come his way.

In the fall of 1927, when I was very young, I went to El Paso, Tex. The Presiding Officer had been sworn into the U.S. Senate in March of that year. At that time, the conservation of water was the uppermost question in the West. It was relatively new then; there were few dams and few projects.

Just above El Paso was the Elephant Butte Dam. The distinguished Presiding Officer of the Senate had gone to the House of Representatives in 1912. He had been a pioneer in water conservation during that 15 years in the House; and, with all due respect to the great Senators

then serving from Texas, when I went to El Paso in 1927, CARL HAYDEN's name was repeated and mentioned more times in El Paso than the names of either of our Senators from Texas.

For he, to the West, meant water. And water meant the thread of life itself. They told me, when I went out there, how a few years before, before the construction of the first great dam on the Rio Grande River, the Elephant Butte Dam, they had disastrous floods along the Rio Grande a few months of the year, and all the rest of the year famine and drought. Since that first great project was built, water has flowed past El Paso in the Rio Grande every single day. And that city has less than 8 inches of rainfall a year.

Many of the problems of the western part of Texas are the same problems faced by Arizona, also a border State having an international boundary. Two-thirds of our State has little rainfall and a scarcity of water, as is the condition of most of Arizona. The distinguished Presiding Officer met that problem; and for 35 years he has contributed his talents and his genius in Congress to helping to build the West and solve its problems.

I think our two States are tied very closely together. El Paso is less than half of New Mexico's width away from Arizona's border. The first stage line, the Butterfield Stage Line, had tied the Territory of Arizona and the State of Texas closely together before the Civil War; and after that, the Southern Pacific Railroad, the main route of travel through the southern part of my State and through Arizona, also tied the two States together. So at least half of my State has felt close to the Senator's State, and has kept up with his career throughout the years.

Mr. President, my father lived to be more than 100 years of age. At 95 years of age, he was giving us wise counsel and sage advice. Coming from a family with a history of some longevity, I appreciate sitting on the Appropriations Committee and observing the deft manner with which the chairman listens to the evidence and, just at the right moment, stops the argument and puts the question to the committee. I have never seen a Senator who had a finer sense of timing—especially on that 26-man committee, not easily run—than the Senator from Arizona.

Earlier this year, as a member of the Potomac Corral of Westerners, it was my honor to be one of the sponsors of a dinner at which the Senator from Arizona was given the title "Westerner of the Year." He had already long since earned it. When I went to El Paso, they were talking about his services as sheriff of his county in Arizona, and being the champion rifleman of the United States. The distinguished Presiding Officer was a true westerner, a sheriff in a country that was tough.

Yes, he was a real westerner. To all of us, he is senior Senator from Arizona, he is the senior Member of Congress, he is President pro tempore, and he is preeminent over us all; but in the West, they speak of him primarily as CARL HAYDEN, a real westerner, personifying the legends of the American West. While such men continue to be born and raised to eminence in the United States, the proud traditions which we westerners honor will continue to live and grow. It is an honor to serve in a body presided over by the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, when I first came to the Senate, 11 years ago, I received some sage advice from the distinguished Presiding Officer and the President pro tempore of this body, the senior Senator from Arizona. He said to me:

> Young man, you can always explain a vote, but it is not always easy to explain away a speech.

I have since learned, sometimes to my sorrow, the wisdom of that advice.

As he reaches his 90th year, CARL HAYDEN sets a record not likely to be equaled again in the history of Congress. He has represented Arizona in Congress ever since its statehood, over a span of more than half a century. During that period, no Member of this body has contributed more to the building of the West.

I wish to say, as a fellow westerner who takes much pride in his friendship and association with CARL HAYDEN, that it gives me great pleasure to join with my fellow Senators in wishing him a very happy birthday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair thanks the Senators who have made such fine remarks about him. All Senators have violated the 3-minute rule. But I forgive them for it.

I wish that all of them may remain in the Senate as long as I have. I shall now abandon the chair and return to my seat on the floor of the Senate.

(At this point Senator MCGOVERN assumed the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, with real enthusiasm I tender my heartfelt congratulations to a great American as he reaches his 90th birthday. And I say to the dean of the Senate that those sentiments are shared by my wife, who respects the senior Senator from Arizona as do I, and by my mother who, in almost her 97th year, salutes her young friend and wishes him Godspeed for many, many more years of constructive service to the people of the United States and to the people of his beloved Arizona.

One may not think so, but as a Californian, I am particularly proud of that branch of my family which lives in Arizona. Years ago, when Arizona was a territory, one of my mother's younger brothers was a member of the territorial legislature, and he and CARL HAYDEN were friends. I flatter myself that that friendship has endured through the years and comes to me by way of inheritance.

For the last few Congresses, it has been my honor to serve on the Committee on Appropriations. There I have seen the consummate skill with which the Senate's dean has discharged his official labors in what is perhaps the most important chore of any Senate committee. Here, clearly seen, are all the abilities that a long lifetime of legislative service has given to him. Here, also, are clearly demonstrated the kindness and the helpfulness by which Senator HAYDEN eases the path which his colleagues, Democrats and Republicans both, tread in their public service.

I can testify to many occasions when this kindly, humble man of integrity and principle has helped my State and me. Indeed, an occasional vexing disagreement to the contrary notwithstanding, the senior Senator from Arizona has been in his years in the Senate a third Senator for the people of California. And again and again, were it not for CARL HAYDEN, progress legislatively in this Chamber for those whom I am honored to represent, in part, would not have been made.

So, on this occasion I salute with very great pride one whom I call my friend and one of the great American Senators of all times.

A skill among many is his facility in Spanish. In the Spanish language, "Don" constitutes a term of high respect when applied to another. I always have used this word in addressing CARL HAYDEN. No one I know is more deserving of such respect. So with the rest of his colleagues, on this occasion of his 90th birthday, I, too, rise to say to my good friend: "Happy birthday, Don CARLOS, and may you enjoy many more years of additional happy and constructive service to all the people."

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, it must be a wonderful thing to have, as a young man, represented a territory; to recall those days of stepchildhood, which in the case of Arizona lasted from the 1840's until 1912; then to have seen that beautiful and lovely area become a State; and then in the 55 years thereafter, until today, to play so large a part in seeing Arizona grow and develop and enjoy a place of full equality with her sister States.

It must be a source of great satisfaction and pride to have uniquely in the history of Congress played so large a part in the story of any State and, indeed, of the Nation. No one has ever equalled that record for length and quality of service. Nor is anyone likely to do it again.

Our greetings to you, CARL, are based on our affection, our love, and our respect for you on the happy occasion of your 90th birthday.

It is appropriately signalized in this Chamber where you have served so long and so well, and where you are loved and admired by all, to wish for you many more years of fruitful endeavor as a public servant, the profession to which you bring such great honor.

No Member of Congress has seen so many changes as you have in your public service or has done so much to bring about those beneficial changes which we signalize as progress and to which you contributed.

You come from the most southwesterly part of the Nation, and it is a pleasure for one elected to represent the most northwesterly part of the Nation to point out that although we may be separated quite a distance by latitude, we are still a part of the great West which has played a major part in American history since the western march of our people who first crossed the uncharted seas of the Atlantic, and then traveled across the Appalachian Mountains and the plains and then across the Rockies to fulfill the great destiny of our Nation.

No one in the history of the Congress

has played so great a part as has the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN] would like to be recognized last. For that reason, he has graciously yielded to me.

I serve under Senator HAYDEN as a member of the Committee on Appropriations. I congratulate him for his unique sense of looking at the present and the future, rather than the past. It is a real inspiration to all of us on the committee to observe the alertness, the interest, and sometimes, indeed, the passionate intensity with which he addresses himself to so many of the problems which come before the committee. This is refreshing and exciting, indeed, to many of us who seem far more tired than he does.

I really feel very deeply that not only Senator HAYDEN himself, but also his whole family and all of those who look to him as "Daddy," should take great pride in his alertness, interest, and sense of involvement which show a tremendous capacity of human personality as reflected by so distinguished and so unusual a man as our President pro tempore.

So I join with all my colleagues in bespeaking for him continued years of health and happiness and success, and especially admiring the inspiration he represents to us, to those of his State, and to his own family.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, it is very difficult to express adequately the respect and admiration which all of us have for Senator HAYDEN. He has been here longer than any of us, although I have been here quite a long time. But we all have developed, over the years, such respect for his judgment and affection for him personally that it is difficult to put it into words as it should be.

I have a rather special interest in CARL HAYDEN, because his mother came from my State—Forrest City, Ark.

CARL HAYDEN has been in Congress so long, and so many people have said so many things favorable to him, that it is difficult to think of anything new. He has made a tremendous contribution to the development of this country, in his sponsorship of the progressive and farseeing programs which all of us, in every State, have enjoyed. Certainly, in my State, which was one of the underdeveloped States, his assistance in obtaining the cooperation of the Federal Government through his great committee has been indispensable.

The living proof of the good judgment of CARL HAYDEN can be seen in his sponsorship of these programs, when we consider the great progress that has been made by the people in my State, and it could have not been achieved without the cooperation of the Federal Government, for which CARL HAYDEN is to a very great extent responsible.

I particularly recall when I was a freshman in this body, which was nearly 25 years ago, how helpful and patient he was with a new Member. This is always deeply appreciated by new Senators; and to have a man of his prestige, stature, and influence befriend one is extremely valuable and helpful.

So I join all my colleagues in offering our sincere congratulations to CARL HAYDEN, not only on his birthday as such, but also for the great contribution he has made to the Senate as an institution and to our country as a great democratic country.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I would not forgo the opportunity to pay my personal respects to the dean of us all, the senior Senator from the State of Arizona, CARL HAYDEN.

Even though at times we become embroiled in honest disagreement over an issue of vital importance to our respective States, what man among us could fail to be inspired by a record of service to State and Nation unsurpassed in the annals of our history? What man among us has not benefited from CARL HAYDEN'S counsel and good judgment at one time or another during our service with this wise and gentle Senator?

Personally, I know of no man for whom I have greater personal affection; and as he enters his 91st year, I would indeed be remiss if I did not express to him that affection and my gratitude for his many and varied contributions to the Nation as a whole and particularly to that section of our country to which he and I are both so dedicated—the West.

We all admire you, CARL; we all respect you for the record of service you have made in Government, and particularly the Senate, and we all celebrate with you, CARL, in hopes that your future will be as fruitful as the past. Congratulations and may the good Lord, in His eternal wisdom, bless and reward you for all you have done.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the indefatigable pursuit of his work, his ineluctable dedication to duty, his unexcelled record of service, have all constituted an example which to me, as one of the newer Members of this body, is as a "pearl of great price in a chalice of silver."

I have served 9 years on the Committee on Appropriations, of which this great Senator is chairman, and he has always been considerate and helpful to me.

So I join with my colleagues today in congratulating Senator HAYDEN on his long period of sacrifice and service to the Senate, to his constituents, and to the Nation. I am glad that he has gone beyond the span promised by the psalmist who said:

> The days of our years are three-score years and ten; and if by reason of strength they be four-score years, yet is their strength labor and sorrow; for it is soon cut off, and we fly away.

My colleagues have said everything that I would wish to say, and they have said it in more eloquent words than I could have expressed.

So, Mr. President, I shall be content with recalling the simple lines of a poet, when I say to CARL HAYDEN:

> Count your garden by the flowers,
> Never by the leaves that fall.
> Count your days by the sunny hours,
> Not remembering clouds at all.
> Count your nights by stars, not shadows.
> Count your life by smiles, not tears.
> And on this beautiful October afternoon,
> Count your age by friends, not years.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I would not want this occasion to pass without paying my own warm, personal tribute to the senior Senator from Arizona.

I have been privileged to know him for many years—long before I came to Congress, as a matter of fact. I first met him in my capacity as attorney general of Nevada, when I represented the State of Nevada in many of its water problems—and certainly the history of the West must be written, in part, around the water problems of that area and the honest efforts of men trying to solve them.

No man ever contributed more and continues to contribute more to that hopeful day when the problems of the Colorado River will finally be solved than the man we honor today.

A compact was entered into in 1922 in Santa Fe, N. Mex., to settle water rights of the seven southwestern Colorado River Basin States. Even today, some 45 years later, we still have the problems unsolved in their entirety. However, great and worthwhile progress has been made.

The senior Senator from Arizona, whom we honor on his birthday today, was in the forefront of the champions to bring water to the starving acres of his State. I salute the senior Senator from Arizona for the constant attention he has given to this endeavor over the many years.

As has been said so well and so much better than I can say it, today we salute one of God's noblemen whose contributions are legend, whose compassion and understanding of the people of the Nation are the greatest.

I have been privileged to serve on the Committee on Appropriations since I came to the Senate. The guidance and help of the senior Senator from Arizona has been of inestimable worth and value to each of us as he showed the great skill that has come to him, which is through a native intelligence, training, and education, and then, in the hard school of experience. Certainly he has had that experience in Congress and has written record after record of great achievements.

Our words here today, however eloquent, will remain in the long shadow cast by CARL HAYDEN'S towering record of accomplishment. It is a record that speaks for itself. It is a monument to the great works of a great man.

It has been one of the great privileges of my service in the Senate to know CARL HAYDEN. My affection and respect for him derives not so much from his record of service—the longest in the history of Congress—but from the fact he has used these years of service so productively.

All of us—each American—owes a tremendous debt of gratitude to the Senator from Arizona.

I salute the senior Senator from Arizona and I wish for him the very happiest returns.

Mr. President, at this time I wish to read a statement on behalf of another distinguished colleague from the southwestern part of the country. The Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] could not be here today because he is in his State on official business.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MOSS READ BY SENATOR BIBLE

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, it is an honor to be able, at this time, to join my colleagues in extending a personal salute to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

It is known to all that Senator HAYDEN has filled with honor and distinction for many decades positions of deep responsibility to his State and the Nation. Countless Members of Congress have received his wise counsel and assistance over the years that the Senator has faithfully performed the duties of high elected office.

The Senator from Arizona has, since first being elected to represent his State in Congress, made it a personal policy to make friends easily and keep them permanently. He has long been a courageous fighter who has never been willing to sacrifice principle for political expediency.

I humbly offer my personal wishes for his continued health and vitality as he celebrates his 90th birthday. I count the Senator as a dear friend whose association has been enjoyed for many years and which will be similarly enjoyed in the near future.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I know that the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] will couple that statement with a warm handclasp to the Senator from Arizona when he returns to the Nation's Capital in the next several days.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, I ask that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] be recognized, so that he may speak on this subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HART in the chair). The Senator from Connecticut is recognized.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I am honored and pleased to have the opportunity to join other Senators in paying tribute to the "first Senator," our beloved CARL HAYDEN, on his 90th birthday.

As has been said here today, Senator HAYDEN not only is the dean of the Senate, but he has served longer than any other Member of the entire Congress. A one-time sheriff of Maricopa County, he has fought as hard in the Senate for what he believes in as he did for law and justice in the days of the frontier.

But CARL HAYDEN is much more. He is a man of wisdom, integrity, and personal warmth, a Senator whose counsel has been often sought and has always been ready to assist or advise any of his colleagues.

We have a special interest in him in Connecticut, because his roots are in Connecticut. His father's roots were in Connecticut, for he was born in Hartford County, a good many years ago, and he is still remembered there. Hayden's Landing on the Connecticut River is well known and a well marked place, and a revered one.

I wish to join other Senators in paying tribute on this happy birthday to the Senator from Arizona. My prayers and my deepest affections are with him today.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, it is a very great privilege for me to have the opportunity to join Senators in presenting birthday greetings to my senior colleague from Arizona. I, too, am very proud of his many achievements which have been discussed by my colleagues.

I want all Senators to know that Arizona began to celebrate his birthday on Saturday of last week. On that day his hometown college, Arizona State University, hailed the occasion by drubbing a tough University of Wisconsin football team 42 to 16. Arizona State, which has often honored him, has recently named a library after the Hayden family and the senior Senator from Arizona was the speaker at the dedication of that library. In addition his University of Arizona, which likewise honors him, traveled to Ohio, a State where Senator HAYDEN had displayed his superb skills for many years in rifle matches, and there defeated another formidable Big Ten team, Ohio State University, by a score of 14 to 7.

Arizonans are so very, very proud of our distinguished colleague and have shown their pride in many instances for his great accomplishments. They take pride in his being a great American and a person who has unselfishly given of his time in public service throughout the years.

Other States share this feeling as was noted by the Senator from California. Senator HAYDEN's school in California, Stanford University, named him Man of the Year this past year. To have these schools recognize his great contributions is testimony to his stature.

All of us in Arizona wish CARL HAYDEN well. We honor him as a personal friend, as a public servant over these many years, and a dedicated American. I wish him a happy 90th birthday and good health in the years to come.

As is generally known Senator HAYDEN has served in Congress longer than any other man, continuously since 1912. This is a remarkable and enviable record. But more important, even, than his years of service is his contribution to Arizona and to the Nation generally. He has served them faithfully and well.

CARL HAYDEN has represented Arizona in Congress since, in 1912, the territory became the 48th State. And during these years, he has seen the State grow with remarkable speed, so much so that it today bears little resemblance, except in its unmatched beauty, to CARL HAYDEN'S birthplace. Thriving cities now dot the once-barren landscape, modern highways and roads traverse the State, once desert lands have been made productive, industry and commerce continue to grow in importance and thousands of new residents flock to the State each year. Yet Arizona has retained much of the charm it held for CARL HAYDEN as a young man.

In the Nation at large, the change that CARL HAYDEN has seen—the change he has helped to bring about—has been equally spectacular. In almost every sense—militarily, economically, socially and culturally—America is a stronger Nation, a better Nation, than she was at the start of this century.

There have been in the past, as there are today, Members of Congress who have been more widely known than the man whose birthday we are celebrating. But few if any Members have been, or are, more widely respected than CARL HAYDEN, particularly among our colleagues in the House and Senate. Quietly, but very effectively, he has done the job for which he has time and again been elected: first, as treasurer of Maricopa County, Ariz.; next as county sheriff; eight times as a Member of the House of Representatives; and seven times as a Senator.

He has worked with equal enthusiasm for the interests of Arizonans and for the rights of all Americans.

And as chairman of the powerful Appropriations Committee, he has consistently put the Nation's interests above all others, including his own.

If ever a man personified the essential goodness of democratic government, CARL HAYDEN is the man: selfless and dedicated, honest and fair, interested and interesting. His life is a study in American government, a mirror of America herself.

I honor CARL HAYDEN.

A personal friend.

A faithful public servant.

A dedicated American.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, it is a pleasure for me to extend my personal congratulations and the congratulations of the people of the State of New Mexico to our esteemed colleague, Senator CARL HAYDEN, on his 90th birthday.

It is difficult to speak of the contributions that the senior Senator from Arizona has made to the progress of our Nation because they are so numerous that one knows not where to begin. One contribution which deserves special mention, however, has been Senator HAYDEN'S leadership throughout the years in the development of our Nation's natural resources.

In pressing for appropriations and new authority to develop the natural resources of this country, he has never sponsored or supported arbitrary legislation for the benefit of one State and to the detriment of another. His attitudes and his actions have always been regarded with the highest esteem by all with whom he has dealt. He has established himself as a true statesman and has earned the respect of those who have been privileged to serve with him.

Mr. President, it would be well for all of us to reflect upon all of the good that this man has done for each of us, for our States, for our colleagues who served before us, and for our Nation. I consider it a privilege and an honor to have known and worked with this fine gentleman. I hope we shall continue to have his leadership and guidance for many years.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to a great man and to an extraordinary public servant—the senior Senator of the United States, the gentleman from Arizona. Although today is CARL HAYDEN'S birthday, I think we in this body all know now what we had long suspected—that this wiry former sheriff of Maricopa County is ageless. Birthdays are notches on a rod used to measure ordinary mortals, not men like the Senator from Arizona.

Senator HAYDEN'S years in public office span the gulf between the old frontier and the New Frontier. His years in Washington link the trustbusters of the T. R. and William Howard Taft era with the Great Society of Lyndon Johnson.

He was a sheriff on the old frontier at

the end of an era peopled by so many brave and colorful characters wearing the badge of that honorable office that it restored to the title of "sheriff" the luster which had been clouded for centuries by tales about the sheriff of Nottingham and his mistreatment of Robin Hood.

CARL HAYDEN has met the challenges of many new frontiers in his long public career and each with the great energy and effectiveness of a young posse leader in hot pursuit of a desperado.

Arthur Edson of the Associated Press summed it up very well in a story about the Arizona Senator on the occasion of a previous birthday. He said:

> There are few other modern politicians who have done more to change the face and plot the future of America. Deserts bloom, highways span the land, foreign aid wobbles through, all because Hayden has known whom to prod and how and when.

The list of Presidents of the United States that Senator HAYDEN has worked with closely is longer than most schoolboys can memorize. When he first came to Washington as the newly admitted State of Arizona's first Representative, Willian. Howard Taft was President. That was in 1912. He was elected to the Senate in 1926, when Calvin Coolidge was President.

I am proud to serve in the Senate with this great man and grateful for the opportunity to be a member of the Committee on Appropriations under his chairmanship.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, it is with much personal pleasure that I join my colleagues to congratulate the Honorable CARL HAYDEN, senior Senator of Arizona, on his 90th birthday anniversary.

Senator HAYDEN came to Washington in February 1912 as Member of the House of Representatives upon the statehood of Arizona. In March 1927, he became a Senator. No other person in the history of the country has served his State and his Nation so long or so well in Congress.

Since I came to the Senate, a mere 11 years ago by comparison, I have become a great admirer of the outstanding ability of the senior Senator from Arizona, and I highly respect him for his astute statemanship. He is a man of great virtue and wisdom, as he has demonstrated on so many occasions in the 55 years that he has been a Member of Congress. Just as his record of service has never been and probably never will be equaled, so it is regarding Senator HAYDEN'S unmatched devotion to duty and dedication to the time-honored principles that has made ours the greatest Nation on earth. Senator HAYDEN is the personification of these principles. I join all other Members of the Senate in extending heartfelt felicitations on his birthday. I wish him many more and every future success and happiness.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the Senate's wisest and most revered Member, the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], on the occasion of his 90th birthday.

Two of the great privileges of my Senate service have been to sit with CARL HAYDEN on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and to share with him the role of President pro tempore of the Senate. I share with him the pride that Stanford University holds for him as an alumnus.

The measure of Senator HAYDEN is not taken by reference to years or chairmanships. The Senate legislative calendar, for the past 40 years, would be a better guide. It is an illustrated calendar, adorned with pictures of an America that he has painted with the delicate strokes of a master.

The panorama of the Nation since those lean days of 1927, when CARL HAYDEN crossed Capitol Plaza to the Senate, bears the indelible but strong imprint of this man from Arizona. Through the depression years, World War II, the postwar period, the Korean war, and our two-front crises of today, he has guided Federal investment, resource development, military preparedness, and programs for the disadvantaged.

There are none who know him who have not been impressed with his detailed knowledge of the needs of the Nation and his ability—without fanfare or credit—to see to it that the Nation meets its responsibilities.

We Montanans have special reason to be grateful to Senator HAYDEN. He has responded to the requirements of our region: for forest fire research, public land development, training programs for Indian citizens, and recreational and conservation programs, to mention but a few.

On behalf of the people of Montana, I say: "Thank you, CARL, for what you have done for the development of our State, and I thank you for being a U.S. Senator in all the finest connotations of the term."

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, on this, the 90th birthday of the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona, CARL HAYDEN, I wish to extend my warm congratulations.

I speak as a friend and as a representative of Virginia. I speak, too, not only for myself, but I bespeak the sentiments often expressed to me by my late father, who served in the Senate with CARL HAYDEN for 33 years.

For Senator HAYDEN I have high esteem and deep affection. And for the people whom he represents—the citizens of Arizona—I take particular pride.

My great uncle, Representative Henry Delaware Flood, of Virginia, after whom I received one of my names, was chairman of the House Committee on the Territories in the early 1900's. Representative Flood presented to the House of Representatives on August 19, 1911, the resolution establishing Arizona as a State. Shortly thereafter, when Arizona was admitted as a State, CARL HAYDEN became its first Representative to the U.S. Congress.

Certainly no State has been better represented more continuously than Arizona; and surely no State has chosen more wisely than Arizona in electing and reelecting CARL HAYDEN—as it has done consistently throughout a period of 55 years.

CARL HAYDEN is a man of great work; but, what is more, he is a man superior to his works. He seems to act without effort, but his accomplishments for his State and country are monumental.

Evidence of his mature judgment and constructive powers has marked the work of Congress for 55 years. He has the capacity to foreshadow the future while working for the present.

In the Senate, we know Senator HAYDEN as a man of reserve but not isolation; we know him as a warm personality without egotism; we know him as a man of wisdom, with kindly wit.

We know him as the President pro tempore of the Senate. We know him as one who has served in this body longer than any man in history.

We know him as a beloved colleague. We know him, too, not only as the senior Senator from Arizona, but, indeed, as Mr. Arizona.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I join with other Senators in extending fervent best wishes on his 90th birthday anniversary to one of the truly great Americans of our time, a magnificent Senator of the United States, Senator CARL HAYDEN.

Our distinguished colleague has given more than 55 years of devoted and dedicated service to his Nation and to his State. Few Americans, indeed few men, have contributed so much to their countrymen and so much to the service of people throughout the world as has this distinguished statesman.

This fair, wise and kindly man has always used his great power with restraint. He is a very great man, but a very humble man, who has demonstrated his courage and capacity for public service for more than half a century.

Mr. President, the fact is that nobody really grows old by living a specific number of years. People grow old by deserting their ideals—losing their enthusiasm. Men and women are as old as their doubts. They are as young as their hopes, their zest for life, and their self-confidence. Given those criteria, CARL HAYDEN is one of the youngest men I know.

With the rest of my colleagues on the occasion of his 90th birthday, I too say good luck, Senator CARL HAYDEN and Godspeed for many, many more years of additional happy and constructive service to our Nation.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I congratulate the senior Senator from Arizona on his 90th birthday anniversary. Beyond that, I offer my appreciation to this good man for his kindness and his encouragement to me as one of the younger Members of the Senate.

His life has already spanned nearly a century. It is a life devoted to public service, to the development of his State, and to the well-being of our Nation.

Senator HAYDEN has been an inspiration and an example of good representation to us all. I wish him well on this special day and for all the days ahead.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, it gives me great pleasure to join with my colleagues who are today commending and congratulating the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona, CARL HAYDEN, on the occasion of his 90th birthday anniversary.

This is a day of joy for all of us. It is always refreshing and encouraging to

find man's proverbial three-score and ten lengthened not only in years but in achievements, as well.

CARL HAYDEN was engaging in public affairs before the Arizona Territory was admitted as a State of the Union. He was a Member of Congress when Presidents Taft, Wilson, and Harding were occupying the White House. He was a Member of the Senate 2 years before my birth.

He has distinguished himself in the Senate during the turbulent years since the depression. CARL HAYDEN's perspective on the political life of America is as circumspect and as expansive as that of any living American.

But a man is known more by what he does than by the length of his service—however uncommon that term might be. By this measure, as by any other, CARL HAYDEN has distinguished himself. My friends who reside in Arizona tell me that Senator HAYDEN is virtually a living legend. His untiring efforts to make the desert flower and to provide for the orderly growth and development of such cities as Phoenix and Tucson are an integral part of Arizona's history.

As a Senator from Minnesota, a State which shares with Arizona an abundance of scenic treasures, I take particular note of Senator HAYDEN's leadership over the last five decades in the conservation of our national resources. Perhaps it is not widely known, but it is a fact that in 1919, when public concern prompted legislation to preserve the pristine beauty of the Grand Canyon, CARL HAYDEN managed the bill on the House floor. His contribution to the preservation of the Grand Canyon is mirrored in the countless other scenic and historic treasures of Arizona which he has fought to preserve for present and future generations of Americans.

I am delighted to commend the senior Senator from Arizona today for his good work and good fortune. I share the hope of all Members of the Senate that Senator HAYDEN's able assistance will be available to the Senate for many years to come.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, our beloved Senate President pro tempore is 90 years young today, so it is a time for great rejoicing in this Chamber.

The very fact that our distinguished colleague could endure more than a half century in the Nation's Capital, representing the best interests of the people of Arizona, is a tribute to his dedication, tenacity, and love for his constituents.

CARL HAYDEN is a product of the magnificence and grandeur of the American West. We who were not fortunate enough to participate in its development from the early frontier days feel that we have been deprived of a part of our precious American heritage.

So even unto this day we carry on a love affair through the medium of films and television epics with an era whose heroes were always larger than life.

Among those of us here today, only our Senate President pro tempore has personally bridged that time span between the great American past and its even more promising future.

He walks among us, a man symbolic of all our hopes, our yearnings and our dreams.

It is with a great sense of pride in our country and in people like CARL HAYDEN that I say, happy birthday Mr. President. Happy birthday.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, Senator HAYDEN's 90th birthday anniversary, I believe, generates an historical fascination within all of us. We suddenly realize just how young a nation we really are and how closely our history trails our heels.

Here is a man who once preceptively pioneered the use of an Apperson Jackrabbit motorcar in the pursuit of mounted bandits and who now deals with equal competence in the problems of space travel and supersonic aircraft.

In one sense, I find this observation of Senator HAYDEN's birthday a little unfortunate. I fear that, whatever we say here, the news reports that go out will nevertheless leave the impression that CARL HAYDEN is noteworthy because he is a Senator and is 90 years old.

His contributions to this body and to this Nation will go largely unnoticed by those who are content to read headlines and the first paragraph or two of a story.

But perhaps even this is fitting. It would certainly be in the Senator's established tradition. He has rarely been unsuccessful in anything he has tried.

And one of his most earnest endeavors—by all available evidence—has been directed at disguising the merits of his contributions, or at least minimizing them.

He is a gentleman, and we all know of his impatience with flamboyance and self-congratulation.

But even if the bulk of the Nation remains unaware of his energy and dedication, we can all trust that the citizens of Arizona are not.

I remember that in 1962, on the occasion of the Senator's 50th anniversary in Congress, his junior colleague, then Senator Barry Goldwater, had this to say:

> There are no words or any eloquence which I could use to express my respect for this lifelong friend—both words and eloquence have been exhausted.
>
> Let me just put it in this simple way—whenever my service in the Senate is terminated, I hope that my service to my country and my State equals a small fraction of what Carl Hayden has provided in both areas.

I think many of us would be happy to echo those words.

Senator HAYDEN recently ascribed his longevity in the world and in the Senate as "luck, pure luck."

I would submit, Mr. President, that ability and perseverance have played an at least equal role. But insofar as luck has played a role in Senator HAYDEN's service record, I would suggest that the luck has been even more ours than his.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I am pleased to join with my colleagues in extending heartiest congratulations and sincere best wishes to the senior Senator from Arizona on attaining this important milestone in his life. With 55 years of continuous tenure in Congress, the last 40 of which have been in the Senate, no man in our history has compiled a more impressive and devoted record of public service than the man we honor today, Senator CARL HAYDEN.

Although my personal acquaintance with this esteemed colleague has been limited to the last 5 years, during this short period I have come to respect his knowledge and wisdom and to appreciate his many virtues and attributes. His kindness, his thoughtfulness for others, and his willingness to share the fruits of his experience with younger Members is well known. More than once I have sought Senator HAYDEN's counsel; never has he hesitated or refused to spend the time necessary to advise me on any issue, whether it be procedural or substantive, and I am extremely grateful to him for his unfailing courtesy.

As President pro tempore of the Senate, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and the Joint Committee on Printing, and member of both the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Committee on Rules and Administration, Senator HAYDEN carries an extremely heavy load of responsibility. From the standpoint of one who is less than half his age, and whose official Senate role is far less demanding, I marvel at his capacity to perform these many duties not only with perception and understanding but also with vigor and promptness. Despite his four score and 10 years, few Members of this body are more faithful than he in attending committee meetings, answering quorum calls, or voting when the yeas and nays are taken.

Mr. President, no Senator is venerated or loved more than CARL HAYDEN. He has earned the admiration not only of Members of Congress; those who acclaim him today include many officers in the other branches of the Federal Government, State government officials, numerous leaders in private life, and countless citizens in his home State and elsewhere who, through the years, have been influenced, guided, and inspired by him. I count my association with Senator HAYDEN to be one of the most valuable and memorable experiences of my brief career as a legislator, and I am delighted that the Senate is today expressing to him the debt of gratitude which the Nation owes this great man for his unprecedented years of devoted and sacrificing service.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, much has been said about one of the supposed chief characteristics of our times—namely, the youth syndrome which seems to prevail these days. So it is that we hear that those over 30 are not to be trusted, as well as the mischievous injunction to tune in, turn on, and drop out.

If ever there was a man who was the antithesis of such a lightweight mandate, it is Senator HAYDEN.

Before this rare man was 30, he demonstrated the very opposite of the dropout point of view. By the time Senator HAYDEN was 29 he was the manifest demonstration of the "face up" insistence that has run like a golden thread throughout his 65 years of public life. He was a delegate to the Democratic National Convention in 1904, the year he was elected treasurer of Maricopa County. Two years later he was elected sheriff of Maricopa County.

What Senator HAYDEN's devoted serv-

ice to the public weal so richly demonstrates is an example all Americans should heed. His love of the West, his profound wisdom as to the West's problems, and his tough pursuit of solutions to those problems marks him in no uncertain terms as the West's architect.

No other man so amply evinces the proposition that youth is a state of mind. Senator HAYDEN, through his continuing vigor and fresh legislative approach, demonstrates for us again and again the marriage of growth and wisdom.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I wish to pay my respect and that of my State of Nevada to the dean and President pro tempore of the U.S. Senate, the distinguished CARL HAYDEN, of Arizona.

As has been widely noted, his service to his State and country dates back to the admission of Arizona as a State in 1912. That event and the arrival of CARL HAYDEN in Congress mark a period of great growth for Nevada's neighboring State of Arizona and for the man who has come to be internationally recognized as Mr. Arizona. I speak today as his friend in congratulating him and wishing him many more useful years of service on the occasion of his 90th birthday anniversary. Nevadans have always held Senator HAYDEN and the fine people of his State in the highest regard and deepest affection.

Mr. President, I received my university education in the State of Arizona and recognize that the southern part of the State of Nevada was once a part of Arizona Territory.

It is a source of wonderment and inspiration to me when I review the growth of the United States as the leading world power, a position attained during the span of CARL HAYDEN'S service. So much progress and development have been accomplished since CARL HAYDEN arrived in Congress, yet the country has been in existence for a period of only twice the age of CARL HAYDEN. So it is small wonder that the United States itself is so young and vigorous.

Mr. President, I am thankful for the opportunity I have had for the past 9 years to study the legislative craftsmanship of Senator HAYDEN. My admiration for him has grown steadily. It is also a tribute to this great American that the admiration and respect which flow to him come from both sides of the aisle.

Other records in service and consistent patriotism will be made in years ahead, but it is a part of the great story of CARL HAYDEN that his service will be the target and the goal of all the men who will follow him in the continuing story of the U.S. Senate.

It is a pleasure at this time for me to join with CARL HAYDEN'S fellow countrymen in wishing him good health, good fortune, and continued happiness in the years that lie ahead.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I am delighted to join so many of my colleagues in paying respect and tribute to the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] as he reaches yet another milestone in a long and constructive life of public service to the people of his State and of the Nation.

His is a record to which few could aspire and one which may never be attained again. I speak not only of his many years of dedicated service, but more particularly of the use to which he has placed that service, of the accomplishment and the good his efforts in this body represent, of the conscientious, intelligent, and vigorous application of his energies for over half a century in the Congress of the United States. Such a record speaks eloquently of the man himself.

It is my privilege to serve under Senator HAYDEN'S chairmanship on the Committee on Appropriations—a privilege I shall cherish as long as I live. I shall always have reason to appreciate and be thankful for his kindness, his tact, his understanding, and his legislative skill. I am happy, therefore, to extend my hand in congratulation as he celebrates his birthday.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, our distinguished colleague from Arizona is beloved and respected by each of us in this Chamber. Our affection for him is not the result of age, because few men carry 90 years more lightly or gracefully. Rather, it is because of his wisdom and kindness, and his accomplishments for his own State and the Nation. As a relative newcomer to the Senate, I have always welcomed Senator HAYDEN'S counsel and appreciated his willingness to listen to the problems of younger Members.

I am particularly fond of one story. As a freshman Congressman, Senator HAYDEN took the floor of the House to make a speech that, reportedly, was notable only for its longevity and vacuity. An older colleague soon counseled him that there are two kinds of Congressmen—show horses and workhorses. The older man said one will get your name in the papers, while the other will get you votes and the respect of your colleagues.

CARL HAYDEN obviously has never forgotten that advice. Since then, he has built his influence on performance, not words. Every Federal program that has contributed to the development of the West—irrigation, power, mining and reclamation—bears his mark. The Federal highway system, which binds this country together, is in large measure his creation.

In 1912 when Senator HAYDEN first came to Congress, a newsman, speaking at the Press Club, allowed that:

> HAYDEN was all right as a frontier sheriff, but he'll never amount to a damn in Congress.

Seldom has any judgment missed the mark by a wider margin. Just 4 years later, the Arizona weekly Tombstone Prospector pleaded:

> We wish the Arizona Republicans would sometimes nominate a man for Congress who would start the perspiration on CARL HAYDEN. Nothing they have produced yet has even made him break into a trot.

That statement still holds.

And on this memorable 90th anniversary I am happy and honored to salute a great Arizonan and a great American.

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, today being the 90th birthday of the senior Senator from Arizona, Mr. HAYDEN, I would like to join with those who have paid tribute to this outstanding public servant. A territorial sheriff before Arizona was admitted to the Union as our 48th State in 1912, a Member of the House from that time until being elected to the Senate in 1927, our esteemed colleague is the embodiment of that principle so ingrained in the American tradition—faithful and unselfish devotion to the spirit and the implementation of representative government. Truly, CARL HAYDEN exemplifies the best in Senate service. May he enjoy many birthdays more.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I desire to be associated with the many other friends and colleagues of Senator CARL HAYDEN paying tribute to him on the occasion of his 90th birthday.

CARL HAYDEN is indeed a most remarkable American. He came to Congress as a Member of the House the day his State of Arizona became a member of the Union. He has served in Congress continuously ever since. It should be added, of course, that his career of public service began much earlier than his long congressional career in that he served as sheriff of Maricopa County, Ariz., even before his State was admitted to the Union and when county sheriffs faced many of the challenges and dangers now being depicted so graphically by our steady and interesting diet of television "Westerns."

Having served long and intimately with CARL HAYDEN on the Appropriations Committee of the Senate which he heads with great decorum and equity and as ranking Republican Member of the Senate Appropriations Interior Department Subcommittee which he also chairs, I can honestly say that it is always a privilege and a pleasure to work closely with CARL HAYDEN on the consideration of these important money bills. His special interest in improving the lot of our American Indians has been a source of tremendous gratification to me since my own State of South Dakota has the third largest Indian population in the Nation.

CARL HAYDEN is also a strong and effective advocate of maintaining the powers, the rules, and the precedents of the U.S. Senate. For this service, also, I pay him great respect.

Let me conclude these brief words of tribute simply by saying, "Happy birthday, CARL, and many happy returns of this momentous day in the life of a great American and a valued personal friend."

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, it gives me great pleasure to add my congratulations to the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona on the occasion of his 90th birthday. The author Dorothy Thompson wisely observed that:

> Age is not measured by years. Nature does not equally distribute energy. Some people are born old and tired, while others are going strong at 70.

CARL HAYDEN has been gifted with an extra allotment of energy, for he is going strong at 90 and I expect him to be going strong for many years to come.

During my 3 years in the Senate, I have been continually impressed by the vigorous leadership which Senator HAYDEN provides the Senate—leadership based on a wealth of knowledge gained through 57 years of experience in the U.S. Congress. As a matter of fact, 1967 marks another anniversary for Senator HAYDEN—his 40th year of service to the

people of Arizona and the Nation in the U.S. Senate. I hardly need say that his chairmanship of the Senate Appropriations Committee commands great respect, especially when the Congress considers projects which affect the State of Arizona. The Senate attaches great weight to his judgment on all legislative matters and on the government of the Senate itself.

I am honored to have the privilege of serving in the Senate with this great man. I wish him the happiest of birthdays.

SENATOR CARL HAYDEN'S LIFE OF CONGRESSIONAL SERVICE IS UNEQUALED

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, at the age of 90 years, Senator CARL HAYDEN is receiving from his colleagues today the praise he so fully merits. I join in this commendation.

CARL HAYDEN is a great American; he is a man unique in the annals of this Senate, from the standpoints of years lived and years served in our forum.

But Senator HAYDEN is more than a legislator and creator of measures that have become law. He is, in a sense, an institution. It was Thomas Carlyle who said:

> What we have done is the only mirror by which we can see what we are.

And CARL HAYDEN can look into that lifetime mirror and see reflected both success and service.

I often relate a personal story concerning Senator HAYDEN. I believe it deserves retelling because it may best serve to indicate the helpfulness and the generosity of the senior Senator from Arizona. In November 1958 I arrived in Washington to serve in the Senate for an unexpired term. I had been in my temporary office 2 days, as I recall, when a kindly gentleman paid a visit. My visitor was Senator HAYDEN and he came to welcome me and to offer his services as I commenced my duties in the Senate. One never forgets a friendly gesture of this nature. Senator HAYDEN deeply impressed me with his genuine desire to be of assistance.

Faithful, patriotic, and productive labors have been the hallmark of CARL HAYDEN'S unequaled congressional record.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, the tributes paid today to CARL HAYDEN are fitting. But they do not measure the full debt this body owes to its President pro tempore, and its most respected Member. For one of his many functions has been his valuable advice and assistance to the Senate's newer Members. CARL HAYDEN has consistently made the effort to guide these Members through Senate procedure and tradition; and in so doing, he has made better public servants of us all. In this sense, then, all of us—his juniors—owe a personal debt of gratitude to the senior Senator from Arizona—the senior Senator from the United States.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, I know I am speaking for all Missourians when I offer my heartiest congratulations to Senator CARL HAYDEN on his 90th birthday.

Senator HAYDEN has long symbolized the vigor and vitality of his State and Nation. He has dedicated his life to public service. He has served Arizona and the United States proudly and well.

He was a leading figure in the move for Arizona's statehood. Since gaining statehood, the citizens of Arizona have had the great privilege of having CARL HAYDEN in Congress.

We in Missouri take special pride in noting that when Senator HAYDEN first came to Congress, Missouri's famous Congressman Champ Clark was Speaker of the House. Champ Clark was from Pike County where my home is and where today in Bowling Green we have a statue of him. Thus Senator HAYDEN'S first legislation in Congress, was handled while working with Champ Clark. In fact, these men continued together in the House, working for the people of this country, for 9 years.

Senator HAYDEN has always impressed me with his young-at-heart attitude. However, it is his record as a representative of the people that has impressed me the most. It is a record of able and wise action. It is a record which has benefitted all Americans.

His leadership as chairman of the vital Senate Appropriations Committee has brought fiscal responsibility and soundness to our national economy. The United States has indeed been fortunate to have CARL HAYDEN in Congress these many years. At this happy time of his birthday I join my colleagues in wishing CARL HAYDEN the very best and also in expressing my hope that he will continue to serve his Nation for many years to come.

ARIZONA'S MAN

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, today we honor the Senate by the recognition of one of our own. In this celebration of the 90th birthday anniversary of Senator CARL HAYDEN, we pause to recall to all of us—and to the Nation we are honored to represent—the great human values of our country.

CARL HAYDEN, senior statesman extraordinary, has lived and served through one of the most tumultuous eras of history, close to the seat of power through more than two score years, and as a hodler of great power for another 15.

If proof were needed that the United States did not come into its present position of world leadership by accident, CARL HAYDEN is ample proof that great men have helped to shape our destiny and have engineered our development.

It is hard to think of Congress without a CARL HAYDEN. Throughout the entire life of the State of Arizona, which he has served so well and faithfully, he has been its stalwart leader. As he has represented his State, so has he helped significantly to boost the United States into a position of eminence among the world's nations. He has helped to shape policies and programs which both at home and abroad have marked our upward movement in keeping the peace of the world: opposing aggression; establishing and assisting new nations; yes, and assuring the dignity of the individual.

He has served his State continuously since 1904—a total of 63 years of distinguished constructive faithful public service. His service as treasurer of Maricopa County, Ariz., in 1904, and as sheriff in 1906 and 1908, was a training for higher office, for in 1912 CARL HAYDEN came to Congress as a member of that new State's first congressional delegation.

He was elected to seven succeeding Congresses serving until 1927. As have many, he began in 1927 his great career as the senior Member of the Senate and is now in his seventh consecutive term in this great body, serving as its highest officer—President pro tempore—and as chairman of the great and powerful Committee on Appropriations.

In these decades he has always served the people of Arizona and the United States with a dedicated spirit of leadership which has advanced human values both here and abroad. It has been due to his brilliant foresight and energy that the United States has grown to greatness in power and in the resources which he has done so much to mobilize.

He was one of the coauthors of the Hayden-Cartright legislation, which gave the Nation's interstate highways a great boost forward. He was the pioneer and moving spirit of the water development that has conserved the water resources of the West so as to develop our great Western States.

But among the men who know him best, he was also a great conservator of men. He has inspired dozens of younger men in helping them to realize, as he has realized so well, the challenge of industry and understanding that rests upon a Senator's shoulder and in his heart. For he has helped so many dozens of new men and women on the Hill to find their way into leadership in their new and important duties. Yes, he has helped some who have become Presidents of the United States and has been a trusted adviser of other Presidents under whom he has served during his 55 years on Capitol Hill.

Today on the occasion of his 90th birthday anniversary, Senator HAYDEN is still young in heart, and his vision for his Nation still has the long reach of a farsighted pioneer peering through the clear air of Arizona.

Here is a man whom every Senator is proud to call a friend. Here is a man who has labored valiantly and successfully in the vineyard—the vineyard of the Senate—where the grapes of goodness and mercy must be cultivated so diligently if the world is to be mankind's glory and not its grave.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], has prepared a statement with reference to the salute that was made by various Senators earlier today in connection with the birthday of the President pro tempore of the Senate.

Because the Senator from Georgia is necessarily absent, in his behalf I ask unanimous consent that his statement be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR RUSSELL

It is indeed a pleasant occasion to be able to salute the ninetieth birthday of anyone, but it is especially heartwarming to be able to join in paying tribute to my beloved colleague, the distinguished Senior Senator from Arizona, on such a noteworthy occasion.

While history will record that Senator Hayden has served in the United States Senate, as well as in the Congress, longer than any other American, his distinguished service to his State and Nation will, without question, be measured by more than simply longevity. He has been one of our great National leaders in the most exciting era of our civilization.

Upon the admission of Arizona as a State of the Union, Carl Hayden was elected Arizona's first representative at large and served eight consecutive terms. He was elected to the Senate in 1926 and has served seven consecutive terms in this body.

Since Arizona first achieved statehood in 1912, there has not been a single moment when the State of Arizona has not enjoyed the leadership of this remarkable man. And I venture to say, that in all the history of these United States no man has contributed more to the building of a state than Carl Hayden has contributed to the State of Arizona.

The distinguished Senior Senator from Arizona is the only member of this body today who occupied a seat in the Senate when I first took office as a United States Senator in 1933.

It has been my privilege to enjoy a close association with him on the Appropriations Committee for these thirty-five years, and I believe I can state without fear of successful contradiction that every man with whom he has served has had a genuine affection for him.

As a Committee Chairman, as well as a colleague, he has been an exemplar of integrity, cooperation and constructive achievement. The welfare and security of our beloved country has been the lode star that has guided him always. It is with great pleasure that I express my affection and best wishes to my warm friend and colleague on his ninetieth birthday, and I look forward to serving with him in the years ahead.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY, CARL HAYDEN

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, among the things CARL and I have in common, the least significant, and yet, when thinking on it, the most remarkable, is the number "7": Senator HAYDEN has been in the Senate for as many terms as I have years.

From the outset of my association with this grand gentleman, his consummate legislative skill and true wisdom have been a model for me. His open friendliness to everyone has endeared Senator HAYDEN to all of us.

Happy birthday, CARL. I know your upcoming eighth term will be as excellent as the earlier seven.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA].

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MONTOYA—CARL HAYDEN—ARIZONA'S UNIQUE CONTRIBUTION TO THE SENATE

Today is the 90th birthday of Carl Hayden, and although many tributes have been rendered and many others will follow, I certainly take pleasure in adding my own.

This body is the most august deliberative body in the world today. The only other group that can stand with it is the House of Commons of Great Britain. We represent participatory democracy at its best in this chamber.

The United States Senate has in its turn been moulded by those men and women who have served in it, giving of themselves in the process. We have grown because of what these lawmakers have contributed. Some of these Senators have left a permanent mark on this chamber. Others have passed on to a few lines in the history books.

We often abuse superlatives by too common usage. But no superlative is wasted when we speak of those very few men who have not only put their lives into this chamber, but have left a permanent mark on it and our country by their actions. Carl Hayden is one of those very few men.

He is a link between the days when America was emerging as a world power and our time now. He is a child of our century and one of the master builders of the modern Republic.

He has stood here when the darkest clouds have gathered over the Republic, and never has he flinched. He has played a role in decisions and policies that will affect mankind decades from now. And he has played a wise and effective role. It is one thing to be somewhere for an extended period. It is another to function expertly and to continually contribute first class performances. All of this Carl Hayden has done.

No nation produces too many first-class leaders. Ours is no exception. Mr. Hayden is one of them now as he has always been. Throughout his career he has continually shown those personal character qualities that add to his stature as a man. Unfailingly considerate and understanding, he has guided many a new Senator towards a finer, deeper understanding of what this chamber really is. The personal example he has set has always been exemplary. I have personal cause to be grateful to him for the many personal and professional kindnesses he has shown me and the people of New Mexico.

I congratulate Carl Hayden on his day. The years have been kind to him, for he retains a keeness of mind and intellect that are always at the disposal of his country, state, and this body. He has served and is serving Arizona and our nation well. May he continue to do so.

This chamber has been blessed with some first-class men. None have surpassed him. I believe every Senator here is the better for having served with Mr. Hayden.

A VERY HAPPY BIRTHDAY

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, I want to associate myself with all of the fine comments made about our distinguished colleague, the President pro tempore of the Senate, the Honorable CARL HAYDEN, and to wish him a very happy birthday.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, annouced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 10673) to amend title III of the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, as amended, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 602) to revise and extend the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, and to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 10673) to amend title III of the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, as amended, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REPORT OF U.S. EXPORTS TO YUGOSLAVIA

A letter from the Secretary, Export-Import Bank of Washington, reporting, pursuant to law, the amount of Export-Import Bank insurance and guarantees issued in connection with U.S. exports to Yugoslavia, for the month of August 1967; to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORTS OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a review of the examination function of the small business investment company program by the Small Business Administration, dated September 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report concerning oil interests acquired in obtaining land for construction projects by the Corps of Engineers (Civil Functions), Department of the Army, dated September 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of inventory accounting systems for aeronautical equipment, Department of the Navy, dated September 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the opportunities for improvement in administration of the contract for operation of the National Center for Atmospheric Research, Boulder, Colo., National Science Foundation, dated September 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committeee on Government Operations.

RICHARD C. MOCKLER

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Richard C. Mockler (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF SECTION 127, TITLE 28, UNITED STATES CODE

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 127, title 28, United States Code, to define more precisely the territory included in the two judicial districts of Virginia (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROJECT PROPOSAL UNDER PROVISIONS OF SMALL RECLAMATION PROJECTS ACT OF 1956

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a project proposal under the provisions of section 10 of the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

Resolutions adopted by the City Councils of Gardena, Montclair, Orange, and Whittier, all of the State of California, favoring the enactment of some form of a Federal tax-sharing program; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the State Council of Kentucky, Junior Order United American Merchants, Covington, Ky., relating to a

peaceful settlement of the War in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Two petitions signed by members of the Communications Workers of America, AFL–CIO, of the State of Illinois, relative to the provision of jobs, housing, and education to solve the problems of American cities; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. MONRONEY, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, without amendment:

H.R. 3979. An act to amend section 6409 (b) (1) of title 39, United States Code, which relates to transportation compensation paid by the Postmaster General; (Rept. No. 578).

REPORT ENTITLED "RIOTS, CIVIL AND CRIMINAL DISORDERS"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 577)

Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations, submitted a report entitled "Riots, Civil and Criminal Disorders," which was ordered to be printed.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 2488. A bill for the relief of Dr. Raul Agustin Pereira-Valdes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 2489. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jesus Jose Eduardo Garcia;

S. 2490. A bill for the relief of Dr. Juan de Moya;

S. 2491. A bill for the relief of Dr. Antonio Pinera;

S. 2492. A bill for the relief of Leonardo E. Arteaga; and

S. 2493. A bill for the relief of Capt. Bruce E. Wilta, U.S. Air Force; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALMADGE:

S. 2494. A bill to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 to prohibit the charging of certain fees thereunder; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

S. 2495. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jesus Ortiz Ricote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BREWSTER:

S. 2496. A bill to authorize the Commissioner of the District of Columbia to enter into and renew reciprocal agreements for police mutual aid on behalf of the District of Columbia with the local governments in the Washington Metropolitan Area; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

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

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 2497. A bill to amend the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966, as amended, to extend the period of time within which the Commission on Marine Science, Engineering, and Resources is to submit its final report and to provide for a fixed expiration date for the National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development; to the Committee on Commerce.

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

AMENDMENT OF THE LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND ACT OF 1965 TO PROHIBIT THE CHARGING OF CERTAIN FEES

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, effective January 1, 1968, the Corps of Engineers of the Department of the Army plans to begin charging private resident homeowners on public reservoirs or impoundments fees for such facilities as floating docks, boat mooring facilities, duck blinds, ski jumps, swimming or diving platforms, and other similar facilities constructed on waters administered by the Corps of Engineers.

According to these plans, private homeowners would be levied an annual fee of $10, plus 7½ percent for each square foot of the area occupied in excess of 200 square feet.

The Department of the Army has taken the view that since the operators of commercial concessions, which do business for a profit on Corps of Engineers reservoirs, are required to pay user fees, private homeowners on these lakes should likewise have to pay a fee.

I cannot follow this line of reasoning, and I find no justification for private property owners being subjected to mandatory user fees of this kind.

The private occupants of lakeside homes or resort cottages have invested both capital and labor in their facilities, often in very large sums. I fail to see any similarity between private homeowners on such lakes and waterways, who are only there to seek relaxation and recreation, and concessionaires who build and operate their facilities solely for personal and private gain.

I see no more justification in this instance than there would be for charging private homeowners a fee to enter either our public city streets or Nation's highways.

I feel very strongly that action is required to secure the traditional freedom, access and use of the public waterways and lakes of this Nation. For this reason I introduced today a bill to prohibit the Department of the Army from charging private homeowners user fees for their facilities on Government-administered waters.

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

The bill (S. 2494) to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 to prohibit the charging of certain fees thereunder, introduced by Mr. TALMADGE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

POLICE MUTUAL AID AGREEMENTS FOR THE METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, in recent years, the local jurisdictions which compose the Washington metropolitan area have been confronted with many urban problems that are regional in nature. It was for this reason that the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments was formed. The council of governments is a voluntary association of the area's 15 major local governments.

The Public Safety Policy Committee of the Council of Governments is concerned with the coordination of police, fire, civil defense, traffic safety and codes, and regulations related thereto on a regional basis.

On September 29, 1967, the membership of the Public Safety Policy Committee voted unanimously to urge the Congress and the State legislatures in Maryland and Virginia to adopt enabling legislation which would allow the local governments of our region to enter into police mutual aid agreements.

This type of legislation was first suggested by the Regional Police Chief's Committee which advises the Council of Governments on police matters. The police committee is composed of the chiefs of police from all area local governments in addition to representatives from the FBI, the U.S. Secret Service, the Capitol Police, the park police, the airport police, and the military police.

The Police Chiefs' Committee has expressed concern on many occasions over the fact that while crime and civil disorder often affects more than one jurisdiction in our area, a police officer cannot render emergency assistance beyond the boundaries of his own jurisdiction.

To resolve this difficulty, Mr. President, I am proposing legislation today to pave the way for an agreement which would eliminate jurisdictional restrictions incumbent upon area law enforcement officers in emergency situations.

The bill I am introducing authorizes the new Mayor of the District of Columbia to enter into and renew reciprocal agreements for police mutual aid on behalf of the District of Columbia with the other local governments in the Washington metropolitan area.

At his discretion, and for such periods as he deems advisable, the Mayor would be permitted to enter into reciprocal agreements with any county, municipality, or other governmental units in the States of Maryland and Virginia for this purpose.

The agreements would allow the District and surrounding jurisdictions to establish and carry into effect a plan to provide mutual aid, through the furnishing of policemen and other agents and employees of the District, together with all necessary equipment, in the event of an emergency resulting from the existence of a state of war, internal disorder, or fire, flood, epidemic, or other public disaster.

This legislation would indemnify officers responding to requests for emergency assistance from claims from third parties and would assure that while working outside their own jurisdictions, they would still be covered by all of the pension, relief, disability, workmens compensation and other benefits they enjoy while performing their respective duties within the District of Columbia.

Mr. President, Congress and the State Legislatures of Maryland and Virginia several years ago approved a bill permitting the development of reciprocal

agreements for mutual firefighting aid by the local area governments.

This legislation that I am introducing today is essential if our local police forces are to meet the growing challenges to the life and property of our area's citizens. I hope that it will receive the strong support and approval of Congress.

I now send to the desk for appropriate reference a bill to authorize the Commissioner of the District of Columbia to enter into and renew reciprocal agreements for police mutual aid on behalf of the District of Columbia with the other local governments in the Washington area.

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

The bill (S. 2496) to authorize the Commissioner of the District of Columbia to enter into and renew reciprocal agreements for police mutual aid on behalf of the District of Columbia with the local governments in the Washington metropolitan area, introduced by Mr. BREWSTER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

AMENDMENT OF MARINE RESOURCES AND ENGINEERING DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1966

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966, as amended, to extend the period of time within which the Commission on Marine Science, Engineering, and Resources is to submit its final report and to provide for a fixed expiration date for the National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, together with a statement of purpose and need and a section-by-section analysis of the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement of purpose and need, and a section-by-section analysis of the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2497) to amend the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966, as amended, to extend the period of time within which the Commission on Marine Science, Engineering, and Resources is to submit its final report and to provide for a fixed expiration date for the National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (by request) was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The material presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., September 29, 1967.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is transmitted herewith on behalf of the Commission on Marine Science, Engineering and Resources, and the National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development, for referral to the appropriate committee, a draft of legislation "To amend the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966, as amended, to extend the period of time within which the Commission on Marine Science, Engineering and Resources is to submit its final report and to provide for a fixed expiration date for the National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development."

This proposed bill would—

1. extend the time in which the Commission's report could be submitted for an additional six months, to January 9, 1969;

2. change the expiration date of the National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development from a date 120 days following the rendering of the Commission's report to June 30, 1969. As under the current law the Commission would remain in existence for an additional 30 days following the rendering of its report.

The proposed extension of the time for rendering the Commission's report is needed to insure adequate and effective discharge of the Commission's responsibility to recommend an overall plan for an adequate oceanographic program that will meet present and future national needs.

The later expiration date for the National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development would continue for a brief period the existing mechanisms for assisting the President in carrying out his responsibilities under P.L. 89–454 and P.L. 89–688. The amendment would further provide a fixed expiration date for the Council rather than relating the Council's expiration to the indefinite date of the Commission's report.

Sincerely,

CHARLES L. SCHULTZE.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND NEED

The draft bill amends the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966, as amended, by:

1. Extending the time in which the Commission's report could be submitted for an additional six months, to January 9, 1969.

2. Changing the expiration date of the National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development from a date 120 days following the rendering of the Commission's report to June 30, 1969.

The Commission on Marine Science, Engineering, and Resources has been charged with recommending an adequate national marine science program that will meet present and future needs, and a governmental organizational plan together with estimated cost. The Act establishing the Commission was approved in June 1966; the Commission was appointed in January 1967. Initially, staff support was provided by the Secretariat of the National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development. Organization of a separate Commission staff was begun in late April 1967; a staff of approximately a dozen professionals is now available. With these preliminary steps completed, the Commission is now in a position to assess what work can feasibly be accomplished within alternative time periods. On the basis of this assessment, the Commission recommends that its enabling statute be amended to extend by six months the period of time within which it is required to submit its final report.

With this additional time, the Commission would be able to develop its findings and conclusions on a significantly broader base of factual information than could be obtained if the report were to be rendered on the date required by existing law. The Commission would also be able, on a twenty-four-month schedule, to test more adequately the soundness of its premises with its Congressional Advisors, members of the National Council and other key individuals.

The task which has been assigned to this Commission is one of very large dimensions. The Commission does not anticipate that it will be able to advance solutions for all of the problems and questions which it might like to consider. It intends instead to be selective and to focus its attention on those areas in which it believes action is most urgent. However, with respect to those matters on which it does advance recommendations, the Commission believes that the President and the Congress deserve a fully-considered, documented and complete proposal, and that it is incumbent upon the Commission to frame its recommendations so that they will provide concrete guidelines for legislative and administrative action.

The National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development advises and assists the President in carrying out his responsibilities under the Act. These include evaluation of Federal marine science activities, the development of a comprehensive program, the establishment of long-range studies, coordination of a program of international cooperation, guidance for Sea Grant program policies, and the submission of an annual report. The advice and assistance of the Council will be useful to the President during the time he is reviewing the Commission's report, evaluating its implications for agency programs, and preparing his recommendations to the Congress.

Extension of the Council to June 30, 1969 provides a fixed date for expiration of the Council rather than relating the Council's expiration to the indefinite date of the Commission's report. The additional extension in the life of the Council by substituting a fixed date would be less than two months, should the Commission report an January 9, 1969, but the definite expiration date would provide more certainty in planning staff work.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

The draft bill amends the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966, as amended (hereinafter "the Act"), by:

1. Extending the time in which the Commission's report could be submitted for an additional six months, to January 9, 1969.

2. Changing the expiration date of the National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development from a date 120 days following the rendering of the Commission's Report to June 30, 1969. The provisions of the Act with respect to the Commission expire 30 days after the Commission submits its final report, at which time the Commission will cease to exist. The provisions of the Act with respect to the National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development (hereinafter "the Council") now expire 120 days after the Commission submits its final report. This amendment instead provides a fixed expiration date for the Council, June 30, 1969, rather than basing the expiration on the indefinite date of the Commission's report. Should the Commission report on January 9, 1969, the Council would expire slightly less than six months thereafter rather than expiring 120 days later as provided in the present language.

During this additional time, the Council could continue to: assist the President in the exercise of the functions and responsibilities set forth in sections 4 and 7 of the Act; coordinate a program of international cooperation in work done pursuant to section 6 of the Act, at the President's request; advise and provide policy guidance to the National Science Foundation on the Sea Grant College Program and prepare an annual report to the Cangress on this program, pursuant to section 205 of the Act.

The amendment would not affect functions vested in the President or the authorization, set forth in section 9 of the Act, for appropriations of up to $1.5 million per year to carry out the purposes of the Act.

RIOT CONTROL BILL—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 369

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference an amendment, in the nature of a substitute, to H.R. 421, the riot control bill, which has been passed by the House and which is now being considered by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

Copies of this amendment have already been provided to the Judiciary Committee.

I think everyone would agree that something has to be done to put an end to the terribly destructive riots of the past few years.

If the riot epidemic continues to spiral upward, and if race relations in this country continue to spiral downward, the process may very well tear our society apart and destroy the United States as a nation.

As I see it, we have to do a number of things simultaneously.

More stringent legislation and more effective police measures will not by themselves be sufficient to prevent the eruption of more Detroit and Newark riots, so long as there are masses of underprivileged, discontented, and embittered people in our Negro communities.

On the other hand, the social reform approach which ignores the need for strengthening the legal bulwarks against rioting, is also doomed to failure. The proof of this lies in the experience of Detroit and New Haven, which were among the most advanced cities in the Nation in terms of what they had done for the Negro.

I speak as a lifelong friend of the Negro cause. Indeed I bow to none in my record of commitment to civil rights and social justice for our Negro citizens.

But even with the best of good will and with the most energetic and imaginative program, it is going to take time—perhaps a decade, perhaps several decades—to sweep aside the accumulated debris of centuries and to eliminate all the social inequities about which our Negro citizens complain.

What happens until we achieve the ideal state of complete equality? Are the riots to continue to grow in number and intensity with each passing year? If they do, I fear that nothing can save our country.

It has been argued that an antiriot bill can contribute little to law enforcement because the crimes we are trying to get at are already covered by local and State statutes.

It is true that there are such statutes. But it is my belief that Federal law should supplement State and local laws to create the strongest possible legal barriers and restraints to riotous activity.

The knowledge that the full power of the Federal law enforcement agencies will be brought to bear in riot situations will in itself serve as a deterrent. It may help to prevent riots in some cases and reduce their severity in other cases.

Beyond this, there is a clear need for Federal legislation providing stiff punishment for itinerant agitators and arsonists and guerrillas and for those who use the mails or other interstate facilities to incite riots or to aggravate riots. This need can only be filled by a riot control bill at the Federal level.

I believe that such a bill is called for, first, because of the interstate character of the problem; second, because of the evidence of foreign control over some of the major extremist groups involved in the incitation to violence and rioting; and third, because the national security is clearly involved.

THE NEED FOR FORTIFYING H.R. 421

I believe that in enacting riot control legislation we should seek to make it as broad as possible, as strong as possible, and as unassailable as possible.

In its original form, H.R. 421 suffers from several weaknesses that would make it difficult to enforce. In certain respects it is too broad, and in other respects not sufficiently broad. And the penalties prescribed by it are altogether inadequate.

The language of the Eastland amendment represents a definite improvement. However, I hope and I believe that there are some new ideas and some new formulations in the amendment in the nature of a substitute which I have introduced today.

Let me set forth the major differences between H.R. 421 and the proposed amendment in the nature of a substitute.

This substitute measure, like H.R. 421, would prohibit and make unlawful any interstate travel or use of facilities of interstate or foreign commerce, including the mails, for the purpose of inciting or conspiring to incite public disturbances resulting in acts of violence against persons or property.

However, I believe that the substitute measure is an improvement because it is more precise in its definitions; because it broadens the scope of the bill to include specific criminal activities related to riot situations other than inciting or instigating; because it simplifies the problem of enforcement; because it provides for stiffer penalties; and finally because it provides for the establishment of an Office of Riot Prevention and Control and an Advisory Council on Coordination of Programs of Riot Prevention and Control, for the purpose of coordinating all research, planning, and training programs relating to riot prevention and control.

DEFINITION OF A RIOT

H.R. 421 defines a riot as "a public disturbance, involving acts of violence by assemblages of three or more persons, which poses an immediate danger of damage or injury to property or persons." This traditional language might be applicable to minor street scuffles involving three or more persons, if interstate travel or the use of interstate facilities happened to be a factor. I do not believe that it would serve any purpose to apply Federal law to such situations. Such situations can most appropriately be handled by State and local laws.

My amendment defines a riot in precise terms as a public disturbance involving 25 or more people, characterized by looting, arson, the use of explosive or incendiary devices, sabotage, or attacks on law-enforcement authorities or firemen.

This is the kind of public disturbance that we are really concerned about.

REBUTTABLE PRESUMPTION

A weakness of the original version of H.R. 421 to which many critics have referred is the fact that it requires proof of intent at the point of crossing a State line or at the point of using a facility of interstate or foreign commerce. My amendment minimizes this difficulty by providing that, if someone has traveled or has used an interstate or foreign commerce facility, and has, within a period of 10 days thereafter, instigated or encouraged the continuation of a riot, or has contributed to a riot through any of the acts specified in the bill, his intent shall be presumed, unless he is able to rebut this presumption to the satisfaction of the jury or court.

Such presumptions of fact are not without precedent and they have been upheld by the Federal judiciary if the inference rests upon a strong logical basis. For example, several of the laws relating to the importation and sale of narcotic drugs contain a provision that "possession shall be deemed sufficient evidence to authorize conviction, unless the defendant explains his possession to the satisfaction of the jury."

TEACHING OR DEMONSTRATING—EXPLOSIVES OR INCENDIARY DEVICES

My amendment would make it a crime to travel or to use other interstate facilities or foreign commerce facilities for the purpose of teaching or demonstrating the making or use of any explosive or incendiary device in a riot situation.

MAKING OR USING EXPLOSIVES OR INCENDIARY DEVICES

It would make it a crime for someone who has crossed a State line to participate in a riot situation by making or using an explosive or incendiary device in this situation, or by engaging in sabotage or attacks with deadly weapons on firemen or law enforcement officers, or on other persons during the course of a riot as defined.

TRANSPORTING FIREARMS

It would make it a crime to transport firearms or explosive or incendiary devices for use in riot situations.

FURTHERING RIOTS ALREADY BROKEN OUT

Its prohibition is not confined to "inciting" or "instigating" a riot. There is evidence that when riots break out, extremists from other cities tend to move in. The language of my bill explicitly makes it a crime to travel or to use interstate or foreign commerce facilities, after a riot has broken out, for the purpose of promoting the continuation of the situation, or contributing to the riot through any of the acts specified in the bill. On this very important point, my amendment roughly parallels the Eastland amendment.

PUNISHMENT

My amendment provides for a maximum punishment of 20 years or $20,000 fine or both, as against a maximum punishment of 5 years or $10,000 or both prescribed in the original version of H.R. 421. Obviously such maximum penalties

would not be imposed in the case of simple looting. But where it can be demonstrated that a man was directly responsible for inciting a riot that results in heavy loss of life and extensive property damage, 5 years or $10,000 is a ludicrously inadequate punishment.

OFFICE OF RIOT PREVENTION AND CONTROL

My bill would establish for the period of the next 5 years a Federal Office of Riot Prevention and Control. This proposal does not appear in H.R. 421.

The purpose of this office would be to conduct research into more effective methods of preventing and controlling riots; to coordinate such research by providing for the participation of the Department of Justice, local law-enforcement agencies, the Army, and the National Guard; and to disseminate this information, by means of seminars, publications, and training films, to the various local and State and Federal offices concerned with the problem of riot prevention and control.

ADVISORY COUNCIL ON COORDINATION OF PROGRAMS OF RIOT PREVENTION AND CONTROL

Finally, my amendment calls for the establishment for the period of the next 5 years of an Advisory Council on Coordination of Programs of Riot Prevention and Control, in which the following agencies of Government shall be represented: The Department of Justice; the National Guard; the Department of the Army; local law-enforcement officers. In addition, the Council shall contain five members to be appointed by the President from among private citizens. The Council, which would meet at least twice a year, would be under the Chairmanship of the Director of the Office of Riot Prevention and Control.

The existence of such a Council would help to promote the coordination of research, informational programs, and operational planning by the various Federal, State, and local agencies, including the Army and National Guard, concerned with the problems of riot prevention and control.

I believe that the establishment of the Office of Riot Prevention and Control and the Advisory Council are of the greatest importance because together they will provide a mechanism for coordinating research, training, and operational planning on the part of the Department of Justice, local law enforcement agencies, the Army, and the National Guard.

The need for a coordinated research and training program was driven home repeatedly during the recent riots.

In part the problem has been one of inadequate training—and in this connection I am pleased to note that the National Guard and the Army, as well as the police in our major cities, are all intensifying their riot control training program.

But intensified training is not enough.

The riot control methods used in Newark and Detroit and other cities are much the same methods that were in use 50 years ago. They depend primarily on rifles, shotguns, automatic rifles, fixed bayonets, and billy clubs.

These methods are extremely costly in human life, and they are simply inadequate to cope with the much more complex and sophisticated and destructive type of riot with which we are now confronted.

Thus far I have come across only a few fragments of evidence to indicate that we have put our unrivaled technological resources to work to improve the methods of riot control.

New and improved methods and improved hardware for riot control purposes can be developed with a concerted program.

But the costs of such a research and development program are beyond the means of local government institutions. It is an effort that should be centralized, under the collective guidance of representatives of local, State, and Federal law enforcement officers, as well as the Army and National Guard.

For example, riots like those which occurred in Watts and Newark and Detroit are really battle situations which require observation and command facilities that even our largest municipal police forces do not maintain.

Among the kinds of technology potentially available to deal with this problem is the use of helicopters as vantage points from which to survey the total scene, to transmit television camera pictures and to survey special areas on instruction and to answer questions from the command center.

Moreover, no municipal police force is equipped to cope with the massive communications problem that arises when a riot develops. It goes without saying that enforcement authorities can be seriously handicapped if there is a significant lag in the flow of information from the various fronts on which the battle is being fought. Experience with several major riots in recent years indicates that situation reports assembled at police command and control centers ran as much as 3 hours behind events in the field.

To deal with this situation, perhaps the Army or National Guard, in cooperation with the Office of Riot Prevention and Control, could develop and make available mobile command vans or aircraft specifically designed to deal with riot situations and equipped to receive and process the massive volume of situation reports that riots inevitably engender.

It would be too much to expect the riots of the past few years to come to an end overnight as the result of the enactment of this legislation or of any other measures we may take. The prospects are that these destructive disturbances will be with us for some years to come.

However, it is not my expectation that the Office of Riot Prevention and Control or the Advisory Council will be permanent fixtures of our Government. On the contrary, it is my belief that at some date in the not-too-distant future—perhaps 4 or 5 years from now—it will be possible to terminate the Office because the situation has been brought under control.

For this reason, my amendment provides for funding the Office on a year-to-year basis.

It is my earnest hope that, before this session adjourns, Congress will enact a riot control bill.

I ask unanimous consent to have the text of my amendment printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

The amendment (No. 369) was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"FINDINGS

"SECTION 1. It is the sense of the Congress that the large-scale public disturbances, commonly described as "riots" which have recently taken place in cities throughout the United States constitute a growing danger to the happiness, prosperity, and ordered progress of our society. The Congress finds that these disturbances involve the commission of criminal acts of violence by certain individuals resulting in a substantial number of incidents of personal injury and loss of life and substantial damage to and destruction of private and commercial property. The Congress believes that the widespread occurrence of such disturbances creates a problem of national scope, that the commission of such criminal actions militates against improved race relations and against all positive efforts to reduce or eliminate legitimate grievances of the Negro community in various parts of the country, and that the commission of such criminal actions can be partially ascribed to the agitation and other efforts of individuals who are not inhabitants of the affected areas and who travel from State to State exporting grievances and inciting civil disorders, or who use the mails or other facilities of interstate communication for this purpose. In view of the above, the Congress believes that riot control legislation at the Federal level is both appropriate and essential.

"PURPOSE

"SEC. 2. It is the purpose of this Act to prohibit and make unlawful travel in interstate or foreign commerce, or the use of the facilities of, or means of communication in, interstate or foreign commerce, for the purpose of inciting or instigating the commission or continuation of serious public disturbances involving arson, looting, the use of explosives or incendiary devices, sabotage and obstruction of essential public works and utilities, and aggravated assaults against firemen and law enforcement officers and, in certain cases, against members of the general public. This Act also is intended to make unlawful travel in, or the use of the facilities of, or means of communication in, interstate or foreign commerce for the purpose of committing certain other prescribed acts in furtherance of serious public disturbances.

"This Act is not intended to apply to every minor public disturbance or breach of the peace in which interstate travel or the use of interstate facilities may be a factor, but is specifically directed against serious public disturbances of the nature of the violent and destructive riots which have occurred throughout the United States in recent years.

"It is also the purpose of this Act to establish, for a period of five years, an Office on Riot Prevention and Control to conduct an operational study of the immediate causes and dynamics of the recent riots in the United States, to make studies and conduct programs of research relating to the prevention and control of riots, and to serve as a central collection office of information of all kinds relating to riots.

"In order to enable such Office to more effectively carry out its functions, this Act further provides for the establishment for a period of five years of an Advisory Council on Coordination of Programs of Riot Pre-

vention and Control, which shall consist of nineteen members who are professionally engaged or interested in fields related to riot prevention and control, to promote the coordination of programs and activities carried out by the Office of Riot Prevention and Control with related programs and activities carried out by the National Guard, the United States Army, and State and local law enforcement agencies.

"FEDERAL OFFENSE

"SEC. 3. (a) Title 18 of the United States Code is amended by inserting, immediately after chapter 101 thereof, the following new chapter:

"Chapter 102—Riots

"'Sec.
"'2101. Riots
"'2102. Definitions
"'2103. Preemption

"'§ 2101. Riots

"(a) Whoever travels in interstate or foreign commerce or uses any facility of, or means of communication in, interstate or foreign commerce, for the purpose of—

"'(1) willfully inciting or instigating the commission or continuation of a public disturbance by twenty-five or more persons, intending, knowing, or having reason to believe that such public disturbance will result in or continue to result in any one or more unlawful acts of (A) arson, (B) looting, (C) sabotage or violence causing damage to, or the obstruction of the operation or functioning of, any basic public works or utility, (D) assault or battery with a dangerous or deadly weapon against any fireman or law enforcement officer engaged in the performance of his official duties incident to and during the commission of such public disturbance, or (E) violence by any one or more persons using any firearm or explosive or incendiary device to inflict injury or damage to persons or property; or

"'(2) willfully making any explosive or incendiary device, willfully teaching or demonstrating to any number of persons the use, application, or making of any explosive or incendiary device, or willfully distributing any instructional materials with respect to the use, application, or making of any explosive or incendiary device, intending, knowing, or having reason to believe that such device will be unlawfully used by any one or more persons to inflict injury or damage to persons or property in the course of a public disturbance by twenty-five or more persons; or

"'(3) willfully transporting, or furnishing by any means, to any other person or persons any firearm or explosive or incendiary device, intending, knowing, or having reason to believe that such firearm or explosive or incendiary device will be unlawfully used by any one or more persons to inflict injury or damage to persons or property in the course of a public disturbance by twenty-five or more persons; or

"'(4) willfully and unlawfully using any firearm or explosive or incendiary device to inflict injury or damage to persons or property in the course of a public disturbance by twenty-five or more persons; or

"'(5) willfully committing, during the commission of a public disturbance by twenty-five or more persons, any unlawful act of (A) arson, (B) looting, (C) sabotage or violence causing damage to, or the obstruction of the operation or functioning of, any basic public works or utility, (D) assault or battery with a dangerous or deadly weapon against any fireman or law enforcement officer engaged in the performance of his official duties incident to and during the commission of such public disturbance, or (E) assault or battery with a dangerous or deadly weapon against any other person in the course of a public disturbance involving any one or more of the acts described in clause (A), (B), (C), or (D);

shall be fined not more than $20,000 or imprisoned not more than twenty years, or both.

"'(b) In any prosecution under this section, proof that a defendant has engaged in, or attempted to engage in, any overt act for any purpose described in paragraph (1), (2), (3), (4), or (5) of subsection (a), at any place within any State or the District of Columbia, at any time within ten days after—

"'(1) his travel in interstate or foreign commerce to that place, or

"'(2) his use of any facility of, or means of communication in, interstate or foreign commerce to communicate with or broadcast to, or to convey any article to, any person or persons at that place, or to transport any person to that place,

shall be deemed prima facie proof that such defendant has traveled in, or has used a facility of, or means of communication in, interstate or foreign commerce for a purpose described in paragraph (1), (2), (3), (4), or (5) of subsection (a), unless such defendant explains his travel in, or use of a facility of, or means of communication in, interstate or foreign commerce to the satisfaction of the jury (or of the court when tried without jury).

"'§ 2102. Definitions

"'For purposes of this chapter:

"'(1) The term "basic public works or utility" means (A) any works for the storage, treatment, purification, or distribution of water if such works is owned, operated, licensed, or regulated by any State or local government, or the United States; (B) any sewage, sewage treatment, or sewer facility, if such facility is owned, operated, licensed, or regulated by any State or local government, or the United States; (C) any facility for the generation or transmission of electric energy, if such facility is owned, operated, licensed, or regulated by any State or local government, or the United States; (D) any facility for the distribution of natural gas, if such facility is owned, operated, licensed, or regulated by any State or local government, or the United States; (E) any bus, railway, subway, waterway, or other public transportation system, if such system is owned, operated, licensed, or regulated by any State or local government, or the United States, and any terminal or public highway, rail line, or other necessary right-of-way used in connection with such public transportation system, or any necessary harbor or port facilities in connection therewith; (F) any radio, telegraph, telephone, television, or other communications station or system owned, operated, licensed, or regulated by any State or local government, or the United States; or (G) any of the equipment, property, distribution, or transmission lines or cables, or material of any public works or utility specified in clause (A), (B), (C), (D), (E), or (F).

"'(2) The term "fireman" means any member of a fire department (including a volunteer fire department) of any State, any political subdivision of a State, or the District of Columbia.

"'(3) The term "law enforcement officer" means any officer or employee of the United States, any State, any political subdivision of a State, or the District of Columbia, while engaged in the enforcement or prosecution of any of the criminal laws of the United States, a State, any political subdivision of a State, or the District of Columbia; and such term shall specifically include, but shall not be limited to, members of the National Guard, as defined in section 101(9) of title 10, United States Code, members of the organized militia of any State, or territory of the United States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or the District of Columbia, not included within the definition of National Guard as defined by such section 101(9), and members of the Armed Forces of the United States, while engaged in suppressing acts of violence or restoring law and order during a civil disorder.

"'(4) The term "firearm" means any weapon which is designed to or may readily be converted to expel any projectile by the act of an explosive; or the frame or receiver of any such weapon.

"'(5) The term "arson" means to maliciously set fire to or burn (A) any dwelling, building, or similar structure, whether public or private, or any other person, or (B) any appurtenance to such dwelling, building, or similar structure.

"'(6) The term "explosive" means dynamite and all other forms of high explosives, any explosive bomb, grenade, missile, or similar device, gunpowder, and any chemical compound or mechanical mixture that contains any oxidizing and combustible units, or other ingredients, in such proportions, quantities, or packing that ignition by fire, by friction, by concussion, by percussion, or by detonation of the compound or mixture or any part thereof may cause an explosion.

"'(7) The term "incendiary device" means any incendiary bomb or grenade, including, but not limited to, any device which (A) consists of or includes a container of any material including a flammable liquid or compound and a wick composed of any material which, when ignited, is capable of igniting such flammable liquid or compound, and (B) can be carried or thrown by one individual acting alone.

"'§ 2103. Preemption

"'Nothing contained in this chapter shall be construed as indicating an intent on the part of Congress to occupy the field in which any provisions of this chapter operate to the exclusion of State or local laws on the same subject matter, nor shall any provision of this chapter be construed to invalidate any provision of State law unless such provision is inconsistent with any of the purposes of this chapter or any provision thereof.'

"(b) The table of contents to 'PART I.—CRIMES' of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after

"'101. Records and reports ---------- 2071'

a new chapter reference as follows:

"'102. Riots ---------- 2101'

"OFFICE ON RIOT PREVENTION AND CONTROL

"SEC. 4. (a) There is hereby established an independent agency to be known as the Office on Riot Prevention and Control (hereafter in this section referred to as the "Office"). Such Office shall be administered by a Director who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall receive compensation at the rate prescribed by section 5315 of title 5, United States Code, for level IV of the Executive Schedule.

"(b) The functions of the Office shall be—

"(1) to conduct, as soon as practicable after the enactment of this Act, an operational study of the immediate causes and dynamics of the various riots that have occurred throughout the United States in recent years;

"(2) to make studies and conduct programs of research, in light of the findings and results developed by the study carried out under paragraph (1), designed to develop improved methods, techniques, equipment, and devices which may be useful in the prevention and control of riots, including, but not limited to the development of nonviolent methods and devices for dispersing rioters and other methods of maintaining order with minimum injury to persons and minimum damage to property, and the development of methods and techniques to achieve the most effective coordination and integration of units of local law enforcement agencies with State law enforcement personnel and with units of the National Guard of the several States and the District of Columbia and units of the United States Army while engaged in maintaining and restoring law and order during a riot;

"(3) to conduct, from time to time, seminars and workshops throughout the United

States for the presentation and dissemination, to officers and employees of State and local governments and of the United States concerned with riot prevention and control, of information with respect to the dynamics of recent riots in the United States, and advanced or improved methods, techniques, equipment, and devices for the prevention and control of riots;

"(4) to publish and disseminate to the States and local law enforcement agencies, to the National Guard of the several States and the District of Columbia, and to the United States Army, a quarterly bulletin or publication presenting and evaluating the latest information concerning the dynamics of riots and the prevention and control of riots, including, but not limited to, information concerning advanced or improved tactical and technological methods, techniques, equipment, and devices to control riots;

"(5) to prepare training films on riot control for the use of police departments and other local law enforcement agencies, the National Guard of the several States and the District of Columbia, and the United States Army, relying for purposes of realism on film sequences of actual riots, collated and edited with analytical commentaries; and

"(6) to serve as a central collection office and repository of information of all kinds relating to riots, the immediate causes of riots, and the prevention and effective control of riots.

"(c) For the purpose of carrying out his functions under this section, the Director is authorized to make grants to or enter into contracts with any private or public nonprofit agency, organization, or institution engaged in, or, concerned with research training, education, or demonstration activities in the field of riot prevention or control.

"(d) In carrying out his functions under this section, the Director is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, agency, or independent instrumentality of the Government, information, advice, estimates, and statistics for the purposes of this section; and each such department, agency, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to cooperate with the Director and, to the extent permitted by law, furnish such information, advice, estimates, and statistics to the Director upon his request.

"(e) The Director may appoint and fix the compensation of such officers and employees of the office as he may determine to be required for the performance of its duties.

"(f) The Director may procure temporary and intermittent services of experts and consultants in accordance with section 3101 of title 5, United States Code, but at rates not to exceed $100 per diem for individuals in addition to reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses.

"(g) On or before August 31 of each year the Director shall transmit to the President and the Congress an interim report on his activities under this section during the preceding fiscal year, together with such recommendations as the Director may deem appropriate. The Director shall submit a final and comprehensive report not later than August 31, 1972. Sixty days after submission of such final report the Office shall cease to exist.

"ADVISORY COUNCIL ON COORDINATION OF PROGRAMS OF RIOT PREVENTION AND CONTROL

"SEC. 5. (a) There is hereby established an Advisory Council on Coordination of Programs of Riot Prevention and Control (hereafter referred to as the 'Council'), which shall be composed of 21 members, as follows:

"(1) The Director of the Office on Riot Prevention and Control, who shall be the chairman;

"(2) Three members to be appointed by the Attorney General from among officers and employees of the Department of Justice;

"(3) Five members to be appointed by the President from among chiefs of police departments of local governments whose names are submitted to the President by the National Association of Chiefs of Police;

"(4) The chief of the National Guard Bureau appointed under section 2015 of title 10, United States Code;

"(5) Three members to be appointed by the Secretary of Defense from among the Adjutants General of the several States and the commanding general of the National Guard of the District of Columbia;

"(6) Three members to be appointed by the Secretary of the Army from among members serving on active duty in the United States Army; and

"(7) Five members to be appointed by the President from among citizens in private life with special training, knowledge, or experience in any field (including research) pertinent to the functions of the Council.

"(b) The Council shall promote the coordination, by advice and consultation, of study, research, and informational programs and activities carried out by the Office of Riot Prevention and Control under section 4(b) of this Act with related types of programs and activities carried out by the National Guard of the several States and the District of Columbia, or the United States Army, or local law enforcement agencies, including as appropriate encouragement of the joint conduct or support of such programs and activities.

"(c) The Council shall meet not less than once each six months.

"(d) (1) Members of the Council appointed by the President from private life shall receive compensation at the rate of $100 per day for each day they are engaged in the performance of their duties as members of the Council and, in addition, shall be entitled to reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties as members of the Council.

"(2) Members of the Council, other than those referred to in paragraph (1), shall serve without compensation in addition to that received in their regular public employment, but shall be entitled to reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred in the performance of duties vested in the Council.

"(e) The Council shall appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable. In addition, the Council is authorized to obtain temporary and intermittent services of experts and consultants in accordance with section 3109 of title 5, United States Code.

"(f) Financial and administrative services (including those related to budgeting, accounting, financial reporting, personnel and procurement) may be provided the Council by the General Services Administration, for which payment shall be made in advance, or by reimbursement from funds of the Commission in such amounts as may be agreed upon by the chairman of the Council and the Administrator of General Services.

"(g) On or before August 31 of each year, the Council shall submit to the President and the Congress an interim report on its activities pursuant to this section during the preceding fiscal year. The Council shall submit a final and comprehensive report not later than August 31, 1972. Sixty days after the submission of such final report the Council shall cease to exist.

"AUTHORIZATIONS

"SEC. 6. For the purpose of carrying out sections 4 and 5 of this Act, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968. For any succeeding fiscal year only such sums may be appropriated for such purpose as the Congress hereafter may authorize by law.

"Amend the title so as to read: 'An Act to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit travel or use of any facility in interstate or foreign commerce for the purpose of inciting or instigating the commission or continuation of certain public disturbances resulting in acts of arson, looting, damage or obstruction of basic public works and utilities, and aggravated assaults upon firemen and law enforcement officers; to establish an Office on Riot Prevention and Control and an Advisory Council on Coordination of Programs of Riot Prevention and Control, and for other purposes.'"

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 370

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia submitted amendments, 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 were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT NO. 371

Mr. PROUTY (for himself and Mr. SCOTT) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the motion by Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, relating to an instruction to strike out title II of Senate bill 2388, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENT: REQUIRING PASS-THROUGH OF BENEFITS—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 372

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, unless present social security law is changed, many thousands of those who supposedly will receive increases upon passage of the pending legislation will end up with no more benefits than they now have. Without an amendment such as I submit today, in the case of several hundred thousand persons at the lower end of the beneficiary scale, the only effect will be to give the States a greater subsidy for their welfare payments, shifting the burden to the Federal Government without benefit to those individuals who are on both social security and old age assistance.

At present the lower range of social security payments to the elderly is too low for them to live on, unless they have other resources. Where there are no other resources, social security must be supplemented by old age assistance, financed equally by local and Federal sources under title XIX of the social security code. It has happened before, and without amendment it will happen again, that social security increases are merely applied to reduce the OAA share, leaving the recipients with exactly the same total.

For example, a person receives the minimum $44 of social security in a State whose minimum standard is $85. Old-age assistance pays the other $41, $20.50 of which is Federal money, the rest local. Suppose the bill now before us raises the social security minimum to $50, a $6 monthly increase. Will the beneficiary

now get $91 instead of $85? In most cases, no—unless my amendment is adopted. Instead of passing on the increase and maintaining the same old-age assistance supplement, the States are free to cut the OAA payments so that there is still only $85 per month total income for the needy elderly person. In effect, the State will pocket the $6 intended for the beneficiary. It will cut its supplement from $41 to $35, in effect making a profit on the raise that should go to the beneficiary. Instead of paying $20.50 as its OAA share, it will now pay only $17.50 as its share, saving its own tax money by requiring, in a sense, a $6 kickback from the elderly.

This, I submit, is wrong. The provisions we make for helping the beneficiaries must be made to help them truly, not simply reduce the tax cost of the States at the expense of those we should assist. It can be done by requiring the State to pass the increase along, not countermand it, and this amendment will do it.

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

The amendment (No. 372) was referred to the Committee on Finance.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 2481) to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide special assistance for the improvement of laboratory animal research facilities; to establish standards for the humane care, handling, and treatment of laboratory animals in departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the United States and by recipients of grants, awards, and contracts from the United States; to encourage the study and improvement of the care, handling, and treatment and the development of methods for minimizing pain and discomfort of laboratory animals used in biomedical activities; and to otherwise assure humane care, handling, and treatment of laboratory animals; and for other purposes.

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE] I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1341) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act in order to authorize comprehensive pilot programs in lake pollution prevention and control.

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

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on September 29, 1967, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1862) to amend the authorizing legislation of the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON TAX CONVENTIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Committee on Foreign Relations has scheduled a public hearing on the following tax conventions at 10 a.m., on Thursday, October 5, 1967, in room 4221 of the New Senate Office Building:

One. Tax Convention with Brazil (Ex. J, 90–1).

Two. Income-Tax Convention with Trinidad and Tobago (Ex. F, 90–1).

Three. Supplementary Income-Tax Convention with Canada (Ex. B, 90–1).

Persons interested in testifying on any of these conventions should communicate with the chief clerk of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION BILL

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, as chairman of the Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Separation of Powers, I wish to announce that the subcommittee will hold hearings on Monday and Tuesday, October 30 and 31, on S. 2307, a bill I introduced which would establish procedures to implement the provision in article V of the Constitution for convening State conventions to propose constitutional amendments. The hearings will begin at 10 a.m. each day in the Senate Judiciary Committee hearing room, room 2228, New Senate Office Building.

Article V of the Constitution provides that constitutional amendments may be proposed in one of two ways—by the Congress or by a convention called by the Congress in response to the applications of two-thirds of the State legislatures. Although the framers of the Constitution clearly contemplated that both methods of proposing amendments would be used frequently, it is remarkable that the State-convention method has never been put into operation. This may not be true much longer, however, since 32 State legislatures have petitioned for a convention to propose an amendment to reverse the Supreme Court's one-man one-vote doctrine on State legislative apportionment. If only two more States legislatures memorialize the Congress to call a constitutional convention, we will be faced for the first time in our history with implementing that provision of article V. Since virtually none of the complex and important questions relevant to the composition and functioning of such a convention, and the disposition of its proposals, has ever been authoritatively resolved, the result could well be a constitutional nightmare. S. 2307 is intended to forestall that nightmare, to bring order to the chaos and conflict that threaten in the absence of such legislation.

I noted when I introduced the bill that I am not firmly committed to all of its provisions. I know that some Senators, in speeches on the subject, have indicated that they disagree with the answers supplied by the bill to such questions as how the convention shall be apportioned and how the delegates shall vote, how long State petitions remain valid, and whether a State may rescind a petition it has filed. I want to assure those Senators that I do not contend that the provisions of the bill represent the only or even the best answers to those questions. Any suggestions for modification will be sympathetically received and earnestly considered.

The important thing, I think, is to answer these questions before, not after, the Congress finds itself in receipt of the requisite number of petitions. The legislation I am proposing would be a general statute to implement the State-convention method of amendment specified in article V. Its provisions would not be aimed at any specific effort to amend the Constitution, and thus should not be influenced by conflicting views as to the substantive merits of any proposed amendment, now or in the future. The legislation would establish fair and permanent criteria against which to measure the validity of State petitions received by the Congress. It would set outstanding procedures to guide the Congress in convening a convention and to govern the convention's proceedings. And, finally, it would establish procedures for congressional review of the recommendations of a convention and for forwarding proposed amendments to the States for ratification.

Mr. President, I consider this to be an important and timely bill. I hope my colleagues will agree and will participate in the hearings. Anyone who wishes to testify before the subcommittee or submit a written statement for inclusion in the hearing record may contact Mr. Paul L. Woodard, subcommittee counsel, Room 1403 New Senate Office Building, telephone 4434, to make the necessary arrangements.

NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF NOMINATIONS BY THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

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

Harrison M. Symmes, of North Carolina, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, vice Findley Burns, Jr.

Hugh M. Smythe, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Malta.

In accordance with the committee rule, these pending nominations may not be considered prior to the expiration of 6 days of their receipt in the Senate.

BOSTON RED SOX WIN AMERICAN LEAGUE PENNANT

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, since becoming a Member of this body, I have been looking for the good news behind the morning's headlines. Such news is not always easy to find. The war in Vietnam still rages on. The problems of our urban centers have not yet been solved. The prospect of a surtax awaits us. And the hurricane season is upon us.

But today, Mr. President, I do have good news, and I want to share it, and my pleasure and excitement, with my

colleagues. The Boston Red Sox have won the pennant.

Perhaps those Senators who come from New York, Illinois, or California, cannot really appreciate the delirium which seized my home State yesterday after the last "out" was made by the Minnesota Twins.

It has been 21 years since a Boston Red Sox team won a pennant. Only last year, the Red Sox were one-half game out of last place at the end of the season. But this year, under the tough but inspiring management of Dick Williams, they have captured first place.

I shall not read into the RECORD all of the names and accomplishments of the members of this superb team. Carl Yastrzemski, the Sox brilliant outfielder, affectionately known to us as "Yaz" is only the seventh man in the history of baseball to win the triple crown. Jim Lonborg, our 22-game winner, who had never beaten the Minnesota Twins before, certainly picked the right time by winning the crucial game yesterday. George Scott, Jose Santiago, Gary Bell, Rico Petrocelli, Reggie Smith and all the rest made it a truly "Go Red Sox" club. Their feat is more astounding when we consider that the Sox did it after losing one of their most valuable player, Tony Conigliaro, a former American League home run champion, who had already hit 20 home runs this season before receiving a serious eye injury which kept him out of the lineup for the crucial last quarter.

But perhaps the most outstanding fact about this Red Sox team, apart from their obvious winning spirit, is their youth. We have a young, fighting team which will be with us for a long time to come. The Red Sox relief pitcher who was warming up in the bullpen during yesterday's game was only 18. I am sure there will be many pennants ahead for this Red Sox team.

Mr. President, several weeks ago, during a fairly crucial point in the baseball season, I sent the following poem to Red Sox manager, Dick Williams:

Of all the teams in baseball
The Red Sox are the best.
You've vanquished all contenders
From the East Coast to the West.

Your fans are all excited
With this year's great performance.
We couldn't be more delighted
With your encouraging transformance.

You've won the praise of all of us
Win, lose, or draw the race.
And it is my humble prediction
You'll end up in first place.

Now, Mr. President, as the Red Sox go into the World Series, I express my confidence that owner Tom Yawkey's team will go all the way.

Ah, Mr. President, there is victory in the air in Boston.

How sweet it is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HART in the chair). Will the Senate indulge the Chair the opportunity to express for the RECORD his disagreement with his colleague from Massachusetts that he regarded today's newspaper headlines as good news. My silence might be misunderstood in Michigan.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I have listened with great interest to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts.

I can fully understand his feeling of joy and his optimism today.

I hope that he will preserve those feelings in his memory for they will not otherwise be with him this time next week.

TRIP TO THE FAR EAST

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I have just returned from a trip to the Far East, Middle East, and Europe, visiting Japan, Hong Kong, South Vietnam, Laos, Thailand, Israel, Greece, Italy, and Great Britain.

The trip further increased my respect for the ability and dedication of U.S. civilian and military leaders, all over the world.

Tomorrow I shall present to the Senate, toward the end of the morning hour, a short statement entitled "A Proposal Looking Toward Peace in Vietnam."

BOBBY BAKER BUDDY CHOSEN COUNCIL CHAIRMAN

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, the President has named Max M. Kampelman to the position of Chairman of the new Washington City Council. This appointment of a former Bobby Baker crony follows the Fortas and Bress appointments to high political office.

Senators may recall that Kampelman was one of our important witnesses that we were denied from subpenaing by a 5-to-4 vote in the Committee on Rules and Administration which conducted the Baker investigation.

Kampelman was one of the founders, and former director and general counsel of the District of Columbia National Bank. That bank received the first charter granted in the District of Columbia in 25 years. This is made more interesting when one remembers that for 6 years Kampelman was a Senate administrative assistant, and that he and Bobby Baker were two of the bank's original stockholders. Additionally, you may remember that Baker obtained some highly unusual loans from this bank, such as a $125,000 unsecured loan which covered the full purchase price of his Spring Valley home. When Baker wanted that loan he first went to Kampelman, who sent him to a bank vice president named Collins. When Collins approved the loan he said:

> Mr. Baker's position within the U.S. government recommends serious consideration to the transaction, as he is a gentleman with innumerable friends and connections whose good offices in behalf of our bank would be very valuable in our growth.

Kampelman as a former Senate employee if called as a witness could have been asked what part if any Baker had in securing the charter for the District of Columbia National Bank. Kampelman could also have been asked if he knew of any conflict of interest on the part of anyone in the securing of the charter for the bank. Moreover this man might have told us if any high Government officials were beneficial owners of this bank stock although not stockholders of record.

Mr. President, the country should take note that Bobby Baker associates have been placed in the courts, the district attorney's office, and now on the Washington City Council.

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

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Does not the Senator think that the appropriate time to inquire into the matter will be when Mr. Kampelman appears before the committee for confirmation of his nomination?

Mr. CURTIS. Not being a committee member, I shall not have that opportunity.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I understand that. However, the committee will have the opportunity.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the Senator.

WE SHOULD BE GIVEN THE TRUTH REGARDING OUR ALLEGED VIETNAM COMMITMENTS

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, we continue our involvement in a miserable civil war in Vietnam because of our proud refusal to admit a mistake in our attempt to make South Vietnam a pro-American and an anti-Chinese buffer state. Above everything else, this administration has involved more than 500,000 of our ground forces in the worst terrain in all of the world for Americans to be fighting in a war. More than anything else, we are fighting to avoid admitting failure. As Walter Lippmann bluntly put it, "We are fighting to save face."

Furthermore, according to all reliable reports from leaders of nations numbered among our allies and also other so-called friendly nations and Communist nations, ending the bombing of North Vietnam will result in negotiations toward a cease-fire and an armistice. It is foolish pride to continue to demand that Hanoi make the first overture and sue for peace as a defeated nation.

Those who favor our involvement and expanding bombing of North Vietnam allege that South Vietnam is "the scene of a powerful aggression that is spurred by an appetite for conquest." Who is this powerful aggressor? The only forces fighting against us in Vietnam are the Vietnamese people themselves. When I was in Vietnam in late 1965, General Westmoreland stated to me that the bulk of the Vietcong forces fighting in South Vietnam were born and reared in South Vietnam. Gen. Richard Stillwell, who was then second in command, told me that 80 percent of the Vietcong fighting in the Mekong Delta were born and reared in that delta area. No one will deny that the great majority of the forces of the Vietcong are South Vietnamese. Even today, the National Liberation Front in South Vietnam is enlisting 30,000 young South Vietnamese each month into the Vietcong, its military arm. There are no Chinese troops nor Russian troops nor volunteers of any other Communist Nation fighting against us in South Vietnam.

Administration leaders from the President down claim that because of our

alleged commitment we should not withdraw our ground forces to Saigon and to other coastal bases or enclaves on the South Vietnamese seacoast where our 1st and 7th Fleets and our Air Forces would give ample protection. Those who urge further escalation of the war and now even urge mining the harbor of Haiphong, or bombing the docks, invariably talk of the commitments they allege were made by Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy. Then, from the President down they assert that we Americans must live up to those commitments.

What are the facts? What commitments did President Eisenhower really make? What commitments did the late, great President Kennedy make? First, before I destroy those arguments regarding commitments, may I say that historically there never were two nations, North Vietnam and South Vietnam.

Vietnam for thousands of years was one nation. There was no North Vietnam and South Vietnam. The Geneva accords of 1954, which we agreed to, but which our representatives did not sign, stated.

> The military demarcation line at the 17th parallel is provisional and should not in any way be considered as constituting a political or territorial boundary.

The Geneva accords also called for elections to be held in 1956 toward unification of Vietnam. The fact is that after we installed our puppet Diem, the elections were called off at our behest. The fact is that the civil war in which we are now involved has been raging in Vietnam since 1940, when the people of Vietnam begin their war of liberation, first against the Japanese and then against the French colonial oppressors.

To maintain that the Vietcong is a powerful aggressor spurred by an appetite for conquest is to distort history. This is a war that millions of Vietnamese have been fighting since 1940. While the Communists may have captured leadership of the nationalist movement, we must not lose sight of the fact that this is also a continuation of a war of national liberation. The Saigon military junta is composed of 10 generals. Of the 10, nine fought on the side of the French colonial oppressors in 1953 and 1954 against their own fellow countrymen seeking national liberation. Prime Minister—and soon to be Vice President—Ky was born in Hanoi and was in the French Air Force in 1954 as a cadet in training. In other words, in the Vietnam war for liberation Ky and his cohorts were the tories and the Viet Minh fighting for national liberation were the patriots.

We certainly cannot claim that North Vietnam threatens our existence as a world power. Very definitely, Vietnam is of no strategic or economic importance to the defense of the United States. Now what about that argument that we are defending a free people against military aggression? There is no aggression from the North. For thousands of years Vietnam has been one undivided country. The Geneva accords called for an election of a president during 1956. We approved of this agreement and the Geneva Accords. Nevertheless our CIA and our puppet president of the Saigon regime called off those elections. President Eisenhower stated Ho Chi Minh would have been elected by 80 percent of the vote. Also, in reference to this, we face the embarrassing fact that very few nations in the world accept this argument as an accurate description of the war. More important, the great majority of the Vietcong were born and reared in South Vietnam. It is factually incorrect to claim that we are in Southeast Asia with more than half a million soldiers fighting a land war in an area 10,000 miles distant from our shores because of national aggression by one state against another. This is a fantastic claim lacking adequate basis in fact. Ho Chi Minh was waging his "war of national liberation" long before the Chinese Communists gained power in their own country.

What really are our so-called commitments in Vietnam? Those who urge further escalation of the war always talk of commitments made by Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy and assert that we Americans must live up to those commitments. What are the facts? What commitments did President Eisenhower make? What commitments did President Kennedy make?

Our initial commitment to South Vietnam, made by President Eisenhower in 1954 in a letter to the President of South Vietnam stated:

> I am instructing the American Ambassador * * * to examine with you * * * how an intelligent program of American aid * * * can serve to assist Vietnam in its present hour of trial. . . . The purpose of this offer is to assist the Government of Vietnam in developing and maintaining a strong, viable state capable of resisting attempted subversion or aggression through military means. * * * The U.S. Government hopes that such aid, combined with your own continuing efforts, will contribute effectively toward an independent Vietnam endowed with a strong government.

Can anyone claim that Prime Minister Ky of South Vietnam, who himself was born and reared in Hanoi, heads a strong, viable state? The military junta in Saigon could not remain in power 1 week except for the operations of our Central Intelligence Agency and the support of our Armed Forces. It is becoming increasingly questionable whether even with all our power we can secure a tranquil administration for Thieu and Ky who received but 34 percent support at the September 3 election.

While General Eisenhower was President, the U.S. military advisory group to Vietnam was increased from a total of 327 in 1953 to 685 in January 1961.

Now, having made it crystal clear that President Eisenhower's commitment, so-called, was a very "iffy" commitment indeed, what commitment did the late President John F. Kennedy make?

President Kennedy said on September 3, 1963, shortly before his assassination:

> I don't think that unless a greater effort is made by the government to win popular support that the war can be won out there. In the final analysis, it is their war. They are the ones who have to win it or lose it. We can help them, we can give them equipment, we can send our men out there as advisers, but they have to win it—the people of Vietnam—against the Communists. We are prepared to continue to assist them, but I don't think that the war can be won unless the people support the effort, and, in my opinion, in the last two months the government has gotten out of touch with the people.

On another occasion, our late, great President John F. Kennedy said:

> Transforming Vietnam into a Western redoubt is ridiculous.

Therefore, it is evident that we are not fighting a land war in Southeast Asia because of commitments made by Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy.

After rehashing the tired arguments regarding our so-called commitment, how can it honestly be claimed that our involvement in this war is justified because of our commitment under the SEATO Treaty? When they do not refer to the very "iffy" commitments made by President Eisenhower and President Kennedy to justify our involvement in the civil war in Vietnam, administration officials during the last year and a half fall back on our so-called obligation under the SEATO Treaty.

Article IV is the basis for this claim. The text of article IV is as follows:

> 1. Each Party recognizes that aggression by means of armed attack in the treaty area against any of the Parties or against any State or territory which the Parties by unanimous agreement may hereafter designate, would endanger its own peace and safety, and agrees that it will in that event act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional processes. Measures taken under this paragraph shall be immediately reported to the Security Council of the United Nations.
>
> 2. If, in the opinion of any of the Parties, the inviolability or the integrity of the territory or the sovereignty or political independence of any Party in the treaty area or of any other State or territory to which the provisions of paragraph 1 of this Article from time to time apply is threatened in any way other than by armed attack or is affected or threatened by any fact or situation which might endanger the peace of the area, the Parties shall consult immediately in order to agree on the measures which should be taken for the common defense.
>
> 3. It is understood that no action on the territory of any State designated by unanimous agreement under paragraph 1 of this Article or on any territory so designated shall be taken except at the invitation or with the consent of the government concerned.

The odd thing about the SEATO Treaty is its elusiveness; it has a quicksilver character about it. It seems to suit the purpose of whomsoever is interpreting it at any given moment. Secretary of State Rusk has stated:

> It is this fundamental SEATO obligation that has from the outset guided our actions in South Vietnam. . . . If the United States determines that an armed attack has occurred against any nation to whom the protection of the treaty applies, then it is obligated to "act to meet the common danger" without regard to the views or actions of any other treaty member.

However, the architect of the SEATO Treaty, the late Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, in trying to assuage congressional fears about the degree of commitment that the United States was making in the SEATO Treaty, said in 1955:

> If there is a revolutionary movement in Vietnam or Thailand, we (SEATO nations) would consult together as to what to do about it, because if there were a subversive

movement that was in fact propagated by communism, it would be a very grave threat to us. But we have no undertaking to put it down; all we have is an undertaking to consult what to do about it.

It is interesting to note that the last sentence of section 1 of article IV states:

Measures taken under this paragraph shall be immediately reported to the Security Council of the United Nations.

In a publication issued by the Department of State in March 1966, entitled "The Legality of U.S. Participation in the Defense of Vietnam," the claim is made that our Government fulfilled this obligation in August 1964, when we asked the Council to consider the situation created by North Vietnamese attacks on U.S. destroyers in the Tonkin Gulf; twice again in February 1965, when the United States sent additional reports to the Security Council on the conflict in Vietnam and on the additional measures taken by the United States in the collective defense of South Vietnam; and in January 1966, when we formally submitted the Vietnam question to the Security Council for its consideration.

It is interesting to note that we did not take any step toward reporting our action in Vietnam to the Security Council until August 1964—after we had already committed thousands of men and billions of dollars of equipment to the prosecution of the war in Vietnam. It apparently took officials of the State Department quite a long time to determine that we were in Vietnam because of the SEATO Treaty. In fact, it appears that this justification was made after it was finally realized that all the other timeworn excuses and loophole-ridden justifications would not hold water.

The fact is that the SEATO Treaty has never been invoked with reference to Vietnam. Of the eight signatories to the treaty, only four—Thailand, the Philippines, Australia, and New Zealand—have given us any assistance whatever and that only minimal.

In a recent speech the President referred to statements of various leaders of nations in Southeast Asia—statements which ostensibly support our involvement in Vietnam.

He quoted the Prime Minister of Australia. What has Australia, which is supposedly so concerned, done to help us? The answer is that this nation of more than 10 million people has sent less than 1,000 soldiers to Vietnam to fight alongside the more than half million Americans. A tremendous contribution for a nation that feels itself threatened by so-called North Vietnamese aggression.

The President quoted the Prime Minister of New Zealand as thanking God that "America regards aggression in Asia with the same concern as it regards aggression in Europe." New Zealand has made the tremendous sacrifice of sending approximately 200 soldiers to assist us. It is obvious that the Government of New Zealand does not regard the so-called aggression in Vietnam very seriously.

If some of our so-called allies in Vietnam seem to be heavy verbally in support of us, words are about as far as they are willing to go.

Regarding South Korea, it is a fact that South Korea has sent 50,000 fine fighting men to fight in the Vietnam civil war. It is also a fact that this was done only after we agreed to give and did give South Korea more than $150 million additional aid in 1965 and 1966. And this year approximately $200 million additional American taxpayers' money.

This represents additional foreign assistance as a quid pro quo for this fighting contingent armed, fed, paid, supplied, and maintained entirely at our expense.

The President quoted President Marcos of the Philippines. The Philippine Republic, freed by us, has made a contribution of only 2,000 noncombat engineers, and has recently refused to increase that contingent. Also, it is worth noting that the Philippine sacrifice was made after we agreed to increase aid to the Philippines to the tune of more than $100 million. We should also note that when President Johnson recently sent two personal emissaries, Gen. Maxwell Taylor and Clark Clifford, to assess the situation in Southeast Asia, their plane was forced to land, because of engine trouble, at Clark Air Force Base in the Philippine Republic. This embarrassed them. A bitter congressional campaign was being waged by opponents of the Marcos administration based an opposition to even this trifling aid to us in Vietnam. President Marcos refused to see them, although he was within half an hour's drive from the base. Here is real evidence of his concern over our involvement in Vietnam. Public sentiment in the Philippine Republic is likely to result in his recall of that noncombat engineer group early next year.

The President also quoted the Prime Minister of Malaysia, which, interestingly enough, is not a member of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization. Is not that rather peculiar for a nation which believes itself to be threatened with Communist aggression and from North Vietnam? Furthermore, Malaysia has not contributed one soldier or 1 cent to aid us in Vietnam.

Mr. President, the observations of the distinguished majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD] who recently returned from a tour of Southeast Asia are worth noting in this regard. The senior Senator from Montana found that while criticism of the war is not great, there is little enthusiasm for it except in South Korea and possibly in Taiwan. To continue to lose the priceless lives of thousands of young Americans in behalf of a cause in which our so-called allies show so little interest is unconscionable.

Also South Vietnam has never by formal action asked SEATO for assistance.

What of other SEATO nations? France has incessantly condemned our involvement in Vietnam and continually urged our withdrawal. Great Britain has done nothing to help. As a matter of fact, many of the war supplies reaching North Vietnam arrive on ships flying the Union Jack. Pakistan, the remaining SEATO signatory, has condemned our participating in the Vietnam civil war and has been against us more often than with us in other international disputes in which we have taken a position. With an ally like Pakistan, who needs enemies?

Like all other official allegations of why we are in Vietnam and what we are doing there, those based on the SEATO Treaty go up in smoke upon the most cursory examination.

Unpleasant as it may be, the time for reappraisal has come, and thoughtful Americans should resolve to be realistic about it. The first step is to cast off the illusion that the civil war in Vietnam represents a final showdown with world communism.

Mr. President, our mission should be to help people, if they want help, and to assist in building political and social conditions that will deter the people of the underdeveloped nations from looking to the Communist ideology for the cure for their national ills.

This does not at all mean abandoning the field everywhere to the Communists and retreating into isolation, but it does mean that we should apply appropriate measures to the particular situation we are dealing with, instead of trying to handle them all by a formula derived from a bygone set of circumstances. It means abandoning the assumption that the only way our national interest can be protected is by the direct application of our military power around the periphery of the Communist world. It means limiting our commitments to vital areas and bringing them into line with our capacity to fulfill them. Dean Rusk may assume the United States has a mandate from Almighty God to police the world. I repudiate any such view.

Mr. President, if we are truly interested in seeking peace in Vietnam, the President should immediately announce the unconditional cessation of the bombing of North Vietnam without imposing any conditions whatever and announce that such policy will continue for sufficient time for us to determine if a diplomatic ending of this conflict can be achieved. Also at the same time our President would do well to announce that in South Vietnam our Armed Forces would willingly abstain from offensive ground action if the Vietcong would likewise abstain from offensive action and acts of terrorism in order to afford the Vietcong and the leaders of the Hanoi and Saigon regimes some days or even weeks to arrange for a conference of independent delegates representing each group involved for the purpose of seeking a cease-fire and an armistice. Every indication that we have from leaders of friendly nations is that an unconditional suspension of the bombing will bring the North Vietnamese to the conference table. The most recent was the statement last week by Canadian Foreign Minister Paul Martin that:

All attempts to bring about talks between the two sides are doomed to failure unless the bombing is stopped.

Canada's plea was echoed at the United Nations by representatives from countries throughout the world.

There is a limited risk in our taking such initiative. The risk is worth taking, especially in view of the statement by Secretary of Defense McNamara of the limited effectiveness of the bombing of

North Vietnam and in view of the alternative risks involved in continued escalation of the war. We are the most powerful Nation on earth. If we are sincerely interested in peace, we can afford to bend a little and venture this minimal risk.

I urge the President to announce that along with stopping all bombing of North Vietnam unconditionally, we will withdraw to our coastal enclaves including Saigon once negotiations begin, providing, of course, that the Vietcong cease offensive action during that period. Furthermore that we are willing to withhold offensive action on the ground in South Vietnam and in the air over South Vietnam if the Vietcong and Hanoi abstain from offensive action, any terrorist attacks, and infiltration of forces south of the DMZ provided we also cease sending in further reinforcements.

Mr. President, we must seek to neutralize Vietnam and end the bloodletting there. Otherwise, the future holds forth for us involvement in that wartorn land for 5 years—possibly 10 or 20 years. Even more compelling is the fact that to continue our present tragic course is likely to lead to a third world war.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 109) to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation commemorating 50 years of service to the Nation by the Langley Research Center.

RELIGIOUS GROUPS STRONGLY ENDORSE SENATE RATIFICATION OF THE HUMAN RIGHTS CONVENTIONS CXLVIII

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, as one who has advocated Senate ratification of the Human Rights Conventions on Forced Labor, Freedom of Association, Genocide, Political Rights of Women, and Slavery during every day of the 90th Congress, I want to express my gratitude for the tremendous support provided by American churches and religious organizations.

Among the American religious organizations which have worked long and hard for Senate ratification of these four conventions are B'nai B'rith, the Episcopal Church, United Church of Christ, Unitarian-Universalist Association, National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., National Catholic Conference for Interracial Justice, General Board of Christian Social Concerns, the Methodist Church, American Friends Service Committee, National Conference of Christians and Jews, National Spiritual Assembly of the Bahai's of the United States, Catholic Association for International Peace, American Baptist Convention, American Jewish Congress, and Hadassah.

What a remarkable ecumenical display.

These groups, having literally millions of members, share one basic tenet—a belief in and a dedication to the real dignity of man.

I urge the Senate to heed the wise message of these millions of men and women of good will.

I urge the Senate to translate these cherished human rights into legal reality by immediately ratifying the Human Rights Conventions on Forced Labor, Freedom of Association, Genocide, Political Rights of Women, and Slavery and thereby put our Nation squarely on record on these fundamental questions of human dignity and world peace.

MEXICO—A NATION ON THE MOVE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, one of the most amazing—and heartwarming—developments in the Western Hemisphere in recent decades has been the steady rise of Mexico both as a power and a partner.

That rise is being accelerated today. Despite some serious problems, such as pockets of rural poverty and rapidly expanding population, Mexico is a nation on the move. Under the leadership of such statesmen as ex-President Adolfo Lopez Mateos and current President Gustavo Diaz Ordaz, enormous progress has been made in achieving economic stability, a high growth rate and opportunities for the nation's citizens.

A recent news article published in the U.S. News & World Report documents that country's success story. At one point, it states:

> Mexico is a shining light that is pointing the way to progress for other nations in this Hemisphere and throughout the developing world.

To that, I can only say "Amen."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

MEXICO'S SUCCESS STORY: NEW INDUSTRIES, SOUND MONEY, STEADY GROWTH

(NOTE.—The Mexicans appear to have found a success formula that is unique in Latin America. Massive worries remain—nagging poverty in the rural areas and an exploding population, as examples. But fresh capital, sound currency and business incentives are giving the U.S. neighbor development on a steady and stable course.)

MEXICO CITY.—Just to the south of the United States is to be found a real success story in what has been an underdeveloped nation. This story points to what can be done by a combination of hard work with policies that experience has shown to be practical.

Mexico, if all of the signs are right, definitely has "taken off." It is breaking through the restraints that long have held the nation in check. Still to be solved are massive problems—rural poverty, maldistribution of income and an exploding population.

The contrast with many other nations of Latin America is sharp. Instability, inflation and unwillingness to face up to basic problems have slowed progress in many of these countries. Mexico, by contrast, is proving that planning for the future, sound policies of taxing and spending, and insistence on a strong currency can be the keys to steady and stable growth for developing nations.

Sound credit. Two years ago, the International Monetary Fund declared the Mexican peso a "hard currency." Mexico's international credit is strong, and there is no trouble in floating bond issues in the New York market. One loan recently was marketed in Europe.

This country's planners seek to keep the nation's rate of growth between 6 and 7 per cent a year, which they regard as a "sustainable rate." When that rate rises to 10 per cent or above inflation threatens and steps are taken to cool things off.

The result is that the average rise in the cost of living in Mexico has been about 2 per cent annually—a record that compares favorably with rises in the so-called "advanced" nations of the world. A special effort is made to keep down costs of the basic elements of diet—beans, corn and milk. It is in this field that the contrast is sharpest with most developing nations.

Confidence high. With the Mexican peso stable, private savings have been growing at a rate of 15 per cent or more a year. The growth of financial institutions has been equally striking. The increased flow of savings is providing capital for both private and public investment—in building, in industry.

The high rate of savings and of investment reflects confidence of people in Mexico's future.

Younger people in Mexico have the idea that the way to make money is to go into business—just as Americans long have felt. The country's "new rich" are industrialists. In most of Latin America, by contrast, the idea is to own land, to go into the military service, or to invest in U.S. or Europe.

Foreign plants wooed.—Mexico's policies are encouraging investment from abroad. In the past two years, direct foreign investment and reinvested earnings of foreign-owned firms have averaged around 200 million dollars annually. At present, many smaller U.S. firms are joining the bigger companies in Mexican investment.

A new development is in the plants that are springing up near the Mexican-U.S. border.

Border towns, once best known for vice, now are attracting American firms. Most are light manufacturing industries, including textiles and electronics, that use much hand labor. Tijuana, Mexicali, Ciudad Juárez have 30 to 40 of these firms, with others interested.

A special policy of the Mexican Government is encouraging foreign-company investment along the border. So long as the finished products of these companies are not sold in Mexico, the firms are permitted to bring in materials duty-free. The hope apparently is to compete with Hong Kong and other centers in Asia. Labor costs are one third to one half those in U.S. While these costs are much higher than Hong Kong's the cost of transportation to the American market is far lower.

Flexible policy.—Mexico, like other nations, including Canada and France, frets about too much control by foreign interests.

There is a so-called "Mexicanization" policy requiring 51 per cent Mexican ownership of new industries that sell inside the country. This tends to deter some U.S. firms. However, the policy is flexible.

If an American firm is producing goods not competitive with Mexican firms, uses a lot of labor, wants to locate in an area that needs new industry, and the products can be exported, the 51 per cent requirement is waived. In one recent case, only 15 per cent Mexican ownership was required.

Said one official: "U.S. investors scream about the Mexicanization policy—but go right on investing."

Although Mexico is making a major effort to become self-sufficient in both manufactured goods and farm products—and imports are held down to around 8 or 9 per cent of the country's total output—the Government often has refused to protect many inefficient industries. There is pressure on

the country's industrialists to cut costs and become more efficient. If prices get out of line, the tap is opened and foreign products are let in more freely.

This country has shown farsightedness in development of the tourist trade—while others in Latin America lagged.

In 1961, despite strong objections from Mexican airlines that wanted protection, U.S. and other foreign airlines were given new routes. Results have been spectacular, with annual increases in traffic from 7 to 14 per cent.

Last year tourists, including those to U.S.-border cities, numbered 1.5 million, and they spent 860 million dollars. This income was a big plus to Mexico in balancing its international payments.

Everything possible has been done to make tourists feel at home. Special examinations are required of guides. Police and other officials wear armbands telling what languages they speak. Ceiling prices are set on hotel rooms—and enforced. Tourist offices have been set up over much of the world.

Hotel space in Mexico City always is in tight supply. Acapulco, once strictly a winter playground, has developed a year-round business. New areas are being developed. The 1968 Olympic Games, in Mexico City, will give a boost to the profitable tourist trade.

Ingenuity and initiative are being shown in other fields as well.

BOON FOR AGRICULTURE

Two years ago, when the American Government ended the *bracero* program which permitted thousands of Mexicans to enter the U.S. to pick vegetable and fruit crops, the Mexican Government entered only a mild protest despite heavy loss of *bracero* income.

Now, U.S. capital is pouring into the development of Mexican fruit and vegetable growing for the American market. Many U.S. growers, faced with higher wage rates, have had to switch to crops requiring less "stoop labor."

A good example is found in tomatoes. When production dipped in California, Mexico rushed to fill the gap, and tomatoes now are an important export. One major U.S. firm has set up a catsup plant. Other plants are being planned.

In the end, U.S. termination of the *bracero* program—the result of heavy pressure by labor unions—may prove a boon instead of a deterrent to Mexico.

Over all, agriculture in Mexico is not advancing as rapidly as manufacturing. Yet farm gains are outstripping those of other countries in Latin America.

FAST-GROWING POPULATION

The area of land in Mexico that is suitable for efficient and really productive farming is small in relation to the population of 43 million. This problem is further complicated by a still unsolved problem of a population explosion of the kind that is general through Latin countries of the Hemisphere.

A portion of the Mexican farm economy consists of peasants, on marginal land, barely eking out an existence. Yet another portion of Mexico's farm economy—where it is possible—is highly developed. Says a bank economist:

"The commercial sector of the farm economy here is vigorous, productive, impressive. It can hold its own with the Western United States."

Advanced irrigation. Mexico's drive for irrigation goes back to the 1920s when farsighted policies were applied. Irrigation has opened the way for large increases in production on otherwise unproductive land.

On Mexico's Northwest Coast are large irrigated wheat farms, operated by progressive farmers. In harvesting season, an American would think he was in Kansas. Yields are extremely high and modern machinery and techniques are used.

Mexico has passed self-sufficiency in wheat and could produce much more than it does. However, the Government has drawn back from protecting marginal farmers by the use of price supports, and is not trying to become a surplus producer. Policy, instead, is to urge farmers to grow oilseeds, feed grains and other crops in which Mexico is not yet self-sufficient.

Varieties of wheat developed in Mexico, with the help of the Rockefeller Foundation, are being sent to India, Pakistan, Turkey and other parts of the world. These strains are more suitable for hot climates and irrigated land than for U.S. varieties.

MANY TRAINED EXPERTS

One explanation for Mexico's success lies in its "cadre of technicians."

Unlike its neighbors to the south, Mexico has trained experts in fields such as finance and banking, dam construction, highway and railroad engineering. If the country wants to build a dam, it does not need to run to the U.S. for either money or know-how. Some Mexican-built dams are regarded as engineering masterpieces. U.S. engineers admit there is nothing they can teach Mexican engineers about draining and irrigation.

Mexico, among other things, ranks as a pioneer in the construction of superhighways and freeways. Some of its engineering ideas in this field have been borrowed by U.S. highway engineers.

Another key factor in the Mexican success story: hard work.

Says an official of the U.S. State Department:

"This is rather hard to explain, but Mexicans are not afraid of getting their hands dirty. In fact, to earn a degree in any professional field, a student must spend at least six months to a year in social service. Many work in remote areas as doctors and engineers. The son of a peasant in Mexico can work up to any job he is capable of filling."

Hand in hand with economic stability has been stability of Government.

A one-party system usually has been found to lead to nepotism, corruption and stagnation. Nobody seems to know quite why, but in Mexico, one-party Government has worked. Upper levels of Mexican bureaucracy are competent and dedicated.

Explains an official of an international bank: "Mexicans try to explain this to me in terms of the revolution, of tradition and culture, but I still do not understand it at all."

Civilian control. Since before World War II, this country has had civilian, middle-of-the-road Government. At times, Mexico has shifted to the left; at other times, to the right. There has been change even when outgoing Presidents have, for all practical purposes, named their successors.

The way the political system operates, extremists so far have had no chance of election. In addition, the military has little power; so does the church. Whatever the reason the result is a system that provides government in a responsible manner.

The Mexican Government, for example, has played a major role in spurring the country's development boom through the *Nacional Financiera,* a Government finance corporation. This agency, through development loans, has helped to establish more than 50,000 industrial concerns.

Many of Mexico's most successful manufacturing firms got their start, or their impetus for expansion, from the *Nacional Financiera.* Its officials are highly respected for their business know-how and sense of responsibility.

Yet Mexico still is beset by serious problems.

Heritage of poverty. The worst of the troubles is rural poverty, inherited from the past and aggravated by land reform which resulted in units too small for efficient, modern farming.

In sections of the Mexican interior, there are places where per capita income is as low as in countries such as India or Egypt, or lower. In some semidesert areas, water is too scarce to meet needs of the people. As a result, some are on the verge of starvation. There are about 3 million native Indians living in remote areas on unproductive land. They speak no Spanish and exist much as their ancestors did across the centuries.

Because of inability to live on the land, hundreds of thousands of Mexicans in a population that is burgeoning have flocked into the larger cities. The result is an employment problem. Mexico has its slums, but they do not compare with those in many other Latin-American countries.

Government's choices. In view of the need to improve the plight of the rural poor, Mexico's economic planners are faced with hard choices.

Some think more should be done for the poor—smaller irrigation projects should be built in poverty-stricken areas, and more secondary roads built to open up remote areas.

Others say money should be put, first, into productive, modern agriculture to build Mexico's economic strength, and that the country is not yet able to undertake a U.S.-type "war on poverty."

The Mexican Government is trying to maintain a balance between these two viewpoints—doing enough in rural areas to prevent starvation, but putting most resources where the payoff is bigger and quicker.

Some steps have been taken to alleviate poverty. Strong efforts are being made in education especially. One program is trying to provide more jobs in small towns in rural areas; another is designed to provide more agricultural credit for small farmers. Officials admit much more needs to be done.

Mexico's Government, despite a good overall record, has had some setbacks.

As an example, the Government requires that automobile assembly be done locally, with 60 per cent of the parts produced in Mexico. It is almost impossible to import a car because of Government regulations. But the market is not large enough to support the required assembly plants. The policy has produced inefficiency and high prices.

Among other problems:

Mexico's birth rate is extremely high, and nothing much has been done about family planning. This is not the result of any church doctrine. Mexicans believe every child born is another fine Mexican to be proud of, and the more Mexicans the better. Outside experts say this may be a "time bomb" which will act as a deterrent to social and economic development in the future.

Occasional violence has occurred in Mexico as elsewhere. A gun battle between rival union factions in Acapulco in August killed 32 and wounded nearly a hundred. Police recently arrested 13 persons on charges of participating in a plot financed by Red China to overthrow the Government by guerrilla warfare.

Higher education is inadequate. Too much of college training is concentrated in the National University at Mexico City, now enrolling 85,000 students. Many teachers and students are part-time, and standards are low. New idea is to improve provincial schools, especially technical schools.

Mexico needs to develop more advanced industries, and to develop its own domestic markets. Too much emphasis is on such products as dishes and home appliances that are exported to foreign markets.

THE WAY TO PROGRESS

Added up, however, Mexico is a shining light that is pointing the way to progress for other nations in this Hemisphere and throughout the developing world.

The United States has indicated that it would be happy to see Mexico assume politi-

cal leadership in Latin America. Mexico has never assumed this role.

Mexican Presidents have been quiet, locally oriented men as a rule, concerned mainly with domestic problems rather than with hemispheric power and leadership. Some observers say this may be one of the secrets of Mexico's success.

HOUSING FOR MODERATE-INCOME FAMILIES

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, ACTION-Housing Inc., a private nonprofit organization which has provided new housing for moderate-income families in Pittsburgh, Pa., now proposes a new plan for housing rehabilitation on a mass scale.

Pittsburgh, a publication of the chamber of commerce of that city, commented on the plan in its September 1967, issue. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

NEW HOPE FOR OLD HOUSING

Pittsburgh is at it again . . . attracting national attention for tackling with imagination another tough problem that is common to urban centers.

This time the action is in the field of housing renewal.

And *action* is the apt word.

Pittsburgh's ACTION-Housing, Inc. is advancing a concept of "providing housing rehabilitation on a mass scale." The proposal is in essence a probing, creative attempt to find a practical answer to revitalizing aging neighborhoods. The purpose of the effort is implicit in the title of a proposed corporation: Allegheny Housing Rehabilitation Corporation (AHRCO).

J. Stanley Purnell, chairman of the board and president of ACTION-Housing, Inc., in testimony (July 27, 1967) before the Housing & Urban Affairs Subcommittee of the U.S. Senate Banking & Currency Committee describes AHRCO as "A joint venture between the private and public sectors to bring about a large-scale rehabilitation of old housing in old neighborhoods for families of moderate income." The income range specifically noted by Mr. Purnell is "between $5,000 and $9,000 per annum."

As a privately structured non-profit corporation, ACTION-Housing has to its credit a number of new housing developments that have been sold or rented to Pittsburgh families of moderate income. In its new proposal, ACTION-Housing enjoys guideline experience in successfully rehabilitating 22 old but structurally sound houses in an old Pittsburgh neighborhood. The corporation acquired the properties on the city's Cora Street at about $4,000 per unit, renewed the houses for an approximate $6,000 each—and are now renting them at only a little more than the tenants were previously paying.

The AHRCO proposal envisions capitalization of between $3,000,000 and $4,000,000 by Pittsburgh industry—with implementation established on a profit-motivated basis in cooperation with local, state, and federal agencies.

It is the intention of AHRCO to provide leadership in the reclamation of approximately 90,000 units of deteriorated dwelling units that are susceptible of rehabilitation in Allegheny County—and to serve eventually as the prototype that could be repeated in many cities throughout the country.

It is likely that there is contained in the proposed AHRCO approach the seeds of a workable solution to the whole problem of aging housing and—in large measure—slum prevention.

With the support and participation of Pittsburgh's leading corporations, AHRCO is on its way to becoming a reality . . . providing another focal point for legislators and the civic leadership of all of the nation's cities.

THE COMPETITIVE ROLE OF PUBLIC ELECTRIC POWER

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, Gov. Philip Hoff, of Vermont, has long been a leader in the struggle to bring down the costs of electric power in the Northeast. On September 14, he addressed the Municipal Electric Association of New York at its 37th annual meeting in Bolton Landing, N.Y., stressing the need for the full development of the hydroelectric resources of the Northeast and the necessity of creating and maintaining a strong competitive force of public power to bring low-cost and reliable electric power to the region.

Pointing out that Vermont's electric rates are the lowest in New England, Governor Hoff said that this is "due to the fact that we have had injected into our total electric power business in the State of Vermont a sizable portion of power, both from St. Lawrence and Niagara, and it has been this injection of public power that has allowed us to have these lower rates." He went on to note that "we desperately need a public power measuring stick to apply against the private power industry in the New England area."

In the State of New York, we have been fighting to maintain the competitive role of public power to serve as a stimulus to the private electric utilities. As Governor Hoff points out, high power costs are not only a State problem, but are a regional problem as well. I hope that his suggestion that cooperation between New York and New England in the development of nuclear generating facilities for electric power supply on a regional basis is given careful consideration.

Because of the importance of Governor Hoff's speech, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

SPEECH BY GOV. PHILIP G. HOFF BEFORE MUNICIPAL ELECTRIC UTILITIES ASSOCIATION OF NEW YORK, 37TH ANNUAL CONFERENCE, BOLTON LANDING, N.Y., SEPTEMBER 14, 1967

Honorable Philip G. Hoff, Thank you very much, and good morning, gentlemen.

My apologies for preventing you from participating in what has certainly been one of the loveliest days of this summer. Frankly, we have had it coming to us. It has been kind of a tough summer, although we can be grateful we don't live along the coast of Maine, or Cape Cod, or along the coast of Massachusetts, where they have probably had the worst summer in many years.

I am here not to talk to you at any length, and I would like to make things clear before I begin, and that is that I have no particular expertise in terms of the electric power problems of New York State. I am broadly familiar with your problems here, and your opportunities, I might add, but I do not pretend in any way to have any expertise in respect to it. I do think I have a good deal of expertise as far as Vermont and New England are concerned, and my object here this morning is to talk to you about what I would like to call the Vermont-New England story in the hopes that it may have some bearing upon your problems here in New York State.

I should say at the beginning that I am neither private power oriented or public power oriented. I like to consider myself as being consumer power oriented, and this, essentially, is my point of embarkation, and it is this philosophy which I have attempted to follow during the entire time that I have been Governor of Vermont. I will come back to that problem before I am through.

Inasmuch as I have developed a few slight prejudices against one sector of the electric power industry here in the New England area, at least, and I do think through Vermont, perhaps we can speak to a couple of problems that you have.

Vermont has the lowest power rates in all of New England, and considerably lower than the New England States. The New England States, incidentally, as a whole have the highest power rates in the country.

In honesty, the reason that Vermont's power rates are lower than our New England neighbors is due to the fact that we have had injected into our total electric power business in the State of Vermont a sizable portion of power, both from St. Lawrence and from Niagara, and it has been this injection of public power that has allowed us to have these lower rates.

May I say, however, it has not simply been just the question of the lower costs of public power in and of themselves, because the injection of this kind of power into Vermont has made Vermonters very conscious of the competing costs of public and private power, and it has been, in essence, a vehicle to exert continuing pressure upon the private sector of the power business in Vermont, and thus it has been not simply the price but the potential comparison and competition offered through this medium that has stood Vermont in such good stead.

Vermont, then, has been the only recipient of any real form of public power in the New England area, and it certainly shows. The New England situation, as a whole, is one of almost tragedy. It has far more power companies, both in terms of generation, transmission and distribution than makes any sense whatsoever, and if we just take the large number of generating companies, large private industries in the New England area, we have far more than that relatively small region can economically afford.

We have in addition a large number of municipals and co-ops, although not too many co-ops in the area, outside of the State of Vermont. They have in a very real sense been the victims of the larger power companies in New England, because they have been able to buy their power only through them, and thus it is that they have been able to make very little headway outside of what limited generation goes on through some of the municipals.

The generating facilities in New England as a whole have tended to be outmoded, even archaic, and we, the people of the New England area tend to pay this price.

In terms of Vermont and New England, several years ago it came to our attention that there were very large generating potentials, hydroelectric in character, located in many parts of Canada, of course, but the one that particularly came to our attention was the Churchill Falls project in Labrador. A number of years ago I was privileged to attend a meeting at which Premier Smallwood of Newfoundland spoke, and at that time they were actively negotiating with the private power companies of New England with respect to bringing power from Labrador to Newfoundland and then down through the coast of Maine. I no more than heard this than I recognized instinctively—although I am not an engineer—that this was not economically feasible, and we bided our time

until finally it was declared to be economically unfeasible.

We then, acting on behalf of the people of the State of Vermont, made contact with Quebec Hydroelectric, and after some discussion, it appeared quite possible that we might be able to obtain as much as 2,000,000 kilowatts of power, which could then be brought into New England and inject into that total power picture there a very sizable amount of public power, which could do as much as anything we could think of to improve that situation, not simply again in terms of cost alone, but in terms of the comparison and competition which it provided.

The problem was what sort of vehicle could be utilized for this particular purpose, and we finally went far west and copied a project that had been used in the Columbia River Basin, a model of its kind, essentially a non-profit corporation, not exactly the same as our situation but essentially utilizing a non-profit corporation which could issue tax exempt bonds, and we had an exact model, through Columbia, which we could follow.

So approximately two years ago we did some rather extensive work on this, utilizing the best bond counsel, corporate people that exist within the New England area and the City of New York, and we finally, a year ago this past January submitted to the General Assembly of the State of Vermont this model, this so-called non-profit corporation for them to act on, and then I began to learn something about real power politics, more so than I had learned since the time I have been Governor.

The problem, of course, was that we had made absolutely no promises to anybody. We did think that, potentially, it was possible to bring in as much as 2,000,000 kilowatts of power. We thought that there was a very distinct possibility that this could be 4 mills or less at the point where it would be turned over to other companies in New England.

We did not promise this. We had no guarantee that it could be done. So that what, in a very real sense, we were talking about was a potential, and we were merely seeking to create in the Vermont Legislature a vehicle which if it were at all possible could be utilized for the great promise offered by the Churchill Falls project.

And we did manage to get it through the Senate, and then we were witness to the most extensive lobbying, highly questionable in terms of its motive and in terms of its approach, and ultimately that bill was defeated on the least reading in the House of the State of Vermont by a very large margin. So the perfect vehicle—because we had spent a great deal of time in developing this vehicle—disappeared.

The municipals and co-ops have undertaken the basic responsibility now, and we are still in hopes that we may be able to utilize some portion of the power developed out of the Churchill Falls project, although in our discussions with the Quebec Hydroelectric the amount of power that we hoped to take from them was in no way identified with any particular project.

But I learned something about a thing called the arrogance of power—not a phrase coined by me in any manner, shape or form, but the more I have been in this business—and, incidentally, this is true whether it be in the form of electric power or whether it be in a wide variety of other activities connected with our society.

One of the most serious mistakes that any society can make is to put too much power into too few hands and, after a while, it becomes self-serving and it doesn't serve the objectives of the society which allowed it to come into being, and, in the end it spends most of its time trying to aggrandize itself, to develop itself, to perpetuate itself in power rather than to serve the people who enabled it to come into being. This perhaps is a lesson that does have some bearing on the situation here in the State of New York. I am sure of this. The need for a measuring stick is overwhelming and it is a mistake to allow any large generating source to be controlled by one group alone. Indeed, this would be true whether it be public or private, because public institutions can become self-serving, too. But it is a mistake to put any generating facility completely, or at least potentially in the hands of one group alone, because if you do, I can promise you that in the end the needs of the people will not be met and, as a person who is essentially consumer oriented, this concerns me very greatly.

For this reason, then, I have been an active proponent of the Dickey-Lincoln project in the State of Maine, and this, too, has been fought tooth and nail by the private power interests in the New England area. As I foresee it, they are going to continue this kind of tooth and nailing fighting to the day that it either passes and is an accomplished fact or until it is defeated.

However, in New England, particularly, we desperately need a public power measuring stick to apply against the private power industry in the New England area. I must say that I think we have made some progress in New England in terms of the private power interests themselves. Nevertheless, this has been at a snail's pace. It has come only at the cost of a great deal of energy and time, particularly on my part.

Finally, we have obtained the active interest of a few newspapers in the New England area, and this has helped immeasurably, too, but the course is very long indeed. And I think, too, nobody should underestimate the political strength of the private utilities in the New England area. They have an amount of political persuasion and control that far exceeds their actual contribution to the New England society, and nevertheless it is there. Again, it is there because it, essentially, has such a large monopoly.

Worst of all, however, is that, without competition, the New England private power utilities have not modernized their facilities. They have not integrated their facilities. In short, by virtue of no competition, by virtue of no real push, they have been able to go their way very much on their own and have not met the needs of the people of New England.

Thus, it is, I think, one of the worst mistakes that any segment of our society can make, to allow any particular generating source to fall completely, whether in fact or potentially, within the hands of one group. And I will recommend this as strongly as I can to you.

The need for competition always will exist, and then, in addition, if you do have some public power and a potentially increased public power involvement and, in turn, generate feelings on the part of the people themselves, apart from the comparison it generates the continued activity and interest and concern on the part of the citizenry, of the society in which this is located. And, when all is said and done, any society is going to move forward or move backward as fast or as slow as the people living within that segment of our society will see fit to do.

I will also make a couple of other suggestions, and, again, I don't know your total situation here in New York State, except to say this: I think you have some real potential in this area. The Far West should be a tremendous example, not simply to New England but I suspect to the East. The Far West has suddenly, somehow, gotten over this myth that there is some great, vast gulf between the private sector of our economy and the public sector of our economy. As a practical matter, if you take the average utility in this country there is considerable question as to whether you could call it completely private or not. After all, how many businesses are guaranteed a definite return on their investment? They are presumably under control, and I think there is considerable question whether they are truly private.

One of the books I would recommend that you read, as a matter of fact—and I think you could read with considerable interest—is Kenneth Galbraith's latest book in which he talks about the larger corporations of America, and really whether they are totally private or not, at least not, certainly, in the traditional sense of the word.

But the point is that in the Far West, particularly, the private interests finally have managed to compromise some of their points of view, and the public interests have managed to compromise some of their points of view. And while it is true that perhaps their natural resources, in a sense, are naturally stronger than we have here in the East, nevertheless they have recognized that to produce, transmit power at a reasonable cost today demands large, exceedingly large combinations, and that if we set out with a vast multiplicity of small units—and this is true whether it be distribution or transmission, or even generation, ultimately the consumer will pay the cost. There are vehicles—vehicles for anybody to see—that can bring these combinations into being, and we here in New England—and I suspect we here in the East—should be taking a stronger look at those vehicles.

I would think, for example, that it might be quite possible, in terms of atomic energy, nuclear energy here in New York State and New England to effectively combine for this purpose. Certainly, however, it would be a mistake to give any one group a monopoly over this particular form of producing electrical energy.

May I conclude by simply saying this, in passing, about atomic power, because we are in the midst of rather extensive hearings about locating in the southeastern corner of the State of Vermont an atomic or nuclear generating facility. Nobody should look upon atomic power as being a panacea in and of itself, particularly in terms of the movement of our society, and the degradation of our natural resources brings immense problems that cannot be easily solved.

So it would be true, whether it be the automobile industry, or whether it be in terms of generation of electric power, that one of the considerations has got to be the impact upon our society as a whole and upon our natural resources. No one, I believe, should look upon atomic energy as being some sort of panacea. It is not. And while this is really sort of off the top of my head, the more I take a look at it, the more I am convinced that we should not look to it alone in the future, and, indeed, we should be looking to hydroelectric generating facilities wherever they can be developed as well.

This, then, again brings in the whole potential of that almost unbelievable country lying to the north of us, and, in honesty and without having gone into it in any great detail—although I did once make the mistake of discussing some potentials with a past president of Consolidated Edison, not very successfully satisfactorily, and you have a little arrogance down here, too. I do not speak about your present president. But I do think that one of the things we ought to be doing in the East as a whole is taking a look at the total eastern power structure. I think we should be investigating very closely not only our relationships as a whole, including both the public and private sectors, but, indeed, I think in broad terms we should be looking at our picture in terms of the great country of Canada lying to our north.

Nobody can predict with any certainty what might occur, but I am convinced that apart from Canada itself there are tremendous potential areas of cooperation on an en-

tire eastern grid basis, and I think the sooner we learn this lesson—and it is a very easily learned lesson if you will just look to the West—the better off we are going to be.

I must say that it is a great pleasure to be with you. I find that my experience over a period of years has taught me that there are certain people that tend to be my friends. I would consider you to be my friends, and if any of you would like to go home by way of Vermont, we would be delighted to have you.

Thank you very much.

DISREPUTABLE HOME IMPROVEMENT SCHEMES

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, the Washington Post has been publishing a series of articles about a group of Washington homeowners who have been cheated in the most horrendous manner by various "home improvement" schemes. I was shocked as I followed the articles over the weekend to learn that many well-meaning, and often low-income, homeowners have lost thousands of dollars at the hands of disreputable businessmen.

I should like to commend the two reporters, Leonard Downie, Jr., and David A. Jewell, for their work in unearthing this sordid matter and for bringing it so dramatically to the public's attention. I also wish to commend Representative WILLIAM B. WIDNALL for calling for immediate congressional investigations of the industry and its method of doing business. He has my complete support in this matter.

The Senate Subcommittee on Housing is at present considering legislation to encourage homeownership among low-income citizens. For this reason, I have written to Commissioner Brownstein, of the FHA, and requested his comments about this matter. Should he have recommendations for remedial legislation, I believe Congress should give them immediate consideration.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Washington Post articles and the text of my letter to Commissioner Brownstein be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 30, 1967]

HOMEOWNERS LOSE MILLIONS IN MORTGAGE SCHEMES HERE—100 SUITS STIR PROBE BY FOUR U.S. AGENCIES

(By Leonard Downie, Jr., and David A. Jewell)

Hundreds of low-income Negro homeowners in Washington are complaining that they are being bilked in second mortgage schemes that Federal authorities say net more than $1 million a year.

In more than 100 suits filed in General Sessions and U.S. District Court here, homeowners allege that these mortgages (deeds of trust) were obtained by a dozen home improvement businesses here through high-pressure salesmanship, fraud and, in many cases, false notarization. Two officers of one company have already been indicted for forging signatures of eight homeowners on deeds of trust.

SOLD AT DISCOUNT

A four-month investigation by a team of reporters from The Washington Post revealed that some second mortgages obtained here have been sold at a discount to a national credit firm. This company is also involved heavily in second mortgage business in Philadelphia, Boston, Cincinnati, Columbus, Texas, Indiana and New Jersey.

The home improvement companies who obtained the mortgages—and the creditors who bought and are now collecting on them—are being investigated by United States Postal Inspectors, the Federal Housing Authority, the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice.

The second mortgage practices have been going on since 1962, and many millions of dollars are involved.

INDICTMENTS EXPECTED

In the wake of this newspaper's investigation, U.S. Attorney David G. Bress said he expected indictments in the cases here within two weeks.

In case after case in Washington, homeowners are being forced to pay exorbitantly or lose their homes:

Two elderly blind women who are paying $7500 plus interest say all they received was a black-and-white portable television set and installation of a small gas heater and a rusting radiator, worth a few hundred dollars.

A retired couple in their 70s told reporters they ended up with $15,000 in mortgages after having $7,500 in old mortgages paid off and an "American Townehouse Front" installed, which consisted mostly of aluminum siding on the upper part of the house front, paint on the rest, and a new front door.

A 67-year-old charwoman has two mortgages on her home totaling $9000 as a result of two cash loans she received that totaled $5000.

TEN LOSE HOMES

At least ten families facing similar debts have lost their homes through foreclosures here in the past two years. Scores more are fighting in court to save their houses.

Many other homeowners who signed contracts for home improvements with any of a dozen local firms did not know—until contacted by reporters from The Washington Post—that their signatures were also on mortgages on their homes filed with the D.C. Government

When questioned by reporters, these nearly 100 homeowners—selected at random from District real estate records—voiced nearly identical complaints as those found in the court suits.

The United States Attorney's office here first began receiving complaints about some of these firms more than two years ago. Two isolated indictments—charging the officers of one firm with forgery and the notary public for another with false notarization—were handed down early this year.

[The practices complained of do not affect most of the several hundred home improvement contractors licensed to do business in the District. These contractors are reputable businessmen whose work is financed conventionally through normal commercial channels.]

On March 30, Federal investigators sent United States Attorney Bress a lengthy report on the activities of one firm.

The report also contained a strong indication that there were many other firms in the District engaged in similar schemes.

FRAUD SQUAD SET UP

In July, after The Washington Post investigation began at the courthouse, Bress decided to set up a special fraud squad in his office to work on the case "because of the voluminous nature of the investigation."

Bress said this week that the fraud charges are "not the crimes of violence that I am now primarily interested in, of course, but it is the kind of illegal conduct we will look into."

Named in many court suits as offenders are Custom House Construction Co., Monarch Construction Co., United Mortgage Co. (trading as Bankers Mortgage Co.) and United Home Enterprises Corporation.

A majority of the financial paper from these firms involved in litigation here has been sold the Atlas Credit Corp., of Philadelphia, a giant credit firm listed on the New York Stock Exchange, which was recently renamed Sunasco, Inc., as the result of a merger. Sunasco lists assets of $400 million.

The pattern was this:

The home improvement firm would sell the paper at a discount to a local Atlas broker. He in turn would sell it at a discount to Atlas in Philadelphia which would then turn it over to a wholly owned subsidiary company to make collections.

Two Federal agencies (the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice) are looking into Atlas' activities in a number of cities, including Washington.

Suits have been filed against four other local firms which also allegedly originated or passed on debt paper to Atlas during the past two years. Some other firms that have sold such paper to Atlas have gone out of business during that time. In some cases their officers have helped start other firms that have also dealt with Atlas.

NOTARY SUIT CITED

First public attention to these schemes came last year when one notary public from Maryland pleaded guilty in U.S. District Court here to falsely notarizing two D.C. mortgages in favor of Custom House Construction Co.

Deeds attested by the notary, Louise Beane, are involved in five suits filed by homeowners against Custom House. The suits say that no notary public was present when they signed, as the law requires.

One lawyer representing eight homeowners filed damage suits claiming a "money lending scheme" involving Atlas Credit Corp. of Philadelphia and Bankers Mortgage Co. of 722 11th st. nw.

That lawyer, like many others who pressed their charges of fraud vigorously, won settlement exceptionally favorable to his clients.

Government investigators say that much of the financial paper generated by Custom House was sold for more than a 40 per cent discount, and some of it has been discounted by as much as 60 per cent.

CANVASS BY PHONE

Here is how some of the home improvement companies have worked:

They canvassed low-income Negro neighborhoods generally by phone, seeking people interested in anything from home improvements to television sets, air conditioning or carpeting.

The telephone canvassing is usually done by women who use real estate directories and cross-indexes listing phone numbers by street address. One company called 6000 homes in 28 months.

A visit by a salesman usually occurs, complete with sales talk, and the quotation of a low price. The suits claim that some fast shuffling of papers to be signed follows.

If the homeowner is buying a product, it is delivered quickly. In the case of home improvements, work begins promptly. Weeks later, a payment book arrives in the mail from a finance firm the homeowner has never heard of.

PAYMENTS SOAR

If the homeowner bothers to multiply the monthly payments by the number of months he must pay, in some cases he may find the principal owed is anywhere from double to four times the amount he thought he had signed up for.

If he protests, he discovers that not only has he signed a note for this amount, but that he also has signed a deed to his home, and that there is not much he can do about it.

The holder of the deed (the firm that sent the payment book) has bought the note and mortgage and thus can claim that it is a

"holder in due course." The law presumes that a holder in due course is entitled to his money, since he has paid for the paper "in good faith." He is merely the financier, and quality of work, for instance, is not his problem. The original salesmen, in effect, wash their hands of the affair.

DEBTS "CONSOLIDATED"

In some cases, a homeowner protests he can't afford whatever it is the salesman is selling because he already is heavily in debt.

At that point he is told he will be "helped" by debt consolidation.

The salesman arranges for him to get a loan to pay off all his old debts and also cover the cost of work to be done or an item purchased.

He is then told that the new monthly payment will be less than the combination of all the previous monthly payments on the other debts.

Sometimes, a few hundred extra dollars is added to the note for the homeowner to use as he pleases.

After the deal is signed, the homeowner sometimes finds the debts are not paid off and he winds up with a large new debt plus some of his old ones.

LOSS OF HOMES LIKELY

Scores of homeowners are in danger of losing their homes over the next few years because of a clause in the contracts relating to the method of financing involved.

It is called balloon payment and works like this:

Say a note is signed which, including interest and finance charges, totals $7,000 to be repaid in five years.

The payments are $50 a month. Sixty months times $50 equals $3,000.

This leaves $4,000 yet to be paid. The clause in the fine print says that the full note is due and payable on the same day as the final payment.

In other words, if the victim cannot come up with the extra $4,000 on month number 60 he can lose his home.

PRESSURE ON LOANS

Balloon payments are an accepted part of many bank mortgage loans. Most borrowers understand how balloon payments work, though, and assume they would be in a position to refinance their notes when they fall due. In the cases involved here, the homeowners often do not understand the meaning of the balloon payment arrangement.

In some cases in which banks make loans insured by the Federal Housing Authority to customers of home improvement firms, the homeowner is pressured into signing a certificate that the work has been completed long before the work is done. The FHA warns homeowners against signing before completion.

The reason the firms press for the signatures is that banks will release loan money to the firms only after a signed certificate is presented.

BANKS HELD NEGLIGENT

Another factor working for the home improvements firms has been the apparent failure of some banks to investigate thoroughly the firms they regularly do business with.

According to FHA regulations, this investigation should find if the home improvement firm is "reliable, financially responsible and qualified to perform satisfactorily the work to be financed."

Thus the FHA is now investigating some of the local home improvement firms, as are the postal inspectors. The post office is involved because some of the firms advertised in newspapers that travel through the mail.

In 1961, the District Commissioners drew up regulations requiring local home improvement firms to register at the District Building and, when registered, to keep their sales practices within detailed guidelines.

The regulations have a loophole, though, according to an official of the District's Department of Licenses and Inspections. The rules say that firms do not need licenses if they do not collect their money until jobs are completed—precisely what some of these firms are doing: getting money after completion certificates are signed.

Several of the firms have registered anyway, but none has been prosecuted for violating the regulations.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 30, 1967]

A WOMAN'S COSTLY BARGAIN

One homeowner who signed up for more than she bargained for is Lucy Kinard. Mrs. Kinard is blind, and lives with her 76-year-old mother, Mary Williams, who is partially blind, at 1103 5th st. nw. She says that she and her mother bought a portable television set for her nephew and had a gas hot water heater and a radiator installed. The total cost, she thought, was $900, so she and her mother made their marks on a contract for that amount.

Soon afterward, Mrs. Kinard says, a man called her to tell her he had bought a note and a deed of trust against their home for $7500, plus 7 per cent interest. She told the man she hadn't signed for that much and couldn't afford to pay. Then, she says, the noteholder came to the house and threatened to foreclose on the mortgage.

Unable to afford a lawyer, Mrs. Kinard, who is 56, and her mother, are now paying $50 a month on the note, in addition to payments on a first mortgage. They have now made 15 payments on the note, but still owe $7402.34 on the principal. The note was discounted, by the way, and the noteholder's price for it was $3494.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 1, 1967]

FIRM DUPED THEM, SAY RESIDENTS

(By Leonard Downie, Jr., and David A. Jewell)

A current Washington ghetto synonym for "you've been had" is "you've been Monarched."

The genesis of the term goes back to 1963, when the Monarch Construction Company began its massive canvassing here of low- and middle-class homeowners, selling private "urban renewal"; the "American Townehouse Front," other home improvements, debt consolidation, the works.

By the beginning of last year—after Monarch disbanded and its president, Nathan H. Cohen, left town—Monarch had sold contracts to hundreds of Washington homeowners and grossed $2.5 million, according to one estimate.

Cohen said yesterday he would not answer any questions about Monarch operations, whether the company was still in business, or about court suits alleging fraud.

He was reached in Baltimore where he and his mother, who was also a Monarch officer, operate the Baltimore Business School, 303 E. Fayette st., a computer training school.

In more than 25 civil suits in General Sessions and U.S. District Courts here, homeowners have charged that Monarch used high-pressure salesmanship and fraud to get their signatures on contracts and home mortgages.

Monarch's Townehouse Front ususally is a combination of white aluminum siding, black aluminum shutters, new windows and door, carriage lamps and trim put on the front of a row house. It can look handsome from a distance, but some owners have complained that the work is shoddy and deteriorating.

Interviews with dozens of Monarch customers draw similar complaints: the Monarch salesman mentioned something about urban renewal and being forced to make improvements; the Townehouse Front looked so nice in the photographs; there were apparent endorsements of Monarch by Negro leaders and Congressmen; there was so much shuffling and signing of papers; finally, there was the debt—often thousands of dollars more than the price they remembered quoted or the worth of the job. Almost always, the note was secured by a deed of trust.

In a civil suit in the Court of General Sessions, Judge Catherine B. Kelly found that Monarch was guilty of using "fraudulent representation" to procure the signature of Alberta K. Smith, 778 Irving st. nw., on a home improvement contract.

Mrs. Smith testified that the Monarch salesman said he was a "representative of urban renewal," that her home "would not be torn down" if she signed the contract and that "urban renewal" would pay $2000 of its cost.

When she called the Redevelopment Land Agency the next day, she testified, she was told it had no connection with Monarch. Mrs. Smith called Monarch immediately and ordered the firm not to do any work.

Monarch sued her for the contract price of $4500. Judge Kelly in July, 1966, awarded Mrs. Smith $1525 punitive damages instead. She has not been able to collect.

Monarch might be termed the "granddaddy" of the nearly dozen firms here that have engaged in second mortgage schemes. A number of companies are under investigation by four Federal agencies and by the U.S. Attorney's office.

Usually, Monarch got the customer's signature on a mortgage to his home, too. Several homeowners complained in the court suits and interviews with reporters that they did not know they were signing mortgages, that no notary public was present, or that the amount of the debt was not the same or did not cover all the work as they had been told.

When Monarch obtained mortgage loans insured by the Federal Housing Administration through a reputable bank, the amount was usually $3500 total cost for the job plus $837 financing charges.

MAXIMUM ALLOWED

The final $4337 amount on the mortgage is the maximum allowed by the FHA under its Title I home improvement program. Usually the customer received the American Townhouse Front which, court suits show, cost Monarch about $1500.

The FHA allows 15 per cent overhead and 40 per cent profit. This would total about $2500 for a Townhouse Front. Monarch usually charged about $3500, plus interest.

Like the customers of nearly a dozen other home improvement firms investigated by reporters from The Washington Post in the past four months, the homeowners who were "Monarched" must pay or lose their homes.

At least three homeowners have lost their homes after signing Monarch contracts. At least six more are in court trying to stave off foreclosures.

Clarence and Georgia Winters, who live in a modest row house at 1102 Park st. ne., are trying to fight that inevitable fate.

Winters, 61, has worked as a skilled laborer for a Washington construction firm for 20 years. His wife, who is 54, has worked for the past seven years as a cook for Sen. Stuart Symington (D-Mo.).

GOOD CREDIT RECORD

In buying furniture, appliances and cars on time over the years, the Winterses have maintained a good credit record. During the 16 years they lived in the house on Park Street, they whittled the first trust on their home down to less than $1000. That is, until Monarch came along in December, 1964.

What happened since to the Winterses is recounted by them under oath in separate depositions filed in their suit in the U.S. District Court:

A woman had called Mrs. Winters talking about improvements to be made in her neighborhood. It was not until two men came

to her house a few days later that she knew the call came from Monarch. (Monarch is believed to have called 6000 homeowners while it was in business.)

The salesmen "were so friendly and nice" and showed them photographs of other Negro homeowners, some prominent Washington Negroes and homes "improved" with an American Townhouse Front.

"They said that Roy Wilkins sent them there," Mrs. Winters attested.

One salesman "said he was going to do the whole entire front, and he was going to remove the windows and give us new windows, and build a brick wall all around the front, and a cement porch, and the aluminum siding."

The Winterses said their kitchen was what really needed work. The salesman told them that the kitchen work would be included, too, and the whole job would be $2000 cheaper than usual "by letting him write it up in December."

The Winters family says the prices quoted that night and on other nights by Monarch salesmen varied from $2500 to $4000. They said they signed one set of contracts the first night, which were taken away from them and replaced by others when the salesmen came back later.

Then, one night three months later, the salesmen came to the Winters home again and asked the couple to sign the top page of a "big pad" of documents.

In their depositions, the Winters couple states further that one of the men identified himself as Nathan Cohen and explained that the other papers were copies of the top page.

"It is just as much for your benefit as it is for mine," Mrs. Winters says Cohen told her as they sat at the dining room table. "We have to get some more copies."

When Winters asked why so many copies were necessary, a man who had accompanied Cohen told Winters to "calm down, you're getting all upset." He took Winters into another room to look at the Winters furniture. The man told him that some of it appeared to be "antiques."

Cohen placed the thick pad in front of Mrs. Winters and told her to "press hard, press real hard," according to her deposition. When Winters came back into the room, he saw his wife's signature and signed himself.

It was only later, the Winters said when they got a payment book from Citizens Building and Loan Association of Silver Spring, that they discovered their signatures were on a mortgage (deed of trust) on their home for $4337 and on a completion certificate for the work.

As work progressed on their home, the Winters found several things that displeased them: cement splashed on the front door, rags and other refuse left on the front lawn, sticky windows, a loose lamp.

Winters, who worked as a carpenter's helper on his construction job, was particularly upset by "the rough job" a workman was doing in his kitchen: such as wooden panels installed upside down, with wide gaps between them.

REFUSED TO PAY

He stopped Monarch's carpenter from doing anything further on the kitchen and began calling Monarch to complain. The Winters said they never got a satisfactory answer to their complaints and, when they received the payment book from the bank, called to say they would not pay until the job was finished right.

That was when they found the Citizens Building and Loan had already paid Monarch its $3500 out of the $4337 loan insured by the Federal Housing Authority. The bank said Monarch had presented a signed completion certificate required by the FHA.

The Winters insist they never signed a completion certificate, since the work was never finished. The completion certificate the bank's attorney has introduced into the court record has no date on it, in violation of FHA regulations.

The bank has introduced into the suit the mortgage it holds to secure the Winters loan. It bears a different date than the mortgage recorded with the District Recorder of Deeds.

Complaints about Monarch first surfaced in the autumn of 1964, after it had been in business for a little more than a year.

In a story published in The Washington Post on Nov. 1, 1964, several owners of homes on unrestored fringes of Capitol Hill complained about Monarch's sales tactics. One woman had already filed suit in U.S. District Court, charging Monarch with "trickery" and "false pretenses."

The homeowners said that Monarch's telephone solicitation, sprinkled heavily with references to "urban renewal" and "talking to you about schedules for your property and your street," led them to believe the Government was somehow behind it.

NO MONOPOLY

Cohen told a reporter then that "we don't think the Government has a monopoly on the words." He said then: "Our program is to rehabilitate a large part of Washington over a period of ten years. If we'd remodel the insides of houses nobody'd see them, while on the outside you can see the change right away."

At the same time, the Capitol Hill Restoration Society, complained about Monarch to Government agencies. Some homeowners and a former Monarch salesman went to talk with prosecutors in the U.S. Attorney's Office about Monarch in 1964.

Yet Monarch's business continued to flourish. In January and February of 1965, it took out full-page newspaper advertisements criticizing Federal urban renewal as "far more urban removal" and boasting its own "private urban renewal program" as having "created $2,149,500 in new first trust loans" and "$300,000 worth of approved Title I FHA loans."

But the FHA was investigating Monarch by then and, on May 11, 1965, placed the firm on its "precautionary measures list."

Notice went out to all banks handling FHA-insured loans that FHA had information "indicating that the subject has not conducted his operations . . . consistent with the purposes and objectives of the FHA Property Improvements Program."

Banks were instructed to deal with Monarch only in cases in which bank officers personally checked the contractors' work and to have completion certificates signed in the presence of bank officers.

Monarch no longer obtained FHA insured loans. Instead, it sold some of its second mortgage notes to Allstate Mortgage Corp., now of 1111 Massachusetts ave. nw. Allstate, in turn, sold some of the mortgages to the Atlas Credit Corporation of Philadelphia (recently renamed Sunasco as a result of mergers). Atlas assigned the notes to its subsidiaries to collect payments from the Washington homeowners.

Monarch also was still able to obtain, from reputable banks, new first mortgage loans not insured by the FHA for its customers. Money from these mortgages was used to pay off the customers' old mortgages and, in some cases, also to pay Monarch for home improvements.

In many of these cases, records indicate that Monarch also obtained the customers' signatures on a new second, and sometimes a third, mortgage. Money from these also went to Monarch for home improvement contracts.

After being involved in more than 50 suits in Washington's courts—more than 25 involving charges of fraud against it—Monarch has suffered one judgment against it and lost four other times on dismissals when it failed to answer questions filed by opposing attorneys.

Monarch, and the dozen other firms under investigation are a minority of the home improvement contractors who do business in the city. Most contractors are reputable businessmen who tell customers just what they are getting and how much it will cost.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 1, 1967]

BILL EYED TO PROTECT UNWARY HOMEOWNER

A ranking Republican House member yesterday said he will seek legislation to prevent recurrence of "the despicable conduct" of home improvement and finance companies who have obtained millions of dollars from low-income homeowners in the Washington area.

Rep. William B. Widnall of New Jersey, referring to the series on home improvement schemes presently running in The Washington Post, said he was "shocked to learn that allegedly reputable firms have made millions by taking advantage of the unwary and uneducated."

Widnall said he was calling for an immediate investigation of the entire industry and its method of doing business. Widnall is the ranking Republican member of the House Banking and Currency Committee and also of the special House Subcommittee on Housing.

"At the same time," Widnall said in a statement issued by his office, "the Congress should investigate the matter to determine what remedial legislation is needed to prevent such despicable conduct from recurring."

Rep. Charles McC. Mathias, Jr. (R–Md.) said the revelations "have far more than local significance. They are part of the national picture of the deliberate attempt of widely organized forces to single out the urban poor as targets."

Mathias said the newspaper series pointed up the need for an increased force of Federal lawyers and enforcement officers to press the campaign against exploitation of the urban poor.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 1, 1967]

NOMINEE IS MONARCH AGENT

Margaret Haywood, one of nine Washingtonians selected Thursday by President Johnson for the new City Council, has been registered agent and attorney for the Monarch Construction Co. for the past two years.

Mrs. Haywood, a Republican, said yesterday she plans to "reassess" her relationship to Monarch and her other clients in view of the nomination which is subject to confirmation by the Senate "to make sure there is no conflict of interest."

As registered agent, she is available to accept service of suits against the firm. She represents Monarch in court, as well, but performs no other functions of the concern, she said. The lawyer-client relationship precluded her commenting on the reports in The Washington Post about Monarch's activities, she said.

Her total earnings from Monarch last year were less than $2000, she said.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 2, 1967]

SUITS HIT MORTGAGE PRACTICES—MISLED ON LOAN TERMS, CLAIM HOMEOWNERS

(By Leonard Downie, Jr., and David A. Jewell)

Custom House Construction Co. went into the business of home improvement construction on March 3, 1966, in an office at 7849 Eastern ave., Silver Spring.

Almost six months to the day later, Custom House went out of business, according to its president, Harvey W. Davis.

Records in the D.C. recorder of deeds office show 55 second mortgages worth $250,000 made out to Custom House.

In the past four months, a team of reporters from The Washington Post interviewed 23 Custom House customers.

All are low-income Negroes, elderly and often widowed, and in each case the price of the job done or products received (such as a paint job or a color television set) was secured by a mortgage on their homes.

DIDN'T KNOW OF MORTGAGE

Four Custom House customers said they had no idea there was a second mortgage on their homes until they were told so by reporters. The other 19 said they first learned of the mortgages from United States postal inspectors, who are investigating Custom House.

At least one customer, Chester Thompson, has lost his home through foreclosure on the second mortgage. Six others—faced with foreclosure—filed court suits charging that their signatures on the mortgages were secured through fraud.

A pattern appeared in the complaints:

The customers were contacted by Custom House, not vice versa.

The customers said they signed what they thought was a contract but later turned out to be a note and mortgage.

The customers said there was no notary public present when they signed the "papers" although the mortgages on their homes bore notarization seals.

All said they received payment books in the mail from companies they had never heard of demanding payment of notes they didn't know they had signed.

The 23 additional Custom House customers interviewed by reporters said the same points apply in their cases.

Custom House is one of nearly a dozen home-improvement firms under investigation by Federal authorities for their second mortgage dealings in Washington. The U.S. attorney's office expects grand jury action within two weeks.

The vast majority of home-improvement firms in Washington enjoy good reputations.

PRICE ABOVE APPRAISALS

Sources said that one professional appraiser who dealt with Custom House said that when he had done appraisals for Custom House the firm automatically increased its prices well above the appraisals.

Suits in court indicate that Custom House would then quote prices to the customers but give them contracts to sign, the face values of which would be double the quoted prices.

In two court suits, customers have claimed notes and mortgages were filed against their home for at least double the amounts quoted on the jobs by the Custom House salesman.

The contract in one case tells the story:

One customer had the front of his house painted "for the total sum of $2350." The contract says that the customer agrees "to pay the sum of $2350 upon completion, secured by a note of $5875 plus 8 per cent interest in monthly installments of $58.75."

When reporters asked the customer, an elderly man who cannot work because he is being treated for cancer, why he agreed to pay $5875 for work that cost "the total sum of $2350," the homeowner replied:

"I thought just the monthly payment was $58.75."

USED TELEPHONE SALESGIRLS

Custom House employed a battery of girl telephone solicitors. One of the girls told an investigator about the sales talk:

The girls were given phone numbers of houses in low-income Negro areas selected from a cross-index file.

They were told to hang up if they judged a white person had answered.

Otherwise, they were to find out within 60 seconds if the resident of the house owned or was buying the house.

If it was discovered the resident was only renting, they were under orders to terminate the conversation and make another call.

Otherwise, they would try to interest homeowners in anything from a television set to a new roof. If the prospects seemed good, they would then turn the files over to salesmen.

One of Custom House's first jobs was on the home of Albert and Mattie Smalls, at 401 11th st. se.

SMALLS FILE SUIT

After being threatened with foreclosure, the Smalls filed suit against Custom House charging "willful, deliberate and malicious fraud."

The Smalls' suit says the salesman told them he could fix up the front of their house for $800.

They thought that would be nice, but lamented that they already had debts of $4900 and didn't feel they could afford it.

The salesman then said he could arrange to get them a loan that would permit them to pay off the $4900 as well as cover the cost of fixing up the house front, according to the suit.

They agreed to this, and signed papers they thought were contracts and loan application forms.

The job was done. They learned later, however, that only $575 worth of outstanding debts were paid off, leaving them with $4397 in old debts plus a mortgage on their home for $500 that they didn't know they signed, the suit says.

The couple paid $1000 on this note until they contacted attorney John J. Carmody Jr., who filed suit. On July 24, 1967, U.S. District Court Judge Joseph C. Waddy issued a temporary restraining order against the present holder of the Smalls' note, prohibiting the holder from making any further collections until the court case is decided.

ACCEPTANCE CORP. NAMED

The Smalls' suit also named as defendant a company called Universal Acceptance Corp., located at 6400 Georgia ave. nw.

According to official D.C. records, a founder, a director and president of Custom House is Harvey W. Davis of 8313 Raymond st., Potomac.

According to these same records, Harvey W. Davis is also secretary, treasurer and a director of the Universal Acceptance, with an address at that time of 8804 Lanier dr., Silver Spring.

Davis told a reporter: "I really can't answer your questions, I really don't know much about that. I took in a partner who knew the home-improvement business. He did the selling and I did the bookkeeping. I never knew any contracts were fraudulent."

All notes and mortgages generated by Custom House were sold immediately, sometimes within hours, to second parties, known legally as "holders in due course."

The Smalls' case was no exception. Their note was sold to Universal Acceptance. Much of the paper generated by Custom House went to Universal.

The Smalls' suit contains the following allegation:

"Davis conspired with both Custom House and Universal to hatch a scheme whereby Custom House would fraudulently obtain a promissory note, reinforce its right to enforce the terms of the note by fraudulently obtaining a deed of trust (mortgage) against the property, fail to perform the consideration for said note, sell the note to Universal at a fraudulent discount rate, allow Custom House to lapse into insolvency thereby defrauding potential creditors and hide the whole behind the sham shield of the 'holder in due course' defense of Universal."

NOTE DISCOUNT CLAIMED

The suit also alleges that Universal bought the Smalls' $5500 note from Custom House for $2200—at a discount of 60 per cent.

Many Custom House notes were sold at discounts ranging from 40 to 60 per cent.

The U.S. Court of Appeals here has characterized discounts of 40 per cent or more as "outrageous" and stated that such discounts, if there are also circumstances such as the purchase of notes executed by unknown persons whose credit has not been investigated, constitute a "badge of fraud."

An answer to this suit was filed on behalf of Universal by Bernard T. Levin, a local attorney. The answer denied all allegations of fraud and maintained that Universal had purchased the note in the ordinary course of business.

In its answer, Universal argued that it was merely a "holder in due course," and it also filed a counterclaim against the Smalls for $5119.55 not yet paid on the note, plus attorney's fee.

Custom House Construction Co. has not yet answered the allegations contained in the Smalls' suit.

The signature of the notary public who swore she witnessed the Smalls' signatures on the $5,500 mortgage on their home was Louise Beane.

In January of this year, Louise Beane, a licensed notary public in Maryland, was indicted and charged with the false notarization of two mortgages in Washington.

NOTARY PLEADED GUILTY

Mrs. Beane pleaded guilty and received a suspended sentence in U.S. District Court here.

Those two mortgages had been generated by Custom House. Mrs. Beane notarized a total of 27 mortgages generated by Custom House.

In six court suits, homeowners have claimed that they did not know they signed mortgages, that no notary public was present when they signed papers and that they had never seen anyone named Louise Beane, either in their homes or in Maryland. Numerous other homeowners made similar claims to reporters.

Seven Custom House notes were purchased by a District realtor named Leonard Freedman, of 761 17th st nw., for what investigators say were 40 per cent or greater. Freedman denies the discounts were that large.

One of those mortgages was on the home of an elderly widow, Alberta Kibler, of 1737 D st. se.

After her home was threatened with foreclosure, she filed suit against Custom House and Freedman, charging that her mortgage was secured by fraud through a conspiracy between Custom House and Mrs. Beane.

Her suit alleges that Custom House's dealings with her were "part of a conspiracy in which Louise Beane similarly made many false notarizations for Custom House."

It says that she was quoted a price of $2750 for a new kitchen and discovered a mortgage against her home she didn't know she had signed for $5550.

FIRM DENIES FRAUD

Custom House answered this suit with a denial of fraud and conspiracy and denied that Mrs. Beane was an agent of Custom House.

Freedman answered by saying he was without sufficient knowledge to admit or deny the charges since he was merely a "holder in due course" and he denied any conspiracy existed. He said yesterday that "all I can do is check the District records to see that it's a legitimate mortgage. I dealt with Custom House the same way I dealt with everybody else."

One Custom House customer, Amanda Green, 56, of 829 Sheridan st. nw., bought four air conditioners for what she thought was "a little over $2000" and later learned there was a mortgage on her home for $5800, plus 7 per cent interest.

Her paper was purchased from Custom House by Freedman. He showed her a note bearing her signature that called for payments of $33.50 a month for 60 months.

At this rate Mrs. Green could not have paid off the interest due on the note by the end of the 60 months, much less the principal.

Since by the 60th month she would have only paid $2010, much of it having gone to

pay off interest, Mrs. Green stood to lose her home unless she could pay the balance or obtain a new loan for it.

If she refinanced the note for the same schedule of monthly payments, she would not have been able to pay off the principal due in her lifetime, Federal investigators say.

Mrs. Green hired an attorney before making any payments. He hired an appraiser who valued the air conditioners at $974. U.S. postal inspectors had them appraised for $971.

Mrs. Green's attorney reached an agreement with Freedman whereby he wiped off the mortgage on her home in return for a payment of $1000.

LABORER SUES

Frank Harris, of 124 10th st. ne., an illiterate, elderly laborer has filed suit saying he was tricked into signing a $7450 mortgage on his home and received only $500 worth of work in return.

His suit claims he signed certain papers because Jack Shulman, Davis's partner and the salesman in this and many Custom House transactions, promised him that Custom House would pay off two previous mortgages on his home.

On the original two mortgages, he was paying a total of $100 a month, Harris said, in the suit. He also said that he had to pay $80 a month on the new mortgage held by Custom House, plus the same old $100 he had been paying.

He earns $65 a week.

Shulman, of 5300 Westbard ave., Bethesda, and Custom House answered the suit and denied any fraud or wrongdoing.

MENTIONED IN SUITS

Shulman is mentioned in most of the Custom House suits as the salesman involved and by most of the customers contacted by reporters.

Shulman told a reporter that none of the mortgages signed up by him were obtained by fraud.

"You will find they were all legitimately signed," said Shulman.

Shulman said that in each instance he was accompanied by a notary public, including those in which Louise Beane's signature appears on the mortgage.

The activities of Custom House, and several other home-improvement contractors, are being looked into by Federal authorities. Most home-improvement contractors are reputable businessmen who tell customers what they are getting and how much it will cost.

Five Custom House mortgages ended up in the hands of Atlas Credit Corp. of Philadelphia, which has been renamed Sunasco, Inc., following a merger. Atlas is now also under investigation by Federal authorities.

Atlas buys second mortgage paper from firms in 40 states and two Canadian provinces.

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON BANKING
AND CURRENCY,
October 2, 1967.

Mr. PHILIP N. BROWNSTEIN,
Federal Housing Commissioner,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR COMMISSIONER: The subject of the articles which have appeared in the *Washington Post* over the weekend has been of concern to me, as I know it has been to you.

That any citizen should suffer from such disreputable business practices is a serious matter. That low income citizens should suffer is most unfortunate.

I noted in the Sunday article that the FHA has made an investigation of the situation and I would be interested in your findings. What role does the FHA play in matters of this nature? Are you presently empowered to take any remedial action?

As you know, the Senate is presently considering enactment of legislation to encourage home ownership among low income families. In view of this, I would be most interested in learning whether the FHA has any recommendation for legislation to protect individual home owners from situations similar to those described in the *Washington Post* articles?

I look forward to your reply.

Sincerely,

CHARLES H. PERCY,
U.S. Senator.

SOARING STATE AND LOCAL TAXES ARGUE AGAINST A FEDERAL TAX HIKE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, it is frequently argued that the tax increase proposed by the President will not really impose a heavy burden on taxpayers because their Federal tax will still be less than it was before the 1964 tax cut. If the extra burden to taxpayers is indeed so slight, why then is there so much public opposition to the tax increase?

The fact is that the total tax burden upon our citizens—when we take into account State and local taxes as well as Federal taxes—has increased sharply since 1964. Using the latest comparable figures, total State and local government tax revenue rose from $47 billion in March 1964 to $60 billion in March 1967—an increase of nearly 30 percent. In the last year, from March 1966, to March 1967, the increase was 8.7 percent.

By types of tax, between March 1964, and March 1967, the percentage increases were as follows: property taxes rose 20 percent; general sales and gross receipts taxes were up more than 40 percent; and individual income taxes increased by almost 60 percent.

Although part of this increase in revenues can be attributed to an expanded tax base, much of the increase has come through new or increased taxes. Between 1959 and 1966, State governments levied 19 new taxes and increased tax rates in 230 instances. During these 8 legislative years, every State except Louisiana raised its tax rates or adopted a new levy in at least one of six major tax fields; sales taxes, personal income taxes, corporate income taxes, motor fuel taxes, cigarette taxes, and alcoholic beverage taxes. In Wisconsin personal income taxes were raised four times.

This data does not include the many increases enacted in 1967. Among the most significant increases this year were the following: Maryland enacted a substantial increase and revision of its income tax; Michigan adopted a tax on personal and corporate incomes which became effective October 1; and California passed the largest tax increase in its history, raising levies on sales and personal income among other items.

The Tax Foundation, Inc., recently estimated that State tax collections will be boosted by close to $2½ billion on an annual basis by new or increased taxes adopted so far by State legislatures meeting this year. By States, the tax increases were expected to yield the following amounts: California, $944 million; Michigan, $281 million; Illinois, $188 million; Ohio $188 million; Iowa, $130 million; Maryland, $120 million; Nebraska, $91 million; other, over $500 million.

Mr. President, this heavy and increasing tax burden that our citizens are faced with at the State and local level should be fully recognized in formulating national fiscal policy. Clearly, this factor makes it all the more important that we avoid raising taxes at the Federal level and renew our efforts to cut expenditures.

NATIONAL 4–H WEEK, SEPTEMBER 30 THROUGH OCTOBER 7

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, good citizenship among America's youth will be accented again this week as National 4–H Week is observed from September 30 through October 7. In the spotlight will be nearly 3 million 4–H'ers completing their year's work and commencing new projects.

Since its origination in the early 1900's, the program stressing head, heart, hands, and health has been of inestimable value in guiding and teaching the country's youth. Today, 4–H'ers may choose from up to a hundred 4–H educational experiences. Selections may be from such activities as clothing, community beautification, conservation, entomology, electric, automotive, and leadership.

Our 4–H'ers can learn about such varied subjects as budget management, town and country business, home improvement, personality development, personal grooming, horsemanship, health and safety, and community service.

In recent years the 4–H organizations have sponsored international exchange programs in which outstanding youth of America have had the opportunity to meet and exchange ideas with youths from a number of foreign countries. This has succeeded greatly as a young people-to-people program promoting international understanding and respect.

The 4–H is a part of the national education system of the Cooperative Extension Service in which the U.S. Department of Agriculture, State land-grant universities, and counties participate. The 4–H organizations are active in each of the 50 States, and more than a half-million volunteer leaders assist 4–H youths in achieving their goals.

The 4–H program has been a vital force in my home State of South Dakota in guiding our young people toward mature, responsible citizenship.

I salute this most worthwhile organization as it celebrates National 4–H Week.

PRESIDENT APPOINTS FRANK GREGG TO NEW ENGLAND RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I wish to invite attention to the President's recent appointment of Frank Gregg to be chairman of the New England River Basin Commission. I am delighted with the President's choice. He could have found no man better qualified to be the first chairman of the New England River Basin Commission than Frank Gregg.

Although Mr. Gregg is not a native New Englander, he has a long and distinguished career in natural resource management. Prior to his appointment he was vice president of the Conservation Foundation. He has also served as executive director of the Citizens Committee

for the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission Report, staff assistant on the resources program staff in the Office of the Secretary of the Interior, executive director of the Izaak Walton League of America, and editor of the Colorado Outdoors magazine for the Colorado Department of Game and Fish.

In addition to these positions Mr. Gregg has served on a number of committees directly concerned with water resource management and pollution control. These include 2 years as chairman of the Izaak Walton League's clean water committee, membership on the President's Committee on the Quetico-Superior boundary waters area, and membership on the Central States Advisory Board to the U.S. Forest Service. He is at present serving as chairman of the National Technical Committee on Water Quality Criteria for Recreation and Aesthetics established by the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. President, I commend President Johnson for the wisdom and excellence of his choice of Frank Gregg, and I offer my warm congratulations to Mr. Gregg. I am confident that he will be an outstanding chairman of the New England River Basin Commission.

SUPPORT FOR PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S TEST PROGRAM ON EMPLOYMENT TRAINING

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, the Johnson administration has once again taken the initiative to involve private enterprise in the problems besetting American society. Today the President announced the start of a pilot program to aid those Americans who are in the ranks of the longtime unemployed.

This new program will involve the full partnership of both industry and government in building new facilities in areas of large-scale unemployment, and in training and counseling those who have been out of work for a long time.

As the President said today:

> Our goal is to replace the waste and failure of unemployment with the productivity of meaningful work.

The President has succeeded in the past in involving private industry in the problems of housing and jobs in our cities. This latest step, a $40 million project that will utilize Federal funds and resources, will focus the talent and experience of private enterprise on the nagging and complex problem of persistent unemployment. The knowledge and expertise of private industry will be invaluable to effect meaningful solutions to this problem.

There is good reason to believe that this pilot project may point the way toward future endeavors that will expand upon new insights generated by this program.

I think the President is to be warmly commended for pioneering in this important partnership for progress between the public and private sectors. It is a partnership that is bound to grow over the years to the benefit of all the American people.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the White House statement today launching this major test program.

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

We are launching today a major test program to mobilize the resources of private industry and the Federal Government to help find jobs and provide training for thousands of America's hard-core unemployed.

The heart of this new effort is to reach the forgotten and the neglected—those citizens handicapped by poor health, hampered by inadequate education, hindered by years of discrimination, and by-passed by conventional training programs.

To succeed in this venture will take more than promises or good intentions. It will require—on an unprecedented scale—the concerted action and involvement of the private sector, working closely with the Federal Government.

As we embark on this new course, let us be clear about what is involved: our purpose is not to hand out but to help up, to help provide every American the opportunity for a good job at a good wage.

Our goal is to replace the waste and failure of unemployment with the productivity of meaningful work.

We call upon private industry to join us in tackling one of America's most urgent domestic problems. I have no doubt that the private sector will respond. For we have witnessed in the past few months a remarkable series of events which attests to the dedication of American business in meeting the needs of the society in which it flourishes:

On September 12, 1967, the insurance companies in this country agreed to commit $1 billion of their funds for investments in city core areas to improve housing conditions and to finance job creating enterprises. Some of these resources are already financing promising housing projects and insurance company executives and officials of this Administration are working together to develop other projects.

A project has been launched to use surplus Federal lands to meet the housing needs of our cities in which the efforts of private developers will be the most important single element.

A Committee, headed by Edgar F. Kaiser and composed of distinguished industrialists, bankers, labor leaders and specialists in urban affairs is examining every possible means of encouraging the development of a large-scale efficient construction and rehabilitation industry to reclaim the corroded core of the American city.

Upon the recommendation of the Kaiser Committee we have begun the "Turnkey Plus" project to encourage private industry not only to develop and build, but also to *manage* public housing.

In this effort, we will again attempt to bring the great resources of the private sector to bear on a critical national problem. Through the great talents and energies of private industry, with full support from the Federal Government, we hope to:

Bring new job training opportunities in existing plants to the hard core unemployed.

Create new jobs and new training opportunities for the seriously disadvantaged in plants which will be established in or near areas of concentrated unemployment.

Encourage new enterprises combining the resources of big and small businesses to provide jobs and job training opportunities for the disadvantaged.

To initiate this effort, the resources of the Departments of Commerce, Defense, Labor, Health, Education and Welfare, and Housing and Urban Development, the Office of Economic Opportunity, the General Services Administration and the Small Business Administration will be combined to provide maximum assistance and to minimize the added cost of those in private industry willing to assume responsibility for providing training and work opportunities for the seriously disadvantaged.

Initially, nearly $40 million from a wide variety of existing programs will be made available, as will millions of dollars worth of surplus Federal property and excess Federal equipment.

We will offer to private industry:

A full spectrum of aid to assist them in recruiting, counseling, training, and providing health and other needed services to the disadvantaged.

Aid which will enable them to experiment with new ways to overcome the transportation barriers now separating men and women from jobs.

Surplus Federal land, technical assistance and funds to facilitate the construction of new plants in or near areas of concentrated unemployment.

Excess Federal equipment to enable them to train more disadvantaged people.

Assistance to joint enterprises combining the resources of big and small businesses to bring jobs and training opportunities to the disadvantaged.

I have asked the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Labor to direct this test program and insure that all available Federal resources are utilized. The Secretary of Commerce will designate a full-time Special Representative as the single point of contact for private employers participating in this project. The Special Representative will provide employers with one-stop service for the entire Federal Government and will make whatever arrangements are appropriate with the various Federal agencies for all forms of Federal assistance.

The Secretary of Labor will designate a full-time officer in the Manpower Administration to work with the Special Representative of the Secretary of Commerce in connection with the training and employment elements of these projects.

I have also asked the Secretaries of Defense, Health, Education and Welfare, and Housing and Urban Development, the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Administrators of the General Services Administration and the Small Business Administration to assist the Secretaries of Commerce and Labor in this test program and to assign a single official in their agencies who will coordinate their efforts in support of this program.

Provision will be made for continuing liaison with local projects and for careful research and evaluation to crystallize field experience into guidelines for future action.

I have asked the Secretary of Commerce to invite corporations throughout the country to join this new effort to bring meaningful employment to disadvantaged citizens both in existing plants and, where feasible, in new locations near areas of concentrated unemployment.

I have directed each Department and Agency of this Government to give top priority to all phases of this important effort.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

BALANCED URBANIZATION AND NEW COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, increased concern is being expressed in Congress, in a number of executive departments, and in the country at large over the continued migration from rural areas into our concentrated metropolitan areas. A new word, "megalopolis," has been coined to describe this concentration of population in geographically limited areas along the east and west coasts and across the lower Great Lakes region.

People are leaving rural areas which lack economic opportunity because of changes in agricultural production, mining, lumbering, and other industries and crowding into the already densely populated metropolitan areas. In a sense they are merely transplanting economic problems from the rural areas to the cities. Many of them lack the specialized training and skills that are needed for industrial and urban jobs. Furthermore, while the migrants tend to locate in central cities, there is a distinct trend of movement of industries out into suburban and other outlying areas.

Increasingly the need is recognized by many of providing alternatives by revitalizing rural and smaller urban economies. Through all of this, the need for a national economic development and urban growth policy become increasingly apparent.

A number of bills have been introduced in the current Congress proposing programs to increase economic opportunity in rural areas and thereby foster a balanced pattern of urbanization. Several proposals have also been made for the establishment of a national commission to study balanced economic development. I invite the attention of interested Members of Congress to the fact that in connection with a study of the development of new communities, the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations is directing its attention to this problem.

The Commission was established by Congress in 1959 and is composed of representatives of the public and each level of government including six Members of the Congress. The senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and I are all original members of the Commission. In the other body, Representative DWYER, of New Jersey, and Representative FOUNTAIN, of North Carolina, are also original members of the Commission, and Representative ULLMAN, of Oregon, was recently appointed to membership.

In addition to the six Members of Congress, the Commission has three from the executive branch: the Secretary of the Treasury, the Attorney-General, and the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning. Other members include four Governors, four mayors, three State legislative leaders and three elected county officials. The public is represented by three members. The Commission's study will provide an excellent opportunity for Congress and the many interested groups and individuals throughout the Nation to give this matter thorough and informed consideration. I ask unanimous consent that the Advisory Commission's study outline be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, Washington, D.C. Sept. 8, 1967]

OUTLINE OF STUDY OF BALANCED URBANIZATION AND NEW COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

The following is a topical and paragraph outline which develops the major areas of coverage for the Commission's study on Balanced Urbanization and New Community Development. Not all topics are treated in equal depth nor is the depth of treatment necessarily related to importance.

The study describes the present pattern of urbanization in the country and the patterns of urban and regional growth and decline. It will review the economic, social, and political factors which influence economic development and urbanization. Consideration will be given to the need for a national economic development and urbanization policy to foster balanced development throughout the country, and to the respective roles of Federal, State, and local governments. It will then consider intergovernmental problems involved in evolving policies and programs to facilitate the financing, development, and governing of new communities as one of the methods to implement national policies and goals for a balanced urbanization.

INTRODUCTION

A. Purpose of the study.

1. To examine the present total pattern of urbanization nationwide, emphasizing the whole range from villages to metropolitan centers, including specific attention to trends affecting small towns and rural counties as well as the large urban concentrations.

2. To provide a description of urbanization, using a broader definition for "urban" and more restricted for "rural."

3. To identify the forces which have influenced present population distribution patterns with a view to facilitating the consideration of possible policies designed to encourage balanced urbanization.

4. To identify economic and social advantages and disadvantages in population concentration in metropolitan centers.

5. To consider the need for a national urbanization policy which can guide specific decisions regarding programs which affect urban development.

6. To examine several types of measures at various levels of government that can be used to foster balanced urbanization.

7. To examine the potential of "rural growth centers" as a method of counteracting the diseconomies of metropolitan concentration and congestion.

8. To examine the potential of new communities as another method of meeting the problem of population concentration in metropolitan areas.

9. To review the problems involved in planning, regulating, and building large new communities. Particular emphasis will be placed on the possible role of Federal, State, and local governments and the relationships between the public and private sectors in developing new communities.

10. To explore questions of land assembly and development; planning and development; provision of community facilities and services; the time and character of municipal government for new communities; and to explore the regions and metropolitan areas.

11. To examine the governmental and administrative techniques that can be used to encourage and regulate urban development in accordance with public policy objectives.

B. Definitions—distinguish types of new communities and related developments: satellite new communities, independent new cities, regional centers, growth centers, planned developments, planned residential districts, planned unit developments, "new town-in town" (on undeveloped sites or cleared sites or a combination of the two).

C. While the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the study of new communities will have relevance for rural and urban growth centers, "new town-in town," planned residential districts, planned unit developments, etc., the emphasis will be on strictly "new communities," i.e., communities started from scratch in areas with no significant development within the projected borders and no coterminus local government. Perhaps modified to include those developments (especially those using staged development) which so enlarge an existing small incorporated nucleus as to put them outside the normal subdivider/developer situation.

PART I—NATIONAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND URBANIZATION

Chapter 1. The process of urbanization

A. Descriptive and statistical account of urbanization in the United States identifying the growth of urban areas emphasizing the whole spectrum from the smallest "rural" urban centers to the largest metropolitan areas and "megalopolis."

1. Emphasis should be given to the total pattern of urbanization stressing the growth of medium-sized urban centers.

2. The significance of the growth of suburbs in relation to central cities and the distinction between central cities and other components of urban population (fringe areas, urbanized areas, other urban places, and some rural nonfarm).

3. A description of the megalopolis concept.

4. Identification of the most rapidly growing small- and medium-sized counties and cities (including those cities located within SMSA's but not a part of the socio-economic structure of the SMSA).

5. Description of problems attendant upon the pattern of urbanization including heavy concentration in metropolitan areas and suburban "sprawl" and the resulting economic, social and governmental problems. A parallel description of problems created by the exodus of population from rural areas.

6. Significance of dispersal of industry into urban fringe and rural areas and increased industrialization of agriculture with owners and even operators more frequently living in urban places.

Chapter 2. Factors influencing economic development and urbanization

A. Analytical discussion of factors influencing national and regional economic growth and decline and urbanization based on the recognition that mature economies function through the interaction of urban-industrial complexes (cities); that the major economic activity of the nation operates and will in the forseeable future continue to operate through a system of cities; that regional differentiation tends to give way to urban interaction as the economy of a nation matures. For the purposes of this analysis, the urban complex or center is not just a densely populated area, but is a social complex containing a hierarchy of economically and socially interrelated and overlapping hinterlands which collectively comprise a recognizable, viable entity.

B. Examination of social and economic forces influencing regional activity and urbanization.

1. The extent and character of national economic growth.

2. The impact of change-initiating factors central to such growth, particularly (a) technology, (b) natural resources, (c) population and labor force, (d) changes in consumer demand, and (e) strategically important institutional changes, such as those flowing from governmental policy.

3. The relative extent to which regions have shared in the national economic growth, and the shift in the relative position of individual regions with regard to the key measures (i.e., employment within major industries).

4. The major characteristics of the economic growth (or decline) patterns of the individual regions, particularly the extent to which such growth (or decline) is related to industry composition or to within-industry locational changes.

5. The nature of the individual regions, and their patterns or urbanization.

C. Examination of economies and diseconomies of concentration and dispersion.

Chapter 3. Conclusions and recommendations regarding the influencing of economic development and urbanization

A. Identify the need for national and regional, State, and local economic development policy incorporating urbanization policy.

B. Consider possible Federal, State, and local policies to encourage a balanced industrial and economic growth throughout the nation and a balanced pattern of urbanization between large metropolitan centers, smaller urban places outside of metropolitan areas, and rural areas.

1. Policy to stem the continued concentration in metropolitan areas and to encourage the development of alternative patterns of urbanization including smaller growth centers and new communities.

2. The use of industrial location policies to influence development; placement of public contracts, institutions and facilities as an influence; and the development of job opportunities.

3. Land use and development policies such as new approaches to zoning, open space provisions, and timing of water and sewer lines and highways.

4. Measures dealing with government organization and structure such as boundary commissions, extra - territorial powers, strengthening county governments, and regional arrangements.

5. Elimination where possible of the arbitrary distinction resulting in similar but separate programs for rural and urban areas—701 and community development districts, urban rural water sewer facilities program, HUD and USDA extension programs, proposed separate urban and rural job opportunity programs.

C. Organizational alternatives to formulate economic development and urbanization policy.

1. A national economic planning agency assigned responsibility for economic development and urbanization policy—an existing or new agency in the Executive Office of the President.

2. Complementary regional, State, areawide, and local planning organization and process.

PART II—INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS IN THE DEVELOPMENT AND GOVERNING OF NEW COMMUNITIES

Chapter 4. New communities in America and their objectives

A. Objectives of new communities and identification of the public interest in them. (Obviously not all of the objectives are equally important or feasible.)

1. Dispersal away from overconcentrated urban centers.

2. Regulate development: an opportunity for planned, staged development to influence the future course of urban growth encouraging desirable cities and towns based on sound principles of physical planning, using flexible approaches, viewing the total projected city as a whole, and providing for various needs on a rational basis.

3. Assure the most economic use of public and private resources for new urban development.

4. Provide a wide range of single and multifamily housing covering a broad price range from low-income housing to luxury homes and apartments.

5. Present the opportunity for innovation and experimentation unhampered by preexisting structures and organization.

6. Provide relatively self-contained social and economic opportunities within or easily accessible to the community for a wide range of professional and occupational needs.

7. Provide housing choices to all groups as a step in overcoming established patterns of segregation which foreclose or minimize the opportunity for moving out of minority ghettos.

8. Relieve pressure on central cities and built-up areas for relocation opportunities in connection with urban renewal, highway projects, code enforcement, and other displacements.

9. Provide for amenities and desirable residential, work, and recreational opportunities. Forestall blight and deterioration.

10. Contribute to the sound economic development of a region.

11. Provide direct economic benefits to the governments involved, such as a diversified tax base and economic provision of public services and facilities.

12. Provide alternative residential and work opportunities for migration coming into metropolitan areas.

13. Provide geographically dispersed alternatives to migration into the largest urban concentrations.

B. History of "new towns" and new communities.

1. Early history.

2. General philosophy of "new towns" and new communities—various streams of thought going into them: town planning, good government, garden cities, economic interest, company towns, convenience.

3. New towns in Europe.

4. New communities in America.

a. Roots in city planning movement.

b. The company town.

c. Earliest planned suburban developments.

d. The 1920's and 1930's Garden City efforts.

e. New Deal "Greenbelt" cities of the 1930's.

f. Defense towns: Los Alamos, Oak Ridge, Richland.

g. Post-World War II large suburban developments—Levittowns, Park Forest, etc.

5. Evaluation of previous experience.

Chapter 5. New Community Development and Government Action

A. Present experience and problems facing new community development—their political, social, and economic feasibility.

1. Need to combine the public interest requirements essential to justify special provisions, concessions, and inducements with the economic need for a profit to interest entrepreneurs.

a. Provision of essential public services and assurance of adequate public facilities designed to incorporate the capacity or be capable of expansion to incorporate the capacity to serve the ultimate planned population.

b. The protection of public objectives such as the provision of a range of housing types including low-rent, public housing and middle-income housing either subsidized, nonprofit, or limited profit.

2. Need for national and State and metropolitan areas, urban development policy to provide broad, basic goals and objectives to guide and inform decisions.

3. Large initial financial commitment and extended development period during which return is limited or nonexistent.

4. Limited tax base for current public needs during earlier stages before commercial and industrial development.

5. Problem of securing adequate fiscal resources to finance needed public services and facilities in those new communities which don't include sufficient industrial and commercial development within their borders.

6. The necessity for imaginative public regulation during the crucial formative stages before a government exists which is specifically concerned with the "new community" per se. Their government, in some States particularly, may not necessarily be coincident with the borders of the new communities—i.e., it may be the county, town, or borough within which development takes place.

7. The need for flexibility to develop new imaginative approaches and meet changing conditions over the period of development while at the same time protecting the public interest by preventing exploitation of the more liberal or flexible regulatory policy thus preserving the essential assumptions under which the initial commitment to develop is entered into.

8. The necessity to anticipate a political and community leadership and a constituency not yet present or even clearly identified consisting of residents, merchants, industrialists, etc. The general direction that will be desired or acceptable must be foreseen and then there must be allowance for adjustment without compromising the basic objectives as actual experience grows.

9. Relationship of development to an existing incorporated place—either a city larger than the new development or a town much smaller than the new development—when annexation is a possible alternative step rather than independent incorporation. Use of local agency formation commission or State review agency could be helpful.

10. The necessity to assess the market for and acceptability of new communities.

B. Possible recommendations for government action to assist in the development of new communities.

1. Organization.

a. A range of organizational possibilities which can be adapted to varying specific needs and objectives of new communities is needed. The organization must provide for supervision during initial stages and the ultimate transition to a permanent arrangement including incorporation if desired. There must be provision for representation and protection of metropolitan, regional, and statewide interest.

b. Organization for overall development responsibility.

(1) Public development authority with an opportunity for participation by and representation of a wide range of public and private interests.

(a) Could include authority for acquisition of title or development rights to land with subsequent sale to private developers or use for public purposes.

(b) Could include responsibility for planning and designing, land development, regulatory authority, public services, and supervision of actual development of public facilities and private houses, buildings, and factories.

(2) A mixed consortium of public and private groups (using the comsat corporation as a precedent) or a strictly private consortium, but with public funds involved in research and development, to take responsibility for development. Existing governments would retain more of the regulatory authority under these arrangements.

(3) New authority to equip the county or the State to take direct responsibility for regulation and development and for marshalling and coordinating participation of other public and private entities.

(4) New authority to permit existing cities to develop satellite cities—to take initiative and exercise early regulatory authority over them looking to later incorporation or possibly annexation.

(5) County subordinate service areas.

c. Organization for development of segments or parts of the new community.

(1) State-chartered development credit corporations to help finance individual developers of housing, apartments, commercial or industrial buildings.

(2) State development finance authorities to channel State funds and credit or credit guarantees into new communities development either through State-chartered development corporations or direct to developers. This type of assistance might be limited

to or have more desirable terms for limited-profit groups.

(3) Citizens nonprofit housing cooperatives or other organizations for low- and middle-income housing and housing for special groups such as the aged.

(4) Limited-profit groups for middle-income and special housing needs.

(5) Authority for an existing government or public agency to undertake low-income public housing and middle-income housing and make necessary commitments and assurances.

(a) Could be either the county, other existing local jurisdictions, or the State.

(b) Could subsequently be superseded by an incorporated municipality or an authority of such a municipality.

(6) Limited, but multi-purpose special districts or county subordinate service areas to assume responsibility for certain public works and services either directly or by contract or interlocal agreement.

(7) Interlocal contracts or agreements with existing governments.

2. Financing.

a. Direct public finanical programs.

(1) Federal and State grant programs for land acquisition and development.

(2) Federal and State grant programs for construction of public facilities—open space, water and sewer facilities, public buildings, hospitals, schools, etc. Special provisions for additional matching or incentives or higher ceilings could be made for planned new communities.

(3) Loans or loan guarantees for similar purposes and postponements of interest where justified.

(4) Grants and technical assistance to the responsible government for planning and for administering development controls during the formative stages.

b. Tax concessions or equalization measures.

(1) Certain types of tax abatement, forgiveness, or other concessions during the period of holding land for development or during the early years of development.

(2) Tax equalization or redistribution measures to help relate needs of new communities to tax resources. For example, in earlier stages of new community development, needs often outstrip the tax base. Or a new community may be located to be accessible to an industrial complex and thereby serve it and yet not include industry within its borders.

3. Planning, site designation, land assembly, and regulation.

a. Public acquisition of land or development rights for subsequent sale to developers or use of public facilities.

b. New, improved and flexible approaches to land use and development controls such as zoning regulations, subdivision control and official maps and building codes; to development plans; and to the formulation of comprehensive planning policies and objectives.

c. A regulatory system to permit negotiation of a total plan with provision for staged development and adaptations to changing population and social and economic conditions while still providing predictability for the developers and adequate protection of the public interest.

d. Application and adaptation of existing regulatory techniques such as planned unit development, planning residential district, usable open space, and staged development.

e. Development of new land use control techniques for large, mixed, residential-commercial-industrial developments such as borrowing or average densities, "floating zone" approaches, and so forth.

f. Some techniques for obtaining assurances of continuing ratios of low- and middle-income housing opportunities to total housing which are the quid pro quo for special regulatory and financial incentives. Protection of open-housing practices. Assurances of adequate, well-planned public facilities to anticipate projected growth.

g. Regulatory leverage arising from public ownership of land or of development rights and conditions attached to sale.

h. National, regional, metropolitan area, and State planning for identification of possible sites and designation of specific sites using physical, social, and economic analysis techniques.

i. Tax policy to influence development.

j. Programming of public facilities to influence urban development.

TRIBUTE TO NORMAN S. PAUL, FORMER UNDER SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, it is my privilege on this occasion to speak by way of tribute to Norman S. Paul, who recently resigned his post as Under Secretary of the Air Force.

We who are privileged to serve as Members of Congress are especially cognizant of the difficulties experienced by the executive branch of our Government in attracting and retaining the highly qualified personnel needed to properly and efficiently administer the affairs of our Federal Government. Yet, over the years we have been fortunate indeed in having self-sacrificing, dedicated individuals who have stepped forward to give of their time and their talents to make our country the great place it is.

In recent years, Norman Paul has been one of those men. He has served our Government for almost 20 years in such varied positions as Legislative Counsel for the Central Intelligence Agency, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower, and, most recently, as Under Secretary of the Air Force, to name but a few of his important assignments. In each of these positions Secretary Paul was at the forefront of the department or agency in its dealings with Congress. He appeared on numerous occasions as a departmental spokesman before the committees of Congress. He certainly must be included among the most able and effective witnesses ever to appear before our committee. He had always "done his homework" and had a complete grasp of the issues presented; however, his committee appearances were further enhanced by his personal charm, ready wit, easy manner, and unfailingly pleasant personality.

In his duties for the past 5 years as Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower and as Undersecretary of the Air Force he has testified on many occasions in support of legislation designed to improve the incentives and opportunities for our military personnel His expertise and knowledge in this area were always of substantial assistance in our efforts in the Congress to make the military career more attractive and to reward properly the men and women of our Armed Forces. Secretary Paul has made substantial, significant contributions to the strength of our Armed Forces during trying times when so many of our men are fighting in Vietnam. He should take justifiable pride in his accomplishments. The Air Force will miss him, we in Congress will miss him, and we certainly hope that his contributions will continue on the national scene.

FIRST QUARTER FISCAL 1968 STATISTICS SHOW NO CASE FOR TAX INCREASE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the bombing, blasting third quarter of 1967 that was supposed to explode with a demand that would begin to make a shambles of the economy unless a tax increase was promptly forthcoming has just been completed.

And what was the economic result in that quarter?

The hard, cold statistics now indicate that the economic case for a tax increase just is not there.

Excessive demand was supposed to be pushing available manpower and facilities to the limit about now. Is it?

Consider the story as told in this morning's Wall Street Journal: New factory orders slipped in August for the second consecutive month as defense contracts declined, according to the Department of Commerce. And Department of Commerce analysts say that new orders probably dipped again in September.

Steel mill shipments in September are estimated to have declined from the August level, and industry sources are pessimistic over prospects for the rest of the year.

It is true that machine tool orders rose in August, and preliminary reports suggest that they rose again in September. But the Wall Street Journal reports:

> Few machine-tool-makers think the gains signal a strong upturn that would carry orders back the torrid 1966 pace.

Construction awards in August climbed 7 percent from July. Also, housing contracts rose sharply, a result which F. W. Dodge attributed to the availability of credit.

Mr. President, this mixed bag of reports suggests that the economy is bumping along, sliding sideways, or perhaps growing or gaining a little. But there is no evidence at all that there is too much demand for the mighty productive facilities of the Nation.

On the contrary, it now seems clearer than ever that our growth this year is going to be a disappointing 3 percent, or perhaps even less, in real terms. This is below the target of almost every economist, liberal or conservative. It may not be enough to maintain our present inadequate 85 percent utilization of our productive capacity and 3.8 percent unemployment. It is even less likely that it is enough to improve this disappointingly slow level of activity.

How in the world can we justify voting a tax increase now that would be imposed at an annual rate of $10 billion?

Mr. President, I do hope the administration will take another hard look at the economic situation before pressing for this tax-increase proposal.

We have just finished the first quarter of fiscal 1968, the year for which the big budget deficit is supposed to be so overstimulating for the economy. Obviously it was not. Not only was there not too much stimulation in this first fiscal quar-

ter. There was not enough. Does this mean it is time to slow down the economy more?

Of course not. Senators who said last July that they would wait until the economic statistics became available later in the year before determining their position on a tax increase, now have the case pretty clearly before them. The economic answer is "No."

Mr. President I ask unanimous consent that the following articles from this morning's Wall Street Journal be printed in the RECORD: "Factory Orders Slipped in August From July Levels," "September Steel Shipments Fell, Mills Estimate," "Building Awards Rose 7 Percent in August From July Total," "August Orders of Machine Tools Rose From July."

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

[From the Wall Street Journal]

FACTORY ORDERS SLIPPED IN AUGUST FROM JULY LEVELS—DECLINE BLAMED MOSTLY ON AEROSPACE BOOKINGS DROP; INVENTORIES GAINED A BIT—SHIPMENT EDGED UP TO RECORD

WASHINGTON.—New factory orders in August slipped for the second consecutive month and inventories unexpectedly increased a bit, the Commerce Department said. Shipments in August edged up to a record while unfilled orders gained slightly from July.

Inventories, which most analysis believed had leveled off, equaled a seasonally adjusted 1.79-month supply at the end of August, slightly above a downward-revised 1.78 at July's end. At the end of August 1966, this figure was 1.68.

New orders, a key guide to future factory output, slid 0.8% in August to a seasonally adjusted $45,559,000,000 from an upward-revised $45,921,000,000 in July, when the decline was 0.4%.

Incoming orders for durable goods alone dropped 1.3%, not the 2.3% estimated in an advance report. The change, a spokesman said, reflects upward revisions in August ordering for fabricated metals, electrical machinery and automobiles.

AEROSPACE BOOKINGS

The August factory-orders setback was due mostly to an $853 million decline in aerospace industry bookings, the department said. Total Defense Department orders for aerospace, ordinance and communications equipment were down to $2.6 billion from July's upward-revised $3.6 billion.

New orders for nondurable goods slid 0.3% in August to $22,201,000,000 from July's upward-revised $22,262,000,000.

Government analysts tended to pooh-pooh the second monthly orders setback, which contrasts sharply with gains in most other key measurements of August business. Economic indicators are being watched carefully by Congressmen to see if they bear out Administration forecasts of a strong upturn in business activity. Government officials predict such a strong upturn would intensify inflation unless Congress raises income taxes. The President's tax bill is bogged down in the House Ways and Means Committee.

Should September's orders decline or hover near August levels, Congressional foes of the President's tax proposal would have new ammunition. It's possible the September report could be sluggish if defense ordering is again low and auto shortages develop as a result of a prolonged strike against Ford Motor Co. Such a long strike, analysts said, could also result in slackened auto-company ordering of metals and other auto-parts products.

INVENTORIES

Manufacturers' inventories rose 0.6% in August to an adjusted $81,365,000,000 from $80,897,000,000 in July when they gained at a similar rate after a 0.2% dip in June, their first decline since mid-1964.

The August increase was centered in the work-in-progress and finished-goods categories of durable goods makers. Analysts said the stocks rise may indicate optimism about sales in the coming months. But they noted that much of the large increase in inventories this year was due to sales falling short of factory managers' expectations. Such "involuntary" accumulation is often followed by planned cutbacks in production that accelerate any downward trend.

Shipments in August gained 0.3% to a seasonally adjusted $45,475,000,000 from July's $45,346,000,000. The advance reflected moderate increases in shipments of motor vehicles and in the aerospace segment of transportation industry. Total durables shipments rose 1.4% in August while shipments of nondurable-goods makers slipped 0.9%, reflecting decreasing shipments in the petroleum, paper and tobacco industries.

Despite the decline in new orders, the inflow of business topped factory shipments for the fourth consecutive month, sending the August backlog to an adjusted $79,850,000,000 from July's $79,764,000,000. The backlog of durable-goods makers, however, edged down $95,000,000 in August to $76,615,000,000. Unfilled orders of nondurable-goods manufacturers gained $181,000,000 to $3,235,000,000.

Here is the Census Bureau's monthly tabulation of manufacturers' shipments, inventories, new orders and unfilled orders (in millions of dollars):

SHIPMENTS

	Unadjusted			Seasonally adjusted	
	August 1966	July 1967 [1]	August 1967 [2]	July 1967 [1]	August 1967 [2]
All manufacturing	43,109	40,864	44,334	45,346	45,475
Durable goods	21,432	20,256	22,043	23,136	23,454
Nondurable goods	21,677	20,608	22,291	22,210	22,021

INVENTORIES

All manufacturing	73,770	80,628	81,005	80,987	81,365
Durable goods	46,680	52,194	52,694	52,346	52,847
Nondurable goods	27,090	28,434	28,311	28,551	28,518

NEW ORDERS

All manufacturing	43,805	42,093	44,517	45,921	45,559
Durable goods	22,244	21,430	22,133	23,659	23,358
Nondurable goods	21,561	20,663	22,384	22,262	22,201

UNFILLED ORDERS

All manufacturing	77,300	80,085	80,268	79,764	79,850
Durable goods	73,615	76,908	76,998	76,710	76,615
Nondurable goods	3,685	3,177	3,270	3,054	3,235

[1] Revised.
[2] Preliminary.

[From the Wall Street Journal]

SEPTEMBER STEEL SHIPMENTS FELL, MILLS ESTIMATE—INCREASE HAD BEEN FORECAST; THE DECLINE IS BLAMED ON STRIKES, REDUCED DEMAND—OUTLOOK POOR FOR REST OF 1967

PITTSBURGH.—Strikes and reduced demand hurt the steel industry's September shipments and the outlook for the rest of the year also is disappointing.

Mills had been forecasting a second straight rise in shipments for September, after deliveries hit a 19-month low of 6,221,000 tons in July. Now, they say that September shipments fell below August, when they're estimated to have reached roughly 7,000,000 tons.

Largely, the downgrading is a product of labor strife, including a strike by owner-operators of steel-hauling trucks against steel plants in a dispute involving their demand for better representation from the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Ford Motor Co.'s closedown by the United Auto Workers union strike and a walkout at Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp.'s Cleveland plant, that has nearly closed that facility. The truckers' strike and the Ford closedown have severely affected steel shipments and are increasingly putting a damper on steelmaking operations.

Mills say that steel buying isn't turning out to be as good as they'd expected either. This has affected the pace of business in the past month and has caused the mills to lower their sights on market predictions for the remainder of the year.

One big mill, for instance, says orders in the past four weeks topped a month before by 10%, but an official adds, "they haven't increased as much as we thought they would." Business during most of the summer has been uninspiring, with consumption of steel lowered and users continuing to trim steel inventories.

"We thought inventory liquidation would be over by now and customers maybe would be building some steel stocks, but now we think it's going to continue, though at perhaps a slower rate," one steelman says.

MILL ESTIMATES

This mill was expecting a 5% rise in September shipments, but current figures dropped below August. A big Midwestern steelmaker that also was forecasting a 5% climb in September deliveries estimates that they declined by about 7%. Another large Midwest mill says lagging demand would have prevented its September shipments from measuring up to August even without the Ford and truck strikes.

In some cases, the effect of strikes has been severe. At J & L the truckers' strike and the Cleveland walkout "will have a severe impact on third quarter earnings," says Charles M. Beeghly, chairman.

Mr. Beeghly says that J & L looks for September shipments to be 30% less than orders scheduled. Generally, steelmen had anticipated that September deliveries would be about the best of the year. The highest month so far in 1967 was March, when shipments were 7,562,341 tons.

J & L earned $13,616,000, or $1.67 a share, on sales of $242,912,000 in the third quarter of last year.

J & L says its operations at Cleveland were "virtually closed down" Friday by a work stoppage of some 3,600 production workers resulting from the suspension of 27 electrical construction employes. The trouble began Tuesday with a five-day suspension of a union committeeman over his refusal to report for a work assignment and another 26 members of United Steelworkers of America Local 188 at a finishing mill insisted they also be suspended, the company says.

The suspended workmen persuaded some 400 of the 700 workers in finishing and shipping operations to stay away from work, J & L says. Later, the dissatisfied workers appeared at the adjacent iron steelmaking gate and convinced enough workers to stay off the job to force J & L to begin banking furnaces, the company says.

TRUCK STRIKE

The truck strike caused most big mills to start piling up unshipped steel in the plants, wherever it couldn't be diverted to rail shipment. As the piling-up process reached its limit, production was cut back.

One large steelmaker estimates that some

7% to 8% of scheduled September shipments had been deferred into October because of the strike. Bethlehem Steel Corp. says that four steelmaking open hearth furnaces are being taken off this week at its Bethlehem, Pa., plant and supervisors are considering curtailment of ironmaking output in blast furnaces, because of the truckers' strike.

Total man-turns canceled at the plant this week will be "substantially higher" than last week, a spokesman said. Bethlehem had said that 750 man-turns would be canceled in the plant's structural division, then canceled an additional 200 man-turns later last week.

Republic Steel Corp. has more than 500 men on layoff because of the truck strike, but hasn't laid off the additional 2,000 that the company indicated two weeks ago might have to be furloughed. Republic apparently has been able to avoid that augmentation by diverting shipments to railroad. Another large producer says truck hauls are still 20% below normal, but some steel has been diverted to rail and barge movement and it seems that operations won't have to be curtailed.

The six-week truck strike by the 15,000 owner-operators appears to be on the verge of being settled. Last Friday, after two days of intense bargaining, between the dissident truckers and representatives of the Teamsters union, the parties arrived at certain proposals that they will recommend as a basis for a settlement. Terms of the proposals won't be disclosed until voted on by the truckers early this week. The truckers sought an increased share of the proceeds from the steel-hauling business, more pay for time spent waiting between loads and more voice in Teamster affairs. The strike has been marked by considerable violence.

FORD STRIKE

The effect of the Ford strike hasn't been as great. One steel mill market analyst computes it this way: Ford makes about a fourth of the nation's cars and trucks, which consume roughly 20% of the nation's steel, so requires about 5% of domestic steel output. But some of this is in auto parts made by concerns that haven't had to trim their production, so that maybe 4% of steel output would be affected.

Since Ford makes about half of its own steel, only 2% of U.S. production by other mills would be affected. Ford is taking shipment on about half of the steel it normally buys, so production of these makers is lowered by only 1% or so, this steelman reasons. On top of this, of course Ford's own steel production—or roughly 2% of the nation's—also is down, he notes.

Mills say that General Motors Corp. and Chrysler Corp. seem to be going full blast in operations and steel purchases, but there's no evidence this is to take up any of the slack caused by the Ford buying letdown. Mills aren't compensating for it, they say.

Most steelmakers look for October shipments to rise sharply from September, because of the expected delayed effect of the strikes on September deliveries—provided, of course, that they don't last well into October. For a while, they add, shipments of canmaking tinplate will continue to benefit from rush deliveries in advance of an Oct. 16 price increase, with a resulting depressing effect after that date.

[From the Wall Street Journal]

BUILDING AWARDS ROSE 7 PERCENT IN AUGUST FROM JULY TOTAL—F. W. DODGE INDEX OF CONTRACT VALUE SET HIGH, REFLECTING HOME-CONSTRUCTION SPURT—AVAILABILITY OF CREDIT CITED

NEW YORK.—Showing the effects of a recovery in home building, construction contracts awarded in August climbed 7% from July to $5,103,750,000, crossing the $5,000,000,000 mark for the third time in four months. The record high, $5,400,000,000 was reached in June.

F. W. Dodge Co., a division of McGraw-Hill Inc., reported that its seasonally adjusted index of construction contract value reached 165 in August, a record for any month. The previous record, based on 1957–59 as 100, was 164 set in June. While the raw value of August awards was about $300 million less than June's, the seasonal adjustment takes into account the fact that June is traditionally the strongest month of the year.

George A. Christie, Dodge chief economist, said that the strong showing in August "is further evidence of the steady improvement that has been taking place in construction during 1967." He noted that the year started out 20% below 1966, but that "the cumulative comparison for 1967 has improved with each succeeding month, and now things have just about evened out."

Mr. Christie attributed the improvement in the construction outlook to "the response of the housing market to the availability of credit." Housing contracts in August were $1,912,112,000, up 26% from August 1966, marking the fourth successive month they've surpassed the year-earlier figure. In May they rose 2% from May 1966, ending a string of 13 consecutive declines.

Both single-family houses and apartments showed strong gains in August. On a seasonally adjusted basis, the index of residential contract value climbed to 136 from July's 129. The index stood at only 107 in August 1966.

Nonresidential building awards totaled $1,846,605,000, up 7% from the year-earlier month. The gain was attributed to a rise of more than 50% in construction of office buildings and hospitals.

Industrial buildings, stores and public buildings all slipped below a year earlier in August, while educational construction contracts held about even.

August contracts for heavy construction were $1,345,033,000, up 25% from the 1966 month. Mr. Christie said that "highway construction, still responding to the restoration of Federal funds, advanced 26% to pull almost even with last year's cumulative total." Sewer systems and water supply projects scored a 41% increase, while several large dam and reservoir projects boosted that category's total to nearly twice the amount of last August.

F. W. Dodge Co. reports construction awards for August:

	1967	1966	Percent change
Residential building	$1,912,112,000	$1,514,617,000	+26
Nonresidential building	1,846,605,000	1,728,891,000	+7
Heavy construction	1,345,033,000	1,790,133,000	+25
Total	5,103,750,000	4,322,641,000	+18
8 months' total	35,181,397,000	35,648,288,000	−4

[From the Wall Street Journal, Oct. 2, 1967]

AUGUST'S ORDERS OF MACHINE TOOLS ROSE FROM JULY—STILL FURTHER IMPROVEMENT FOR SEPTEMBER IS NOTED BY A NUMBER OF COMPANIES—FEW SEE RETURN TO 1966 PACE

Machine-tool orders rose in August from the previous month and a number of builders note a further improvement in September. But few machine-tool executives think the gains signal a strong upturn that would carry orders back to the torrid 1966 pace.

Net new orders for metal-cutting machine tools in August rose to $105,950,000, highest for any 1967 month so far, from $88,250,000 in July, according to the National Machine Tool Builders' Association in Washington. However, orders lagged behind the $113,050,000 of August 1966.

Orders for metal-forming machine tools, a smaller category of machines including presses that shape metal through pressure instead of drilling, shaving or grinding as cutting tools do, declined in August to $14,000,000 from $18,100,000 in July and $24,650,000 in August 1966.

Total orders for both types of machines at $119,950,000 exceeded August shipments of $105,650,000, adding to the industry's backlog for the first time this pear. Most manufacturers came into 1967 with heavy backlogs as a result of unusually high orders in 1966, but reduced bookings through the first seven months of this year lowered the total.

Shipments of metal-cutting machine tools in August were $85,050,000, down from $96,150,000 in July and the lowest for any 1967 month, the association says. This chiefly reflects closedowns for vacation, both by machine-tool builders and their customers, rather than a significant trend. The August shipments exceeded the $80,950,000 of the comparable 1966 month.

The association estimates backlogs for metal-cutting machine tools at the end of August were at an average of 9.5 months production, up from 9.2 months at the end of July but about a month lower than the January order accumulation.

Shipments of metal-forming machines in August were $20,600,000, down from $21,200,000 in July and $26,700,000 in August of 1966.

MEANING OF SHIFTS

Machine-tool builders caution against reading too much significance into month-to-month shifts in orders. The August order figures don't indicate that U.S. industry is about to embark on a capital goods buying spree, they say.

Total machine-tool orders for the first eight months of this year, at $893,450,000, were down 31% from the abnormally high $1,286,150,000 a year earlier, they note.

But a survey of a dozen machine-tool builders, including many of the largest companies along with some smaller companies, shows that most believe the last four months of the year will be relatively good.

"Our orders have been holding about steady, with September about equal to August, which was a good month for us," says August R. Hayes, sales manager, Moline Tool Co., Moline, Ill. "Our backlog had been holding reasonably steady for a little over a year at about 11 months production but it's a little stronger now than a couple months ago."

Giddings & Lewis Machine Tool Co., Fond du Lac, Wis., also says September orders about equaled August and that bookings for both months were right on target with budget forecasts. This is an improvement from the first six months when orders lagged slightly behind forecasts, the company says.

Most companies say this improvement has come without significant help from the automotive industry. Neither the auto makers nor suppliers of parts have been ordering machine tools in large quantities in recent months, machine-tool executives say.

EXCEPTION TO PICKUP

"Our salesmen report an overall pickup in ordering and they're optimistic that the favorable trend will continue," says New Britain Machine Co., New Britain, Conn. "The one exception to that is automotive. We had expected some automotive business, but we just haven't been getting much."

"Automotive companies, supporting industries as well as the auto producers, just haven't been ordering in the last three months the way they did earlier," agrees Robert D. Lawson, vice president and general manager of Norton Co.'s machine-tool division. The Worcester, Mass., maker of grinding machines had expected a pickup in automotive business by September, "but it hasn't occurred," he says.

For machine-tool companies heavily dependent on that industry, this slowness in auto ordering has severely reduced business. Several executives say this is one major

reason why domestic orders for metal-forming machines in the first eight months of 1967 were down 46.7% from a year earlier, compared with a 28.1% drop in domestic orders for metal-cutting machine tools. They say the forming-machine end of the business is more heavily dependent on the auto industry.

"Business is lousy," says one maker of metal-forming presses that normally sells heavily to the auto industry. "The dropoff began about the first of the year and really tailed off about in May. As a result, our backlog is down to five months production, while a year ago we had a 16-month backlog."

Machine-tool builders say the Ford strike may be a factor in lower automotive ordering, but that it isn't the major one. The slide in auto tool buying began well before the strike, the companies say, and automotive manufacturers usually base their machine tool ordering on longer range considerations.

COMPARATIVE NEW ORDERS
METAL-CUTTING MACHINES

	1967		August 1966
	August	July	
Domestic	$96,750,000	$77,900,000	$107,100,000
Foreign	9,200,000	10,350,000	5,950,000
Total	105,950,000	88,250,000	113,050,000

Note: 8-month total for 1967, $761,550,000; 8-month total for 1966, $1,048,950,000.

METAL-FORMING MACHINES

	1967		August 1966
	August	July	
Domestic	$13,400,000	$13,600,000	$22,700,000
Foreign	600,000	4,500,000	1,950,000
Total	14,000,000	18,100,000	24,650,000

Note: 8-month total for 1967, $131.900,000; 8-month total for 1966, $237,200,000.

COMPARATIVE SHIPMENT FIGURES
METAL-CUTTING MACHINES

	1967		August 1966
	August	July	
Domestic	$76,300,000	$88,800,000	$74,400,000
Foreign	8,750,000	7,350,000	6,550,000
Total	85,050,000	96,150,000	80,950,000

Note: 8-month total for 1967, $816,000,000; 8-month total for 1966, $715,800,000.

METAL-FORMING MACHINES

	1967		August 1966
	August	July	
Domestic	$17,650,000	$18,700,000	$24,400,000
Foreign	2,950,000	2,500,000	2,300,000
Total	20,600,000	21,200,000	26,700,000

Note: 8-month total for 1967, $218,250,000; 8-month total for 1966, $217,900,000.

VIETNAM'S ARMY: "INEFFICIENT, SLOVENLY, AND LAZY"

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, we are told that the war in Vietnam is going well, that we are making progress. Certainly we are making progress in the sense of progressing deeper and deeper into dangerous and difficult situations—as witness the plight of our Marines at Con Thien, and at Gio Linh.

But as our casualties go up, do the Vietnamese losses likewise rise? The answer is "No." We are doing exactly what we were told 3 years ago would not happen—we are fighting the war that Asians should be fighting for themselves. When they will not do it, we do it for them The plain fact is, they all too often will not, so we are increasingly doing it instead. The facts are made clear in a recent article by Wesley Pruden, Jr., writing from Saigon for the National Observer. He cites incidents and circumstances in proof of the fact that, in his words:

The Vietnamese army is the No. 1 scandal of the war, and it is the No. 1 failure of the U.S. military.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article, from the September 25 issue of the National Observer, may appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

INEFFICIENT, SLOVENLY, AND LAZY—THE TROUBLED ARMY OF SOUTH VIETNAM

SAIGON.—The colonel was on his way back to the base, his day's work finished. He and his Cessna O–1 "Bird Dog," the busy little single-engine observation plane, were all alone in the bright-blue sky.

"I was down on the deck," the colonel recalled later, "just plain having fun with flying, for a change, I'd fly up to a hill, then hump over it, and down the valley to the next hill. I was on my way home and there wasn't any hurry.

"Just then, I came over the top of the hill, and spread out in front of me was one of the longest, cleanest beaches in the world. I couldn't believe what I saw in front of me: a string of boats, beaching themselves, and men spilling out of them. These weren't landing barges, and I knew they weren't ours.

" 'Hell,' I said, 'this is a Viet Cong landing party, and what a piece of luck this is.' " With his voice almost trembling with the excitement of his rare good luck, the colonel quickly put the message to his radio center, carefully making the navigational fixes and sending the exact co-ordinates of latitude and longitude.

TEMPTED TO STAY AROUND

"I knew we had people [troops] in the area, and I had flown over an Arvin [Army of South Vietnam] base camp a few minutes before, so I was tempted to stay around for the action. I knew it wouldn't be long before all hell would break loose.

"I could hardy wait to get to the base to get a report on the landing party. There were maybe 300 or so of them, and I knew they would have been zapped [shot up] by the time I got back to the base. I jumped out of my plane and almost ran to the [co-ordination center] to see what had happened.

"The sergeant on duty wasn't at all excited. Yeah, he had got my message. Yeah, he had passed the word on. The word finally was sent over to the local Arvin commander, like the plan says. I knew all that. I wanted to know what the Arvins had done with it. Nobody had ever given them sitting ducks like this one, and I knew that even the Arvins couldn't goof something like this.

"That was before I knew the Arvins as well as I do now. The Arvin commander had got the message all right. But he said he had another operation planned and he couldn't afford to change his plans."

And what happened to the landing party? "They came ashore unopposed, and for all I know they're still sitting down there on the beach."

THE NO. 1 SCANDAL

This was months ago: the colonel is retired and no longer in uniform, but it is typical of a story that is repeated frequently. Collecting tales about the incredible inefficiency, slovenliness, and laziness of South Vietnam's army is perhaps the easiest work in all of the country. The army is the No. 1 scandal of the war, and it is the No. 1 failure of the American military command here.

U.S. officials insist the Vietnamese army isn't all bad; they cite the Vietnamese rangers and marines as specific examples of units that have performed well, often remarkably well, under heavy fire and intense pressure. "When he has good leadership, the Vietnamese soldier will fight as well as anybody's soldier," says an American officer.

Yet, hardly anyone disputes the evidence that the good units are the rare exception. Even the Vietnamese concede that much of their army is not as good as it ought to be. No less an authority than Gen. Cao Van Vien, the chief of the Vietnamese joint staff, concedes it. He not long ago cited his 25th Division as not only the worst in the Vietnamese army, but probably the worst in the world.

Last week, the new president-elect, Nguyen Van Thieu, boldly cashiered four of his most powerful colleagues—including three who were or recently had been connected with the training program. It was, Americans here hoped, the beginning of General Thieu's promised shake-up and clean-up of his army. But it is much too soon to say so.

Those fired (or forcibly "retired") include Maj. Gen. Ton That Xung, the former commander of the national military academy at Dalat; Maj. Gen. Bui Huu Nhon, commander of the Thu Duc Military Training Center; and Brig. Gen. Nguyen Thanh, who until recently commanded the army's military-training program.

If President-elect Thieu keeps his promise, others will be forcibly "retired" as well. Just before the Sept. 3 election, General Thieu said he might eventually get rid of as many as 50 top-ranking worthless (and worse) officers.

The National Leadership Council, the ruling military junta, has been pressed for months to replace corrupt and ineffective generals, but it is not yet clear how many of them General Thieu can rid himself of. The first to go were dispatched on election eve, but the public charges against them hinted that their chief crime was the support of a rival presidential slate.

The officers dismissed last week were accused, vaguely, of several things, including helping themselves to bribes and acquisition of government-owned land. They probably won't be brought before a civil court, but will instead be required to answer questions of a special military disciplinary council.

But even if President-elect Thieu succeeds in getting rid of all the deadwood (which isn't likely), the Army of Vietnam will still have problems. Hard-nosed, honest combat leadership can't be found overnight and unless the entire approach to army organization is changed the officer is not likely to improve much, if at all.

Despite years of U.S. training, the Vietnamese army is woefully timid. Commanders rarely will commit their troops unless they are certain—the word here is certain, not confident—they can whip the enemy. Often, a Vietnamese commander won't even go to the aid of a neighboring outfit under attack if he thinks his own unit will get cut up in the rescue attempt. The fighting day stops promptly at nightfall.

THE THREAT AFTER DARK

The Arvin commander frets most of all about a night attack, because he knows the Communist Viet Cong are masters of stealth

and speed once the land is enveloped by the brooding jungle night. If an Arvin outpost is attacked after dark, the reaction—usually by helicopter gunships—is left for the Americans.

"This is awfully frustrating," a grimy U.S. lieutenant remarked the other day, as he unrolled a map inside his tent east of Saigon, "but I can understand it. The Arvin commander figures the war might be a long one, and if he loses his troops he won't get any more, so he doesn't want to risk losing the ones he has." Understandable, but it means that the commander isn't likely to do much more than lose his men piecemeal, over a period of years rather than months.

The commander might or might not know very much about military tactics. The chances are his aptitudes for soldiering had little to do with how he got his job in the first place. His essential qualification was the attaining of a French-style second baccalaureate, or university degree, and this limits the officer corps to the wealthy.

Even more important than wealth in Vietnam is the family tie, and once the officer gets his commission, he is likely to count more on his cousins and uncles than skill and valor to get his promotions. There is no such thing as time-in-grade promotions; the lieutenant may wait 3 years, or 13 years, to get the golden insignia of the *daiwe,* or captain.

POOR PAY SCALE

Pay is miserable, for both officer and soldier alike. The average infantryman makes the equivalent of about $15 a month, the average captain a bare $25. To this, the government adds a monthly rice ration and housing; officers take their families with them even to the remotest back-country outposts.

But what the Arvins need most of all is discipline. If Thieu can accomplish this, the improvement will be, by comparison with the present, vast. Desertion has not often meant anything more than a mild reprimand, if that; desertion in an American army in wartime can mean the firing squad. No wonder, then, that the desertion rate has been astronomical. Last year, more than 130,000 Vietnamese soldiers strayed away (though many returned later or joined other units closer to their homes).

Discipline in the ranks of the Viet Cong seems, on the other hand, almost miraculous. They are, after all, Vietnamese too. This dedication to Communist duty is too often taken, by critics of the Saigon army, as heartfelt devotion to a cause. It is hardly that. Captured Viet Cong, as well as captured Communist memoranda, have made it clear that Charlie fights because if he doesn't, he can count on getting shot in the back by his own people. Arvin, until now, has been able to run either way with little worry about the consequences.

Neither the officer nor the soldier has a military tradition to fall back on. The Vietnamese army dates only from 1949, when Bao Dai was recognized as chief of state, under the French union.

AN INCREDIBLE COLLECTION

Le Garde du Sud Viet-Nam, about 20,000 men, was then a part of the 150,000-man French army fighting the old Communist-led Viet Minh. The armed forces were an incredible ragbag of Frenchmen, Germans (veterans of Hitler's armies), Moroccans, Senegalese, and the Dutch. *Le Garde du Sud Veit-Nam* was officered exclusively by Frenchmen, who rarely hid their contempt for *les jaunes*—"the yellow." To the French, the color of Vietnamese skin was the same as the color of the Vietnamese spirit.

The first U.S. military aid to the Vietnamese began the next year, when the United States and France signed a mutual defense treaty for all of French Indochina, which then included both Vietnams, Laos, and Cambodia. This pact was signed two days before Christmas 1950, and a small group of American advisers went to Saigon to set up "the shop."

By 1954, the year of Dienbienphu, "the shop" had grown to 200, commanded by Lt. Gen. John W. O'Daniel. General O'Daniel came to Saigon, he said later, "to try to get a little bit of a voice in the training of the Vietnamese troops." The Vietnamese, of course, were still under the French. Though many of them left after the Geneva convention later in 1954, the last French officer didn't leave the Vietnamese army until 1956.

It was about this time that the first of the Vietnamese officers were appointed to military schools in the United States. The first officers accepted went to infantry school at Fort Benning; later, senior officers were admitted to the U.S. Army Command and Staff College in Fort Leavenworth, Kan.

Few of these officers are still in uniform; most are now past the retirement age. But all through the late 1950s, the size of the army grew. By 1961, it had increased to 200,000 men; by mid-1964, a year before the big U.S. build-up, it had reached 275,000 regulars.

NO U.S. COMBAT TROOPS

In these early days, there were no U.S. combat troops; all were advisers. When the Geneva agreements were signed in 1954, under which both Vietnams were to be kept free from a military build-up, the American advisory force was kept to a level of 342 officers and men. Nearly all of them lived here in Saigon. At the end of 1960, form was still being observed: When Washington and Saigon wanted to double the size of the Military Assistance Group-Indochina, they sought (and won) the approval of the Internation Control Commission, which then (as it does now, for the record) policed the Geneva accords.

But by 1961, it was clear that neither Hanoi nor Saigon intended to maintain a placid little country. At the invitation of President Ngo Dinh Diem, the U.S. advisory force was increased to 4,000 men. By January 1965, it had reached 15,000. In February of 1965, the first U.S. combat troops arrived.

In Diem's last days, the army was not doing badly. Diem was very much the political boss, and the generals were told to run the war while Diem ran the government. It was after a succession of coups, following the murder of Diem, that the top leadership of the army degenerated. By one recent reckoning, only 2 of the 44 generals on active duty in the last days of Diem are still in uniform today.

CONFUSING TURNOVER

Some of the 42 general officers who have left the service have not, of course, left much of a void behind them. But this incredible rate of turnover is a striking illustration of the unrest and confusion that has made the Army of Vietnam the unreliable "fighting force" that it is today.

Confusion dogs the system from bottom to top. Only the rich become officers, only the poor become soldiers, goes the slick Saigon saying. It often seems so. Stories abound of the selling of draft deferments.

From this pool and others, South Vietnam is committed to raise another 60,000 troops. This would bring its combined total to nearly 700,000. About half are regulars and the rest are the home-guard Popular Forces and the militialike Regional Forces. It's an impressive enough figure for a nation with a population of 16,000,000.

But until someone devises a way to make them into something more than a ragtag army of chicken thieves (Viet Cong commanders occasionally shoot their men for unauthorized "requisitioning" of villagers' chickens and pigs), the numbers that seem impressive on paper won't mean anything.

THE TEMPORARY SOLUTION

The natural temptation here is to shove the Arvins further into the background; U.S. troops are, after all, reliable and willing, even eager, to go after the enemy. This is hardly a permanent solution. Many Vietnamese are beginning to resent this, even though they understand why. Several civilian candidates struck a common plaint when they accused the generals of turning the war over to alien armies.

This feeling would be aggravated, many U.S. observers here believe, if, as some suggest, all military forces were put under a single, unified command. This was done in Korea, and a miserably inept Korean army was slowly transformed to the army that is fighting with distinction in South Vietnam today.

There are several important differences between this war and that one, however. Since troops were sent to Korea by the United Nations, a unified command was all but mandatory. And since most of the troops (as well as the money and equipment) was supplied by the United States, it was all but mandatory that an American general be named as the commander.

The most important difference is that the war in Vietnam is a guerrilla war, the Korean war was not. The Communists never let up in the propaganda that the United States seeks only to replace the French as the colonial master of Vietnam.

Thus, putting the Arvins under U.S. command and discipline, however effective it might be, could very well turn out to be the greatest blunder of all. To the sensitive Vietnamese, their army would seem to be nothing more than another *Le Garde du Sud Viet-Nam,* this time part of the U.S. Army.

Some success has been achieved by integrating certain Arvin units with American units at the company level, with joint U.S.-Vietnamese command. This has been done by the Marines near the Demilitarized Zone, by the 1st Cavalry (Airmobile) Division in the central highlands, and, most recently, by the 199th Light Infantry Brigade in Gia Dinh province, near Saigon. The idea is to tighten up discipline in these selected Arvin units, teach them effective fighting methods, and turn them back to their old units—and hope it catches on.

SOME ARVINS ARE EXPERTS

Some Americans are pleased with the results and contend that unification often has immediate benefits to the American units too. "When I'm point man on patrol," Pfc. Barrie E. Idom of Newport Beach, Calif., said the other day, "I'm glad my Arvin buddy is along. He can spot booby traps I'd never see. 'Charlie' is pretty good at setting booby traps. You can't see the wires; you have to spot the trap, and these Arvin soldiers are experts at that."

Sgt. Stephen Mulry of Long Beach, Calif., a squad leader, lights a cigaret and talks about the problems of joint command of the two squads with a Vietnamese noncom who speaks as little English as Sergeant Mulry does Vietnamese.

"I issue my orders and my counterpart issues his." Sergeant Mulry says. "Before every operation, we have a detailed planning session to prepare for any situation which may occur. Of course, if something develops that we didn't cover, we have to play it by ear. I remember once when we were forced to change our ambush site at the last minute. I pointed to a spot on the map and my counterpart shook his head and pointed out another one.

"Sure enough, we bagged two Charlies at his site. We may not speak the same language, but we're both soldiers and our military language is universal."

AN URGENT NEED

The experience of the 199th Light Infantry Brigade does, in fact, support the common view here that the Arvin soldier would be a good one if he had good officers and good training. To get this, the entire structure of the Army of South Vietnam will have

to be turned upside down. It must be done soon.

General Thieu has promised to do this, and perhaps he will. But it is not likely to happen unless American pressure is applied. "There is lots to do," a U.S. officer remarked wearily. "There is pride to wound, and toes to step on, and if it comes to it, seats of pants to kick."

It will be difficult, because the generals do not like to be pushed, and it may take the kind of pushing that the United States has never liked to do here. The alternative is even less attractive, and it is a very, very expensive alternative.

—WESLEY PRUDEN, JR.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE RELEASES TANKERS TO CARRY NO. 2 FUEL OIL TO EAST COAST

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have been concerned with recent reports indicating that a tight supply situation is developing in New York and in other east coast States that could result in higher prices for millions of consumers for No. 2 household heating fuel oil.

Inasmuch as it appears that the principal reason for the current shortage is an insufficient supply of U.S.-flag tankers, on September 20 I wrote Secretary McNamara requesting that to the maximum feasible extent the Department of Defense release U.S.-flag tankers it uses so that they could be used to transport this fuel from the gulf coast to New York and other east coast ports.

Today I received a reply from the Department of Defense. In that letter I am informed that the No. 2 fuel oil situation on the east coast is improving. As one of the factors the Department of Defense reply cites the "recent" return to the commercial trade of four U.S.-flag vessels chartered by the Department of Defense. It also indicates that five more such vessels are scheduled to return to this trade by November 15, 1967. This is good news.

So that the public record may be complete on this matter I ask unanimous consent that my letter to Secretary McNamara and the Department of Defense's reply of September 29 I received today be printed in the RECORD at this point.

While the No. 2 fuel oil situation may be improving—and the relief provided by the Oil Imports Appeals Board on September 27 by granting import quotas to several east coast No. 2 fuel oil suppliers has contributed importantly to that—the winter season itself will determine whether the supplies are adequate and this situation bears therefore constant watching. I assure the Senate that I will do so and I urge that all interested Senators do the same.

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

SEPTEMBER 20, 1967.

Hon. ROBERT S. MCNAMARA,
Secretary of Defense,
The Pentagon,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SECRETARY MCNAMARA: There is a tight supply situation developing on the East Coast that could result in sizable price increases to consumers of #2 Fuel Oil (household heating fuel). Since this product is used by millions of householders in New York and in other states on the East Coast, the added burden in the cost of living would be widespread.

I am informed that the main reason for this shortage is insufficient supply of U.S. flag tankers. The prime source of supply of #2 Fuel Oil is in the U.S. Gulf area and the movement up to the East Coast is intercoastal trade and therefore U.S. flag vessels must be used.

Due to increased national security requirements in connection with the war in Viet Nam, the return of much procurement of fuel to domestic sources to lessen the dollar outflow and to improve our balance of payments, and more recently due to the Middle East crisis, the Department of Defense chartered every available U.S. flag vessel earlier this year. While some of the above factors still are in effect, with the availability of petroleum products in the Persian Gulf now returned to normal, I urge you to release U.S. flag vessels to be used in the East Coast trade. This move will not only continue to keep these vessels in operation and assist our domestic producers and marketers, but it will also very materially help the East Coast consumer by relieving the critical supply position that currently exists.

Other moves to bring relief to the East Coast may be necessary, such as the easing of oil import quotas, especially if we have an unusually hard winter, but meanwhile you could very materially help relieve the present crisis.

With best regards,
Sincerely,

JACOB K. JAVITS.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., September 29, 1967.

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: This is in reply to your letter to Secretary McNamara of September 20, 1967, in which you requested the Department of Defense to release U.S. flag vessels for use in the East Coast trade.

We are aware of the supply situation on the East Coast and have had discussions with the Department of the Interior on this subject, including the possibility of our releasing additional U.S. flag vessels.

The Department of the Interior has advised us recently however, that the No. 2 fuel oil situation on the East Coast is improving. Factors contributing to the improvement are: (1) an increase in distillate fuel oil stocks on the East Coast; (2) the recent relaxation on No. 4 fuel oil imports; (3) the opening of the Trans-Arabian pipeline on September 15, 1967; (4) the decisions of the Oil Imports Appeals Board on 27 September 1967 granting import quotas to several East Coast No. 2 fuel oil suppliers; and (5) the recent return to the commercial trade of four DoD chartered U.S. flag vessels, with five more scheduled for return by November 15, 1967.

Despite the fact that the Department of Defense is also finding it difficult to meet tanker requirements under present conditions and the fact that we also are governed by public laws (Title 10, US Code, Sec. 2631 and Title 46, US Code, Sec. 1241(b)) on the use of U.S. flag vessels, everything possible will be done to assist the Department of the Interior and other governmental agencies to avoid a critical heating oil shortage on the East Coast.

Sincerely,

PAUL H. RILEY,
Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Services).

PANAMA CANAL CONTROL AND MODERNIZATION: VIEWS OF EMINENT CONSTRUCTION ERA ENGINEER

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, when first undertaking the serious study of interoceanic canal problems and Panama Canal history, the voluminous writings on them appeared overwhelming. But gradually, as knowledge was gained, the subject came into focus, and what at first seemed to be an insuperable task proved relatively easy when it was reduced to its simplest elements.

In the course of my examination of many contributions to canal literature, past and current, I have noticed a vast difference in quality between those composed by casual writers and self-serving propagandists, as compared to matter produced by persons with responsible experience in the construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation, or protection of the canal, and who have lived in the Canal Zone or in Panama. The latter group knows the problems of the isthmus at first hand and cannot be misled by fallacious arguments, however plausibly expressed. The latest significant contribution is an article by Dr. Richard H. Whitehead of Laconia, N.H., recently published in the Manchester, N.H., Union Leader. This newspaper is published by William Loeb, son of the former secretary to President Theodore Roosevelt.

Dr. Whitehead, as a young electrical engineer, served in the Canal Zone during 1912–16 and became the first superintendent of the Pacific Locks in the permanent operating organization. After leaving Canal employment, his career was distinguished in both industry and public service. Thus, when discussing such crucial questions as sovereignty over the Canal Zone and management of the Canal enterprise, he speaks with the background of successful experience and with only one view in mind—the best interests of the United States and world commerce, as well as of Panama.

Significantly, Dr. Whitehead strongly opposes the long-planned surrender of U.S. sovereignty over the U.S.-owned Canal Zone territory to Panama, the establishment of a joint United States-Panama management over the canal, and the construction of a new canal of so-called sea level design, all of which are provided for in the proposed new canal treaties.

For increased canal capacity, Dr. Whitehead urges the modernization of the existing high-level lake and lock-type canal by the simple and relatively inexpensive means of constructing additional locks, emphasizing that water supply is no problem, as water can be pumped at low cost. He also suggests the construction of a Nicaragua Canal, with locks of the same size as those for the St. Lawrence Seaway—800 feet by 80 feet by 31 feet—as a self-liquidating venture, a proposal that I shall not comment upon at this time.

In connection with the needed increase of capacity and operational improvements of the existing Panama Canal which has lock dimensions of 1,000 feet by 110 feet by 41 feet, Mr. President, I would invite the special attention of the Senate to the fact that canal marine operations were the subject of meticulous studies in the Panama Canal organization during World War II. As a result of these studies, there was developed a plan that, in addition to providing for a set of larger locks, called for the elimi-

nation of the Pedro Miguel Locks, the consolidation of all Pacific Locks south of Miraflores, the formation of a summit lake traffic reservoir in the Pacific sector to correspond with the lock plan at Gatun, and the raising of the summit water level from its present maximum of 87 feet to 92 feet.

This plan was recommended to the Secretary of War by Gov. Glen E. Edgerton in 1944 for thorough investigation and was approved in principle by Gov. J. C. Mehaffey on November 15, 1945, during executive hearings before the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries as the preferred plan for the major increase of capacity of the existing canal. The original third locks project, which would be modified, was authorized in 1939 at a total cost not to exceed $277,000,000; and some $75,000,000 was expended on it before work was suspended in 1942, including lock site excavations at Gatun and Miraflores that could be used in improvement today.

The proposed modifications for the original project, known as the terminal lake-third lock plan, would include provision for one set of larger locks—1,200 feet by 140 feet by 50 feet—and greatly improve canal operations. Because of these advantages, it won the support of Secretary of the Navy Frank Knox and of his successor, James Forrestal, and was approved by President Franklin D. Roosevelt for a postwar project.

Also, Mr. President, I would invite attention to the point that the total investments of the United States in the Panama Canal, including defense, from 1904 through June 30, 1966, was $4,889,051,000, and that Dr. Whitehead's reference to $1.9 billion is evidently exclusive of the defense costs.

In order that Dr. Whitehead's illuminating paper may be easily available to Senators, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

WHY WE SHOULD KEEP FULL CONTROL OF THE PANAMA CANAL AND NOT GIVE UP OUR SOVEREIGN RIGHTS TO THE CANAL ZONE

(By Dr. Richard H. Whitehead)

Over five weeks ago I received copies of the Proposed New Treaty from Panama under which we are to give up our sovereign rights to the Canal Zone, abolish the Panama Canal Company, set up a dual operating authority, greatly increase the annual payment to Panama by raising canal tolls, and give all canal property in the Zone not used by the canal to Panama, all in the expectation of our building a Sea Level Canal elsewhere. The Treaty would give the present canal eventually to Panama without payment of any kind on their part. The proposed treaty was published in all Panama newspapers. The new treaties not only abrogate the 1903 Treaty, under which we took the gamble of building the present canal, but also all other treaties including the Treaty of 1936. Under this 1936 Treaty, a so-called treaty of friendship and mutual accord, *our sovereign rights were reaffirmed*, thus disposing of that old canard that we have our position in Panama by force and the imposing of our will on a reluctant people.

The American People have been kept ignorant of these treaties and brainwashed by a steady barrage from government sources aimed to minimize the importance of the present canal to our economy. This not withstanding the fact that 70% of the cargo transiting the canal originates in or is landed in U.S.A. ports. Even the effect of increasing tolls to give a greater take to Panama will have serious repercussions. For instance, we now are exporting a heavy tonnage of coal mined in the U.S.A. through the canal to Japan. This coal is carried to port by the Norfolk and Western Railroad. Only the present low tolls through the Canal make it competitive to other world sources. The Treaty therefore provides not only for eventually *giving away* the canal but also meanwhile raising the cost of living in the U.S.A. by increasing costs of our imports and exports. It will also, as in the case of our exports of coal, put a lot of Americans out of jobs.

In Panama there is a University with a dominant far leftist group that plan and promote the troubles we encounter in Panama that is independent of government. This University is the protected sanctuary from where all the riots start in Panama, that destroy Canal property and lives, and make it unsafe for an American Canal employee to cross the street from the Zone into Panama. The Panama authorities let them riot, kill, and burn and then blame it all on us. There will always be trouble in Panama as long as the government of Panama is unable under their laws to restrain the leftists in their University.

Besides the riots that have burned and destroyed property and lives in the Zone, Panama has had frequent armed insurrections of its own as attested by the bullet marks in the walls of the National Palace. Recently there was an invasion planned from within. In 1936 we revised our treaty and gave up our right to maintain law and order in Panama. Without our military presence with such an unstable government, the safety of the Canal would be most problematical. The only power that maintains order in Panama is their police force. Their former Chief, who became President, was assassinated by opposite political forces who were never punished a few years ago.

Every step we have taken to help Panama, every concession made by us, has simply resulted not only in a lack of appreciation but increased demands. The organized leftwing group in the University hate us and there is nothing we can do about it. When we built the new Thatcher Ferry Bridge at a cost of $26,000,000 for the sole benefit of Panama did we get thanks? No. We had another riot. In 1964 we couldn't even have a pleasant commemoration event to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the opening of the Canal.

The U.S.A. has invested 1.9 billion in the Canal [in addition to defense costs.] On the balance sheet of the Panama Canal only 350 million has been capitalized. Countless millions have gone by gifts and grants to Panama in property, public roads, water supplies, sanitation, education, and into many other channels for their well-being. In the fiscal survey of Panama, "Report of the Fiscal Mission of the Organization of American States, Etc., 1964", the opening paragraph states: *"Panama has been inaptly referred to as a small poor country.* The country is small, with a population of only 1,100,000, but compared to countries in Latin America . . . Panama is relatively well off. Panama has the fifth highest per capita income among nineteen Latin American states." In considering our relations with Panama we must bear in mind that there is no great middle class.

There are twenty or so wealthy families, a small middle class, and a large part of the population live in the interior in what we would consider a primitive state. What we are up against in Panama are the ruling families and their *uneasy relationship* with a leftist-oriented University. There is no possible solution by us to a peaceful and lasting settlement to our Canal problems with Panama. Every concession simply hastens the day and probability of giving up the Canal to our shame and future regret. If what we have already done for Panama hasn't produced an atmosphere of mutual friendship and trust, nothing ever will. There is no way of having the Panama University friendly to the American people. Here is a basic conflict that can only be held in check by our determination to assert our rights. It is part of the cold war. Revolutions are common in Panama. With 20 political parties, no great stabilizing middle class, a few wealthy ruling families, and a leftist University ready to stir up trouble, our giving up any control of our life-line Canal is unthinkable. The future interest of Panama itself would logically be best served by our standing by our present rights. This does not mean, however, that we should not increase canal payments to Panama and help continue to develop their economy. The removal of our military arm is just inviting more trouble.

What would happen to the present Canal if the Senate approves this give-away treaty? My answer, and I organized the operating force on the Pacific side, is that *the safety of the canal would be jeopardized by dual operation.* I know many simple ways that sabotage could wreck the Canal. Such sabotage is likely when sensitive positions are filled under the proposed treaty by unscreened graduates from the Panama University under a dual control of the Canal.

In spite of all the facts given, which should be known to our State Department, the proposed treaty is being carefully pushed through an unsuspecting Senate. The strategy is transparent to one who is cognizant of the facts leading up to its proposed presentation.

First the Army Engineers claim the Canal is obsolete, that the locks should be eliminated, and the Canal changed to a sea level canal. This implies that such a sea level canal would be free from locks. They suggest also a sea level canal may be built to replace the present Canal elsewhere and that when this is done the present Canal will be obsolete entirely. Therefore, they reason we might as well get rid of it and give it to Panama. Then the Army and the State Department collaborated and had Congress pass a bill with an initial appropriation of $17,500,000 to study the situation. But the commission appointed *is limited to a study of a sea level canal.* The problem of tides is discussed by the proponents of the legislation but lightly passed over. After three years the commission finds that the tidal currents in a sea level canal would make its transit hazardous and states that "tidal navigational devices will be required". What are these tidal navigational devices? They don't state, but I can tell you in simple language, *they are tidal locks.*

I can easily prove that they will be more complicated than the present locks. Why? Because a ship from the Pacific entering the tidal locks must be locked either up or down to enter the Canal. Thus depending on whether it is high or low tide in this *so-called sea level canal* there still remains the locks they would like to eliminate, but the locks required are more complicated. The problem of caring for the flood waters from tropical rainfall, whose natural route to the sea is through the line of a canal, still remains. These flood waters reach in the present Canal 350,000 cubic feet per second. A sea level canal costs billions more than a high level canal that works with and harmonizes with the forces of nature like our Panama Canal at present. Both Stevens and Goethals, who built the present Canal, emphatically stated they would prefer a high level canal that tames the Chagres, to a sea level canal even at the same cost. We have currents of over 5 knots in the Cape Cod Canal with 12 foot tides. At the entrance to the Panama Canal tides reach 22 feet. These tides, without tidal locks, will produce tidal currents

of 7 to 8 knots. This would make navigation in a narrow waterway of say 600 foot width for large ships hazardous and impractical.

The commission study of a sea level canal is a red herring to distract the attention of the American people from realizing how important the present Canal is to us. The limiting factors in the present Canal are its depth of 40 feet, the limited size of its locks of 110 feet, and the width of Culebra Cut of 300 to 500 feet. Water supply is no problem as pumped storage, a device used by many utility companies, can inexpensively care for any seasonal shortage.

The Army, contrary to popular belief, *did not build* the Panama Canal. That was a historic *civilian* achievement of the American People. The Army, 20 years ago, made a study of converting the present canal into a sea level canal and delayed the installation of larger locks on which we have already spent in excavation over $50,000,000—locks that are badly needed now. Their estimate for converting an inadequate sea level canal to care for the larger ships built since was nearly 2½ billion dollars. The study was rightly shelved by a previous administration and never reached Congress or the public. I believe that when all the chips are down, this is still their objective and they are the agent for the commission. It will never be done, but if such an objective could be achieved the Army could say *We built the Panama Canal.* It is interesting to note since the Army made its study the canal was threatened with closure by a rock mass breaking away from Contractors Hill in Culebra Cut. Only prompt action and months of work removed the moving mountain slab of rock that had broken away. What would have happened if the canal had been 100 feet deeper through the Continental Divide as they propose?

When the 300 foot width to Culebra Cut was decided on, the estimates for excavation were increased to 195,000,000 cubic yards. Before we reached the 40 foot depth in the Cut, we had taken out 325,000,000 cubic yards. To date we have removed over 700,000,000 cubic yards and the slides *are still in motion.* It will take us 4½ more years to widen Culebra Cut from 300 to 500 feet. For every ship that has gone through the Canal we Americans have excavated over two thousand cubic yards of material, and we are still digging.

They talk of using atomic energy to remove dirt and rock and illustrate the effect of its use by showing a hole in the dry desert of Nevada from a single blast 350 feet deep. In the tropics the rainfall would change the material on the slopes to *sliding mud* and fill up the hole made by the blast. The so-called new science of soil mechanics will quickly realize that atomic energy will at the same time it blasts a hole in the ground, also weaken the adjacent supporting structure, with the probability of starting slides like Culebra and Cucuracha of the Panama Canal. So estimates on costs based on use of atomic energy are very problematical; the Army estimates of excavation made initially for the Panama Canal were far off in left field, and the estimates for costs of a sea level canal are subject to the same unreliable guesswork.

The answer to the Panama Canal problem is a simple, relatively inexpensive one *that cannot be proposed by the commission* under the present limiting sea level legislation. It is simply to *keep control of the present Panama Canal,* deepen it, widen it, and add a set of larger locks. Then build a high level lock canal through Nicaragua for smaller ships using locks the same size as the St. Lawrence Seaway. Most of the engineering studies have been made and the cost factors are available. As the construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway is recent, estimates of a similar canal through Nicaragua would be reliable. This canal would divert the smaller ships from Panama and shorten the distance from New Orleans to San Francisco by 360 miles. It would be a self-liquidating venture, costing about one-half billion. It would create the new wealth that a new line of communication always does. This canal could be a joint venture *under our control* with participation by the Central American States. Castro wouldn't like it because of its proximity to Cuba but started on the right basis it would help us and the Central American countries.

I would suggest if we do this that we insure establishing an educational system that will put our contributions in the proper light to the nations we work with. If we do not look ahead to our future relationships with the countries we are cooperating with the result will be as in the case of Panama. We will do wonderful things for others, spend vast sums to advance their economies, but instead of building lasting good will they will openly, as in the case of Panama, refer to the treaties they have entered into as "cursed treaties" and give no credit to us for the benefits they have received from our hands.

Having been in Government, I know partly how propaganda is set in motion by government agencies to promote a policy that is frequently not declared beforehand to the American public. The present aim is to promote the new treaty with which the American public is unfamiliar. The first step is *secret* negotiations, the past two years in the case of Panama. During this period future obstacles are cared for by brainwashing publicity. In the present case a red herring device of a sea level canal has been used and Congress has been prevailed on to pass legislation to study a sea level canal only *so that other sensible and more practical proposals* cannot even be discussed.

We are now in the final stage. Panama has known all about, and deliberated on, the proposed treaty for months. They are in—the American public is out. They know of the unlikelihood of a sea level canal ever being built and the great importance of the present canal. They also know that the vast majority of ships built recently that are too large to transit the Canal, will never use any canal and can operate only between a few places having sufficient depth to care for them. Many were built to avoid payment of tolls to the Suez Canal, a busier waterway than Panama, when Egypt lets it open. While the Panamanians are being informed fully we are kept in ignorance, except for the brainwashing propaganda that is given to us meanwhile.

Now we come to the final and present stage: The State Department knows if the American people have the opportunity of digesting all the facts that the Senate *will not likely approve* the proposed treaty, so they take the next step, just before releasing the treaty for Senate approval. This step has just been made in the Christian Monitor of August 29, 1967, in a brainwashing article from Panama entitled *"New Canal Treaties Stir Panama Politics".* This article is a clever piece of propaganda. Here is how it ends:

"The existence of a foreign colony supported by a massive military force in the heart of Panamanian territory, whether sanctioned by treaty or not, works as an irritant to Panama pride and nationalism". "Naturally Panamanians want control over the Zone and an end to military bases," *a student said.* "After all the definition of national sovereignty is to have political and economic control over national territory."

The article then concludes:

"Under these circumstances *any delay* in signing of the treaties *or any revisions to the detriment of Panama,* could spark violent protests, a coup, or open revolution . . . that could be far more dangerous to United States interests than any of the concessions contained in the agreement."

Thus notice is served by those we have done so much for, and to whom we have made concession after concession and assisted in every conceivable way, that we had better not deliberate the merits of the proposed treaty, only sign it without regard to the equities in the situation which have cost the American taxpayer to date nearly two billions. We must not discuss the recent riots and what might have happened to the canal if we had had no protective military force. We must not remark that our past acts of generosity have only led to more trouble, dissatisfaction, and increased demands. It is plain that if the Senate passes this treaty that future historians of our great Nation will mark it as a great unwise step.

"Without wisdom", the Good Book says, "the people perish". May He grant our leaders not only wisdom but the courage to fight for the right. A shameful surrender of our heritage is being planned of which the public is almost unaware. If it succeeds it will be a major victory for world Communism in which the University of Panama has played a major part.

I, as one of the builders of the Canal, will feel that something precious has gone out of my life and that those of mine who follow are going to have fewer opportunities in the America of Tomorrow.

This I have prepared in beloved memory of Stevens and Goethals, who built the Canal and with whom I had a long-standing, intimate relationship.

SALUTE TO THE REPUBLIC OF GUINEA

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, today the people of Guinea celebrate the eighth anniversary of their national independence. On October 2, 1958, Guinea became an independent republic, after it rejected the Constitution of the Fifth French Republic and the concept of the French community.

Since that time, Guinea has participated in many international organizations and been an active leader in regional African affairs. In general she pursues a course of nonalinement, avoiding binding commitments to major political-ideological blocs.

In 1962, it was my honor and pleasure to be in Guinea and meet with the capable President Sekou Toure and his Cabinet. They have faced many stimulating and frustrating challenges in seeking to develop the material and human resources of their nation and to fulfill the aspirations of their people.

Mr. President, it is my sincere wish, shared I am sure by many Americans, that our two nations enjoy friendly and fruitful relations based upon mutual respect. I join well-wishers throughout the world in saluting the people of Guinea as they celebrate their national independence.

"THE COMING DEFEAT OF COMMUNISM"—A PASSAGE FROM THE BOOK BY JAMES BURHAM.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, recently I re-read a passage from "The Coming Defeat of Communism," by James Burham, which I consider so impressive and so pertinent to the situation in which we now find ourselves, that I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE COMING DEFEAT OF COMMUNISM

(By James Burham)

"Suppose that there are two contiguous ranches, of vast extent, located in frontier country where there was no police force and no functioning governmental authority. The two share a long fenced boundary which runs all along all kinds of terrain from flat meadows to cliffs and canyons. One of them, the X ranch, is much more the prosperous, with fat pureblood cattle, many fine buildings and corrals, and much first-class equipment. The other, the Y ranch, has poorer animals and inferior shoddy equipment and buildings. Both employ many hands.

The policy of the Y ranch is constant attrition. Every night, fences are cut and heads of X cattle driven over the line. Disguised Y employees are planted in the X working force, and in its management. They or their colleagues from across the line, frequently damage X equipment, dynamite barns, burn fodder, dismantle pumps and contaminate water holes. The infiltrated Y agents nurture discontent among the cowhands, and spread mythical stories about utopian conditions on the Y ranch. The Y agents in the X management give regular reports to the Y bosses, and manipulate contracts to favor Y interests. Every now and then, the Y ranch carries wider operations. Miles of fence are torn down, a new fence is put up around sections of heretofore X land, including all cattle, buildings, and men found there, and Y signs are posted.

Both managements know, in addition, that the complete Y plan is to take over the entire X property, after dynamiting the central buildings and shooting up most of the leading personnel.

The X management was trained in more settled parts of the country, where legal, rather than violent, methods were in practice. It counters the Y actions by hiring numerous lawyers and getting certified copies of its deeds and titles. It is disturbed about the fence cutting, and tries to develop repair crews to push each morning to the latest breaks. It strains its resources to try to put the fires out, save its fodder, repair the pumps, and test and decontaminate the waterholes. Occasionally it dismisses one of the more blatant Y agents around the property; but often the other agents, and those they have influenced, raise such a howl that the job, or another, is given back again. When parts of its land get absorbed by the shifted fence into the Y ranch, the X lawyers file formal protests. But the X management has always had a great respect for fences. It keeps its wirecutters in the storehouses (from which they are often stolen by the Y agents) even though the Y built fence is so slipshod that it could almost be pulled apart by hand.

The X lands shrink; its cattle diminish; its loyal employees lose confidence; its supplies are exhausted and its equipment deteriorates with the never-ending repair jobs, and the rushing about. The exhausted watchmen cannot properly guard the buildings and corrals and endless miles of fence. The Y management, well informed, observes guiding its own decisions and its own timing. The Y management is even, at times, a little puzzled. For it knows its own immense weakness compared to X. It knows most of its own men are dissatisfied, only waiting for a lead to go over to X. It knows that it has no firm title to any of its acres, and not even the counterfeit of a title to the lands which it now fences off; and that it would have to yield on one section after the other if the other X ranch merely walked in and asserted its rights. It knows that its whole operation, in spite of its bold front, is so shaky, functioning so badly, that it is in danger of toppling over at a single firm push. But the push doesn't come and the Y management concludes that it has been right all along in believing that there is an endemic disease, spread throughout the X organization, which paralyzes its power of decision."

NEW LEFT ATTEMPTS TO ENCOURAGE DESERTION FROM THE U.S. ARMY

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, from time to time short news accounts appear recording attempts by the new left student groups to encourage desertion by U.S. soldiers stationed abroad. Few of these articles have gone into much detail and depend mainly upon the assertions of sympathetic reporters and other biased information.

U.S. spokesmen have denied that desertions are increasing in any appreciable number.

However, I invite the attention of the Senate to a statement prepared by Mrs. Elizabeth Osth for broadcast over Radio Station WDIX, in Orangeburg, S.C. Over the years, Mrs. Osth has acquired a solid reputation as a researcher and analyst of Communist and Socialist activities. Her studies are meticulously drawn from the publications of the leftwing movements themselves. From her wide acquaintance with the personalities and intellectual trends in this area, she is able to present news and information which is generally overlooked in the Nation's press but is yet news of significance to our society.

She has now prepared a study which gives specific instances and accounts of what the new left is doing to encourage desertion. Whatever the success of this movement, it is clear that the new left is working very hard to achieve its goals. I would like to call these facts to the attention of my colleagues for further study and, in particular, to commend Mrs. Osth for her diligence in bringing them to light.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that her WDIX broadcast entitled "Left Wing Student Movement Here and Abroad" be printed in the RECORD.

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

LEFTWING STUDENT MOVEMENT HERE AND ABROAD

When he was only 19 years of age Jeffrey Shero, then a University of Texas student, came to the attention of Congress by signing an ad in the *Herald Tribune* against being drafted to fight in Vietnam. By the time he was 20 he had been elected vice-president of the Students for a Democratic Society at its June 1965 convention. In 1966 his picture was published in the Communist publication called *Southern Patriot,* and during this past summer he made headlines in *New Left Notes,* official organ of the SDS, because of his presence in the Soviet Union as a delegate to the "international youth meeting to celebrate the fiftieth anniversary of the Russian revolution."

New Left Notes for August 21, 1967, called Shero, "Our Man in Moscow," and published his article including the fact that he told Cuban delegates that "SDS" thought the war against South-East Asia was a logical extension of the American political economy, and that we understood that American troops would be fighting more wars in our economic colonies in the near future." He said, "we (meaning the SDS) were prepared actively to oppose these campaigns, while building a movement whose goal was the building of a new society."

Shero stated that the value of the conference lay in the hundreds of conversations with delegates from throughout the world. All the Americans present met with the entire Vietnamese delegation and Shero himself had long conversations with a North Vietnamese editor and the leader of the delegation from the National Liberation Front. These Communists expressed their appreciation for the anti-war movement in the U.S.

Most dangerous perhaps is the fact that the National Liberation Front leader wanted information on the SDS and SNCC programs of draft resistance and desertion. It seems John Tillman of SNCC was present with Shero and didn't hesitate to make SNCC facts known to the Red leader. According to Shero's report, "Phoung said that some black soldiers have deserted to the (National Liberation) Front." He said, "the Front has special leaflets for Negro soldiers talking about conditions in the United States and asking why they come to Vietnam to help kill and oppress the Vietnamese people." This propaganda is prepared by Frenchmen who deserted in the last war. To prove these desertions Phoung said he would attempt in the future to communicate specific names and addresses of soldiers who had deserted.

That event, in itself, ought to cause Congress to overrule the Supreme Court or any agency of the executive branch of this government, so that travel abroad by such radicals can be prohibited in time of war, declared or undeclared. Here we have an open statement by an SDS leader that he has connived with the enemy we fight in Vietnam—connived with him in the bosom of the enemy in Moscow which finances the Vietcong. Imagine the boon to the leftwing movement here if they can obtain names of deserters and at the same time constantly flit back and forth from here to Hanoi as couriers.

Shero wrote that the European New Left and Old Left was well represented at the Soviet Conference. The New Left student movement in Europe calls itself syndicalist and is similar to its United States counterpart. A plan was concocted for SDS speakers from here to travel to European campuses this fall to speak about the war in Vietnam and about the American left movement. It seems, according to Shero, that the German SDS members thought it would be nice if some of their members could come to live in the United States and work with local university groups here for a semester. Certainly this should be prohibited by law.

Shero further wrote that he talked with British New Left groups, and to the French, about their programs of "talking with the troops about the Vietnamese war and encouraging them to desert." Shero wrote that "Both the French and Swedish governments have now given political asylum to troops who have deserted." Shero is conniving in this effort for he stated that "We talked of better coordinating efforts, and some groups asked SDS to create leaflets to give to the American soldiers for them. They felt that Americans would best understand the attitudes of American soldiers. One German SDS member from Munich said they had been taking up a collection for the National Liberation Front, got into a discussion with some Negro troops, and in the end the troops gave a contribution."

Shero then announced he was going to attend an all-European syndicalist student conference in Berlin and would write about that later.

He was true to his word. *New Left Notes* for September 18, 1967 carried his article called, "The Mood in Europe." He said in the old days the "long-haired kid hanging around the European train station or soldier's bar" might

offer "Dirty pictures." But today he offers "a better deal." This "better deal" is described by a name too vulgar to quote, but it adds up to efforts to demoralize United States Army men abroad. They urge our men to desert.

Shero revealed that the German SDS began to move. He explained that France has improved its system for "smuggling guys into the country and getting them work papers. Sweden takes more." He said that in Amsterdam the Dutch (leftwing) movement searches among U.S. Army deserters for "the right man to make the legal test case for asylum. England prints leaflets, and the international floaters smuggle them to the continent."

Jeff Shero reported openly that what he calls the international underground consists of "thousands of crow quick minds (with) incredible mazes of contacts, and a few dollars."

According to Shero the Dutch Provos, the name for the New Left in Holland, claim that to promote desertion is part of the struggle against the American war. He said young Europeans, speaking of the leftwing of course, equate what he calls "American barbarism" with the "deeds of the Nazis."

In the September 23, 1967 issue of the Radical Red weekly newspaper, *National Guardian*, another article appears on the front page by Jeff Shero. Here he again discussed the various youth movements in Europe and particularly stressed the importance of what he termed "solid left wing trade union traditions" there. These offer, among other things, "a beer in the club in an atmosphere of sexual liberation and fraternity against the authorities and occasional illegal actions. . . ." Shero admitted that "Many of these unions are surreptitiously aiding the army desertion effort carried out by the more militant activists in Europe. Student union money . . . finances conferences on student affairs where private discussions between people working in the underground desertion movement take place, and where plans for better contacts and coordination are made. . . ." He wrote that as in America, "the anti-Vietnam war movement (in Europe) is searching for tactics which will have more effect than the marches of the past year. Campaigns now center on the army desertion programs" and a few other plans. Shero thinks the New Left movement in Europe is healthier than it is here because it is less isolated from society there.

Jump back now to the *National Guardian* newspaper dated September 9, 1967. The front page article, continued on page 8, was written by Peter Schumacher. He wrote from Amsterdam that at least two European countries, France and Sweden, are giving legal refuge to U.S. servicemen refusing to fight in Vietnam. According to Schumacher an estimated several hundred GIs have deserted in Europe and are being put in hideouts there. Groups in Belgium, Denmark, Holland and Germany, and soon Italy will be included, all have "activist" leftwing groups aiding in this desertion of our men. Most of these work "underground." Schumacher reiterates what was written before by Shero—that the activists are looking for a GI willing to risk a test case leading to the granting of political asylum in European countries.

A radical student leader in Holland named Ton Regtien told Schumacher that "In Amsterdam we are on the lookout for an American deserter who will take the risk to stand as a test case here in a similar way as Negro soldiers Louis Armfield and Roy Jones have done in Paris and Stockholm." It seems Jones, 21 of Detroit, was an intelligence specialist until he deserted from an army base near Nuremberg. An underground organization helped him get to Sweden by providing him with forged leave papers.

According to Schumacher, the difficulty in locating an American GI willing to risk a test case for political asylum abroad somewhere is in the fact that most men who desert do so on what he calls "human grounds" rather than due to their "political consciousness." This is an admission really that most GI's who do desert abroad probably do so because of fear of war rather than because they are so pro-Communist they won't fight in Vietnam.

It seems that a pacifist-socialist senator in Holland who has been behind numerous anti-Vietnam demonstrations in Amsterdam helps U.S. army deserters by using his parliamentary immunity. He has asked his Netherlands government if deserters can have political asylum there but to date there has been no reply.

The first U.S. army deserter was offered refuge at the Russian embassy in The Hague, but due to certain circumstances this was not accepted. Instead, the man was taken to France and put in touch with the left-wing Student Union (the UNEF) there. They found a hiding place for him on a farm in France where he still works. Now more than 20 deserters have passed through Amsterdam to Paris by car. There is also a Danish underground group aiding in this anti-American effort. Schumacher reported that to urge desertion, pamphlets are handed out near U.S. army barracks in Germany instructing GI's on ways and means. Fortunately for us, German police attempt to confiscate such leaflets, but now others are printed in England and given to our GI's on leave.

Obviously, it is national suicide for the United States to continue permitting radical student revolutionaries to travel abroad where they are in a position to set up intelligence networks with Marxist-Leninist student movements there. Congress needs to act immediately to put a halt to such subversion.

PROF. JEROME B. COHEN OPPOSES TAX INCREASE

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the role of the Federal Reserve in feeding the very inflation they also advocate controlling through a tax increase is discussed in a very cogent letter in yesterday's New York Times by Prof. Jerome B. Cohen of the City University of New York.

Professor Cohen notes that the money stock has risen at an annual rate of 9 percent in the past 6 months; that private demand deposits have risen since February at a 10.5-percent annual rate; and that time deposits at commercial banks have gone up even faster, at an annual 18-percent rate since January. All of these put together average out to 13 percent, a sizable increase from the 1960–66 rate of 8.5 percent.

In view of this, the fastest growth in monetary expansion in 20 years, Professor Cohen contends that the Federal Reserve Board has, by contributing to the "easy money" situation so largely, failed to control the situation as it might have. In short, we should be controlling any inflationary dangers besetting us through a better use of monetary policy rather than laying the burden on the public through a tax increase.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this letter may appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

AGAINST TAX RISE

To the Editor: A propaganda campaign is under way to convey the impression that most economists in the country favor a tax increase. Many of us do not, but we lack Washington sponsorship to organize and publicize our views. [Editorial Sept. 24.]

One of the chief culprits in the inflationary pressure building up at present has been the Federal Reserve, which has been pumping credit into the economy vigorously since the beginning of the year.

The money stock has risen at a 9 per cent annual rate in the past six months. As a result of the "Fed's" easy money, about $10 billion has been added to the money supply since the beginning of the year. Private demand deposits are up at a 10.5 per cent rate since February.

Time deposits at commercial banks have grown at an 18 per cent annual rate since January. Consequently, the inclusive money supply, private demand deposits plus currency plus time deposits, has increased at a 13 per cent annual rate this year. From mid-1960 to mid-1966 this measure grew at an average rate of less than 8 per cent.

GROWTH OF DEPOSITS

As a leading bank declared recently, "Monetary policy has been extraordinarily expansive during the past nine months. The public's holdings of currency, demand deposits and time deposits have grown faster than at any other time in the last twenty years."

The Chairman of the Federal Reserve System has come out for a tax increase on several recent occasions to contain the inflationary pressures which his system has been helping to generate. In the face of a mounting Federal deficit, Federal policy should have been neutral during the first half of 1967, and restrictive from mid-year on.

If Federal Reserve policy were reversed and average free reserves of the member banks were reduced from the present plus $275 million to a minus $400 million figure by a tight-money policy, no tax increase would be necessary.

A tax increase isn't needed at this time and once imposed is difficult to reverse. Federal Reserve policy is much more flexible if used intelligently.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the unanimous-consent agreement reached on Friday last, the pending business is amendment No. 341, offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], and the debate is limited to 2 hours to be divided equally and controlled by the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK].

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR COOPER

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that—notwithstanding the unanimous-consent agreement, that Amendment No. 341, offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], be

the pending business—the distinguished Senator from Kentucky be recognized for 20 minutes.

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

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

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

VIETNAM

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, President Johnson said in his comprehensive statement of the administration's position on Vietnam last Friday evening that peace lies with Hanoi. One statement was:

> It is by Hanoi's choice, not ours, not the world's, that the war continues.

I cannot agree. I do not criticize my country, but fact and reason dictate that the first step toward negotiations and peace—the unconditional cessation of the bombing of North Vietnam—lies now in the choice and control of our country.

The reasons which lead the North Vietnamese, in my view, to ask for the unconditional cessation of bombing, the growing support of this requirement by friend as well as foe, lead to the conclusion that there is little hope for negotiations and for a just settlement of the war in Vietnam until the United States takes this first step—the cessation of its bombing of North Vietnam.

This has been my judgment since the bombing started in 1965. It is a judgment which I expressed first in March 1965, when the bombing commenced, and later in January 1966, after I had returned from Vietnam, and in several speeches in the Senate this year. It is a judgment that I have expressed to the President of the United States and to the Secretary of State since that time.

I speak today because there are new situations which cause me to urge again this course of action.

The first is the possibility of the assistance of the United Nations, or of its member states, during its session in New York. The strong and consistent position of the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]—a man whom we all respect and admire—that the issue of Vietnam should be submitted by the United States to the Security Council without reservation, and if the Security Council will not act, to the General Assembly, has received wide support in the Congress and throughout our country.

The distinguished majority leader is correct in holding that the United Nations should assume jurisdiction and satisfy its chief reason for existence, that of maintaining peace, whatever the obstacles may be. The United Nations should assume jurisdiction, but if it does not, the presence of representatives of concerned countries at the United Nations provides an unusual opportunity for private discussions and negotiations—an opportunity which will not be easily available after the session has adjourned.

We may note, while jurisdiction has not yet been assumed, that the chief burden of practically every speech of representatives of the members of the United Nations; speaking in the General Assembly, has been the war in Vietnam.

There is a second reason which leads me to speak today. We are on the eve of a national election—one of the great events in American political life—and the campaign debate is already underway.

Vietnam will inevitably be an issue, for it is the greatest problem and concern of our country. It would be strange indeed if it were not an issue in the coming campaign. Parties and candidates will take positions and the people will make their decisions upon policies and the course of the war in Vietnam.

We know that in the heat of the campaign when emotions are aroused, politics may for a time override the reasonable debate of policy, and the opportunity for a settlement of the war may be postponed until after the election next November. I do not want this to happen. I do not speak politically today, for the war with all its problems and burdens is the concern of all our people.

No one can say whether this will cause a postponement of a settlement of the war, but if it does, we know that in the intervening period until November 1968, a heavy price will be paid by the young men of our country and the peoples of South and North Vietnam. And in that period, the dangers of an expanded war will not be lessened.

We have all been in politics; we have all been in campaigns. Many of us have participated, one way or another, in presidential campaigns. I believe we will all agree that there will be less possibility of a settlement of this war during the campaign year.

The cessation of bombing is a difficult decision for the President to make. It involves a change in present policy, but such a change would be consistent with the President's speech at Johns Hopkins in April 1965, in which he stated that the United States would be willing to enter negotiations unconditionally. Admittedly, the cessation of bombing might not result in negotiations, and admittedly it involves some immediate risk to the security of our forces in Vietnam. But the possibility of a cease-fire, negotiations, and a settlement based upon the determination of the people of North and South Vietnam far outweighs any risk.

It is in this sense that I believe the issue of negotiations and of peace in South Vietnam lies now with the administration and with our country.

Now I should like to direct my attention to some questions and criticisms that have been raised regarding the proposal to cease bombing. It is correct and proper that questions should be asked and criticisms should be raised on such a vital issue.

I am aware that it can be said that the plea for a cessation of bombing expresses only a hope. I do not believe it is only a hope. Fact and reason are the basis of my support and my appeal for the cessation of bombing.

We must take into account the long record of North Vietnam's requirements for an unconditional cessation of bombing. As escalation has increased, its government has presented to the United States additional and harsher requirements; but the continuing condition, without variation, has been the cessation of bombing.

Ho Chi Minh's response to President Johnson's letter of February 10 of this year, in which he asserted the full list, the old list, of requirements, appeared to foreclose the President's offer; but it ended with these words:

> It is only after the unconditional cessation of United States bombing raids and all other acts of war against the Democratic Republic of Vietnam that the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and the United States could enter into talks and discuss questions concerning the two sides.
>
> The Vietnamese people will never submit to force, they will never accept talks under the threat of bombs.
>
> Our cause is absolutely just. It is to be hoped that the United States Government will act in accordance with reason.

Recently, after the speech of Ambassador Goldberg—and it was a very good speech—in the United Nations, the response of Hanoi, through its press, appeared inflexible. But again, the same theme—the cessation of bombing—was emphasized.

North Vietnam's requirement undoubtedly is based upon its view that the United States has, by its bombing, invaded and aggressed against its territory and its people. We do not have to accept as correct this reasoning of North Vietnam, but we have to consider it. I believe that commonsense informs us that a people who would not surrender to the French or to the Japanese, and again to the French after World War II, and a Communist government allied with Communist China and the Soviet Union, will not negotiate under the threat of bombing, which they consider to be an ultimatum to come to the conference table or to surrender. In fact, some of our military leaders have said that the purpose of our bombing is to compel the North Vietnamese to come to the conference table.

We must take into consideration, also, the reasoning and the opinion of other countries and peoples of the world. U Thant, the Secretary General of the United Nations, recently said again, categorically, that if bombing should stop, negotiations would occur shortly. Mr. Kosygin, according to the report of the Department of State, told President Johnson, at Glassboro, that negotiations would ensue if the bombing stopped. It is hardly likely that the representative of the U.S.S.R., speaking to the President, would make this statement without authority. At the United Nations, in growing chorus, the representatives of member states have taken the same position. It may be that their statements express a hope, but they are made by men experienced in world affairs, experienced in negotiation, and they speak for their

governments. The necessity of a cessation of bombing is becoming a worldwide judgment. It is one which the United States cannot afford to ignore.

I hope the President will take counsel from such an international consensus and from the countries which are our friends. Such a friend as Canada, speaking through its Minister of External Affairs, Paul Martin, has said:

> It seems clear that all attempts to bring about talks between the two sides are doomed to failure unless the bombing is stopped.

I believe, also, that the President can take counsel from those in Congress and throughout the country who have maintained this position for a long time, not from any doubt of the strength of our country or doubt of the good intentions of the President, but upon the basis of fact and reason.

Now I direct my attention to other questions that are asked, and they are proper questions. Many questions necessarily must be raised and faced by the Government, by the President, and by those of us who propose this alternative course, if the cessation of bombing were not followed by negotiations.

Would the failure of negotiations endanger the security of our forces?

Would the resumption of bombing be required?

Would the failure of negotiations lead to the hardening of the positions of the parties and a long and expanded war?

Would a failure of negotiations, harden the positions of the parties and lead to a larger danger—the intervention of Communist China and a larger participation by the Soviet Union?

I should like to answer these questions for myself.

The reasons which support a cessation of bombing would in my view be applicable to the policy we should follow if negotiations do not ensue immediately. If negotiations should not follow, I believe our policy should then be to confine military action to South Vietnam along with the cessation of bombing it would be the best means of preventing a long and expanded war, and the best means of ultimately securing negotiations.

This is not a position I have taken recently. In 1965, in debate in the Senate Chamber, I said that the cessation of bombing and the confinement of the battleground to South Vietnam were the best means of preventing an expansion of the war and preventing the possible intervention of Communist China and the Soviet Union.

The necessity for such a new policy is supported by the record of our present policy. Since bombing began in 1966 the infiltration of men and supplies from North Vietnam has increased, as have the activities of the Vietcong. Our forces have grown from nearly 24,000 to over 500,000. This does not take into account those forces which are on the perimeter of Vietnam, our naval forces; or Thailand, Japan, and the Philippines, who together are engaged in support of our forces in Vietnam.

The increase of our forces to over 500,000 men and and massive bombing, the weight of which is larger than the bombing in World War II, has not halted the infiltration of men and supplies from the north. We must ask if this vast expansion of the war in 2½ years is a consequence of our bombing, rather than as the administration says, that bombing has been required because of the expansion of the war.

I believe it is our bombing which has caused vast expansion of the war.

Since the bombing of North Vietnam began, the Soviet Union has stepped up its supply of arms including sophisticated weapons, and recently it has promised additional aid and volunteers, if necessary. The Soviet Union considers North Vietnam its ally which it must aid, as we consider South Vietnam an ally which we must aid.

Again, we must ask if this increased supply from the Soviet Union and the provision of sophisticated weapons is a result of our bombing, and whether confinement of the battleground to South Vietnam would result in a reduction or a cutoff of the Soviet Union's supplies to North Vietnam. It would be an important means of determining the intentions of the Soviet Union in Vietnam and, indeed, their intention toward the United States in the difficult problems which engage our two countries.

It is tragically clear also that the extension of the war to North Vietnam has not strengthened the security of our forces. Since the bombing started the casualty lists have gone up from a few hundred until today the number killed is over 13,000, and the number wounded is over 88,000.

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

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may continue for 10 minutes.

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

Mr. COOPER. Now, with this record, can it be said that it would endanger the security of our forces if we should cease the bombing and confine the battleground to South Vietnam?

It is difficult for me to believe that if we change our policy to one of deescalation, that the United States, with its vast array of arms and power could not protect our forces effectively and do so even better than today. Our vast power could be concentrated where needed in support of our troops and at the points where infiltration routes from the north enter South Vietnam.

I have raised these questions as to whether the proposal to cease bombing is simply one of hope, and what situations might result if negotiations did not ensue, for they are proper questions and they must be answered.

But my chief purpose for speaking today in support of this proposal, as I have urged for two and a half years, is to press for cessation of bombing, as a means to determine if the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong will respond—and whether the war can be brought to an end. If the war does not, then I believe that confinement of the war to South Vietnam would reverse the present dangerous expansion of the war and lead ultimately, if not immediately, to its end.

We cannot foresee every eventuality. I argue today that we should take steps which will reduce the conflict or which we can hope will lead to its settlement rather than to continue a course of action which promises thus far no settlement except by the arbitrament of war.

I do not attempt to lay out specific policies that United States should pursue if negotiations occur. I believe our objectives for the people of South Vietnam are worthy, but I believe also that the ability of the United States to determine the course of another country is limited. As the people of North Vietnam and, indeed, of South Vietnam would resist domination by the United States, they will resist domination by the Communist Chinese. This is borne out by the history of their long struggle against the French, Japan, and China. In the event of negotiations and any settlement, it is likely that an international body, and most likely the Geneva Conference, could provide time and opportunity for the people of South Vietnam and North Vietnam to determine the form of government and society they desire. We hope that it will be a choice of democratic values, but their people must make the choice.

It is clear that the United States, with all its vast power, its good and noble intentions, cannot prescribe the affairs of another country. We cannot intervene throughout the world unless our national security or freedom in the world is truly affected. We can be of assistance. We can support the processes of world order and law, we can provide effective economic aid and, above all, we can set an example of freedom and opportunity at home, which the peoples of the world seek.

The war troubles our people. I do not think it is a criticism of the American people to say that it troubles them. We are concerned that our country shall, by its actions, express the ancient principle, in which we believe, that the affairs of nations and men can best be governed by reason and justice, and not by force—even our force, and that our country with all its power and influence shall lead the way to sustain that principle in the world.

If our country does not do this, then I see little hope that other countries in the world with power and influence will do so. It is because of this faith, as well as for the practical reasons which I have argued, that I urge the President, who wants peace—who has sought peace—and who must make the decision, to order a cessation of the bombing as a step toward negotiations and a just settlement of the war in Vietnam.

Mr. President, I close by reading the closing paragraph of an editorial which was published in the New York Times last Friday:

> The Administration has repeatedly protested its desire for peace. Now is the time to prove this intention by heeding the advice of close friends and the wider world community. As Danish Premier Jens Otto Krag observed the other day: "He who takes the decisive step by which to bring the fighting to an end, to get negotiations started, and to insure durable peace in Southeast Asia will inscribe his name in the books of history."

I would like for the name of the United States to be included in the books of history for this noble cause.

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

Mr. COOPER. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished Senator from Kentucky for his responsible attitude and the statesmanlike address he has just delivered.

I know how deeply he feels. He recognizes that the President of the United States wants peace. In his suggestions he has been most respectful and most constructive. He has weighed, as he pointed out in his remarks, the consequences of a bombing halt.

That raises a most interesting question, because if there is to be a bombing halt, is it to be of a temporary nature, with a time limitation, or is to be permanent and marked by a period?

If it is to be the former, I think the danger is great that if there is no reaction from the other side and bombing is once again resumed, the war will be widened still further, made more open-ended, and will create a greater possibility of a confrontation with China.

The Senator from Kentucky, though, has not indicated that he is interested in that kind of cessation in the bombing, that he is interested in a cessation, period. In that event we could confine our activities to South Vietnam per se, and see what the reaction would be on the basis of the proposal made by the Senator from Kentucky.

In that respect, I might say that in discussing Vietnam this morning with the distinguished dean of Republicans, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], we came to the conclusion that what we are doing in Vietnam is fighting two wars. One is a civil war in the South. That is how this war began. The other is a war against Hanoi because of the penetrations—with the buildup of our forces—of troops sent down by General Vo Nguyen Giap, commander of Hanoi's armies. We should remember that the war is a two-phase struggle. Even if we do bring the war in the north to a satisfactory conclusion, we still will have the elements in the south which number about 250,000 Vietcong plus 50,000 North Vienamese—almost exactly the same figure they had a year ago at this time.

That is something we should keep in mind. But I am getting off the point here.

The Senator has also brought out and raised again the proposal in which he is so much interested; namely, the taking of this question before the United Nations. He has indicated that many voices have been raised in the United Nations, in this session, on the subject of Vietnam. Friendly and unfriendly nations have discussed it from their own points of view; but practically all the nations, as the Senator has indicated, who have spoken thus far, through their highest officials in the field of foreign affairs, have indicated a deep, intense, and abiding interest in what is going on in Vietnam and what they consider to be solutions for the situation there. I cite, as examples, the statements made by Paul Martin, Minister for External Affairs in Ottawa, by Couve de Murville, French Foreign Minister, and many others.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. As these talks go on in the United Nations, the fighting continues on land and the bombing in the north extends, first, within 10 miles, or 30 seconds from Chinese frontier, and, second, in the past few weeks, within 6.8 miles, or 24 seconds, from the border of China.

During this period, also, an announcement was made that it is the intention of this country to build a light antimissile defense, not against the Soviet Union but against China—it says here!

Well, it is a necessity, I assume, not so much because of China, in my opinion, but because no agreement has been reached with the U.S.S.R. to hold back in the construction of an ABM system—a system which, if we go through with it, will cost this country at least $40 billion and the Soviet Union a similar effort.

Mr. President, in my judgment, all these factors indicate the increasing possibility of a confrontation, not necessarily in the immediate future, but at some time in the future, if conditions develop through miscalculation, mischance, or accident, to bring this about—and I am referring to China.

Now is the time, as the Senator from Kentucky has indicated, and the Security Council of the United Nations is the place, to bring up the U.S. resolution on Vietnam which has been on the table since early February of 1966, to propose another resolution, or to consider a resolution offered by another country. I mean no offense when I say that this is not the time to take U Thant at his word, that what is necessary is a halt in the bombing. He is the Secretary General of the United Nations; Kosygin is the Premier of the Soviet Union; Hans Tabor of Denmark; and Paul Martin, of Canada can speak only personally for their proposals for a settlement. The times call for the Security Council, to speak officially on the basis of the procedures of the charter.

Now is the time, and the Security Council is the place, to take a consideration of this sort in open discussion.

It would be my hope that we would push the initiative, which the President undertook in February of last year, to insist that this matter come before the United Nations Security Council.

The question of taking up is not vetoable.

The question of discussing and who should participate in the discussions is not vetoable.

If the Security Council members do not want to have this issue called up before their body, let them stand up and tell the world what their reasons are for refusing to use the charter or trying to open the way to a settlement of the situation in Vietnam, a settlement which is as much their responsibility as it is of the combatants directly or indirectly concerned.

If they want to recommend a stop the bombing, if they want to reconvene the Geneva Conference, if they want to lay down these conditions, let them take that responsibility officially under the charter and keep it away from any one man, be he a Secretary-General of the United Nations, or a foreign minister advising us what should be done.

Even though they express their opinions singly, their collective voices are rising. It would help to hear them officially in the Security Council.

I thank the Senator from Kentucky very much for allowing me to make these remarks.

Mr. COOPER. I appreciate more than I can say the remarks and advice of the majority leader.

I have been strengthened in my support and resolve in the position I have taken because of the example and high patriotism of the majority leader. I remember that in 1954 when it was proposed that American ground troops and bombers should be sent to Vietnam to support the French before and even after the fall of Dienbienphu, that the Senator from Montana opposed and I supported our involvement at that time, and we have been together on Vietnam since that time.

The question has been asked, "What does unconditional cessation of bombing mean?" It means exactly what it says. The Secretary of State and the President have spoken of our bombing pauses. There always has been a call for reciprocity or pauses during religious holidays.

I do not question the good motives of the President in ordering those cessations, but they do not meet the condition—one we do not like to admit, but it is nonetheless a condition based upon the fact that North Vietnam considers U.S. bombing an aggression against their land—one which is not negotiable.

May I say this? I do not think we will run any greater risk by stopping the bombing and confining the battle to South Vietnam than we are running now—and that it will entail a lesser risk to our men. The pressure has been from the north. If we stop the bombing, perhaps the pressure might be lessened. At least we will find out.

We must consider also that the struggle for independence from any foreign power has been one of long duration. The people fought for independence from China for years. They fought for independence of the French for years before World War II. We have to face up to the fact that Ho Chi Minh has long been leading the fight for independence. During World War II he led the fight against Japan. The United States supported him then with supplies and weapons. When the war closed, he declared the independence of all Vietnam. The French moved in to assert their colonial domination. The French promised free elections, and the withdrawal of troops. Ho Chi Minh agreed that Vietnam would become a member of the French Union. But the French broke their pledge. In 1954 there was another chance for independence, when the Viet Minh had defeated the French. But Ho Chi Minh agreed to the 1954 Geneva Conference.

This history of Vietnam in its struggle for independence makes it apparent the Government of Vietnam will be determined by the people themselves, and not by the United States.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. COOPER. I promised to yield first to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, first I wish to congratulate the Senator. I think his original statement is extremely well done. He has rendered a service in bringing this subject up once again, as he has in the past. I particularly wish to associate myself with what he has just said with regard to the origin and history of this conflict.

I was interested in his reference to the Geneva Conference and whether or not it might be reconvened as a result of putting the matter on the agenda of the Security Council. It strikes me, under the present conditions, as being one of the best ways to proceed that I can think of.

If I understood the majority leader—although he did not put it exactly this way—the onus for asking for a reconvening of the Geneva Conference should be on the Security Council, because there are 15 members, and many of the members were participants at the Geneva Conference when the meeting took place in Geneva in 1954. Furthermore, Security Council initiative would remove the responsibility from either the Russian or the British, or ourselves for that matter, in requesting it.

I think what the Senator had in mind in his statement was that he would recommend that the United States do everything possible to have the Security Council recommend the reconvening of the Geneva Conference. Is that correct?

Mr. COOPER. Yes, I think that the most likely and appropriate way would be for the Geneva Conference to resume its jurisdiction.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I agree, because most of the participants at Geneva are in the Security Council, except for the NLF. It was not in existence at that time, and some provision might be made for it to participate with the other conferees. I think the Senator is quite right. It is a most timely recommendation. If there is anything I could do or say to help prevail on the President to take that course, I would certainly like to do it.

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator may be allowed to proceed until the debate is concluded, at which time the Senator from Nebraska will be recognized, and the time begin to run on the limitation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the Senator made reference to our security, as nearly everyone does in commenting on this subject. Our security is very much in the minds of the military people and everyone else. I think the speech is excellent and speaks for itself, but I would like to ask him to comment on what effect the Senator thinks this war, as such, is having on the security of this country generally. It surely cannot be that the Senator believes South Vietnam itself threatens the security of this country. Does he?

Mr. COOPER. No. I do not think we can intervene over the world unless our security is actually threatened or unless the whole problem of freedom in the world is involved. No, I do not think our security is threatened in South Vietnam. If our security were threatened on this continent or hemisphere, or even because of some countries with which we have close ties, it would be a different thing.

The Senator asked me if this war threatens our security in other ways. I think it does. Our involvement has made our relations with the Soviet Union more harsh and reduced our capabilities in the Mideast, Europe, and elsewhere. It makes it more difficult to settle conflicts elsewhere, and in these respects endangers the security of the United States to a greater extent.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think the Senator ought to extend that thought a bit, because I think the country does not realize the ramifications of this war if it continues, not only as it ties up our own military men and our arms, but what it is doing to our relations with many countries which have been traditionally our friends and supporters and who believe today that we are taking a wrong course and who have very grave doubts about our wisdom. Does the Senator not agree?

Mr. COOPER. Yes. No country can be right in every instance. Naturally, that is true. But I think countries must have assurance about our judgment—and I think we have exercised good judgment——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In the past.

Mr. COOPER. In the past, in most of the dangerous situations that have arisen. A progression of events led us into the war in Vietnam, and perhaps the great mistake, and the great criticism of everyone is, that we did not look ahead. But the question remains, What can we do to break out of this cycle? The countries of the world do look at the United States, the most powerful and the richest country in the world, and ask, "Why doesn't the United States take the lead to bring the war to a close?"

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What I am trying to lead up to, perhaps in an awkward way, is that we have two alternatives. There may be others. One alternative is to follow the Senator's suggestion, which I favor. If we do not do that, it seems to me we are undermining the security of this country in a very serious sense, because of the fall-off, if you like, in our other relationships.

Take our domestic situation. I do not think there is any doubt, and I ask the Senator from Kentucky, does he think there is any doubt, that the difficulties in our budgetary matters here at home, the great deficit of $28 billion which the President mentioned a few weeks ago, when he made his great speech with respect to the deficit, are aggravated by the fact that since that time we have pledged ourselves to an ABM, a thin one, at an initial investment of $4 billion, and the majority leader has stated that if we go through with it, the cost will ultimately be $40 billion; he has also mentioned the proposals of the Secretary of Defense to save money by building a new early warning ABM system, at a cost of $4 billion; and by the fact that we are pursuing the SST, which we will soon have before us, and also pursuing the moon-shot?

All of this together, it seems to me, is seriously undermining our security in a very broad sense, because we are tied down militarily in Vietnam, and we are neglecting our affairs everywhere else, all over the world—in the Middle East, South America, and so on—in addition to our domestic problems.

If we balance the two off, which is the greatest long-term threat to our security, to continue this war, with all its side effects, or to seek to negotiate, through a reconvened Geneva Conference?

Mr. COOPER. Of course, the former, without question.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator says "without question." It does not seem beyond question to the President. The President stated the other day that the key to all we have done is our own security. Apparently it is not as obvious to the President as the Senator says, "without question." There must be at least some question in some people's minds about this matter.

I think it is very useful for the Senator to make it as clear as he can, because the President seems to think our security will be in great jeopardy if he changes his position on South Vietnam. I would gather that from what he says. I think those are his words.

The Senator from Kentucky does not agree that our security is dependent upon pursuing this war in South Vietnam, does he?

Mr. COOPER. No; I do not agree with the President that our security is dependent upon pursuing the war in South Vietnam. I feel in my bones it is not.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Oh, I do, too. But, on the other hand, I feel——

Mr. COOPER. The problem is, what do we do to find some way out?

My thought is that if the people of this country, and the overwhelming majority of Members of Congress, believed that our security was threatened we would be united, and we would support without question any means to fight the war. We would endure any deficit. We would endure controls. We would do what we have done in other wars.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Surely.

Mr. COOPER. The real answer, and I believe it is this answer that troubles our country, is that the people do not believe such a threat exists.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. To put it another way, I am reminded of an editorial published in one of the leading Chinese newspapers about a year ago, not too long after we were having hearings on Vietnam.

The editorial, as reprinted in the New York Times, stated, after a lot of preliminary talk, of course, in their usual vitriolic manner, that the Chinese should be obliged to the Government of the United States for bringing its soldiers, weapons, and material over to the continent of Asia, because otherwise the

Asians and the people of North Vietnam would have no way to get at them, to destroy them; that the only way they could put the United States in its place was for us to come over there. I thought at that time that there was a good deal of truth in it.

What worries me about our security is not the war in Vietnam, but what is happening to us here at home and all around the world: particularly here at home, if we do not stop it. If we continue with our present course, and continue to have the inflation we are threatened with, which is beginning now, with this tremendous budget deficit, then I really begin to have fear about the future effectiveness of this country in defending itself and its interests in all parts of the world.

So it seems to me that our country is much more endangered by continuing the policy we have followed for the last 2 years then it would be by following the Senator's suggestion. Does the Senator agree?

Mr. COOPER. That is my purpose in trying to propose some ways to try to see if the war can be brought to an end.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I concur in the Senator's position; and, without asking further questions, I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I join with the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations and the distinguished majority leader in again calling attention to the distinguished public service rendered by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], in his continuing analysis of our situation in Vietnam, where, as the whole world knows, we have a bear by the tail.

I agree with the Senator from Kentucky that a world framework is now again being established—as it was established in January and February 1967, when we failed to take advantage of it—which perhaps will accommodate an unconditional cessation of the bombing, with, in my judgment, the word "permanent" stricken out. The President, for all practical purposes, has acknowledged that, but apparently, and for reasons that are not clear, just could not bring himself to the final point of saying, "We will do it."

I agree that a bombing cessation is worth trying. We know it will amount to some risk for our forces but our forces are suffering losses now, and the question is whether the risk is worthwhile. I think it is.

I should like to join also with the majority leader in his feeling that the United Nations should be seized of this decision. It is high time that Vietnam was debated in the world forum. We can have no fear from that.

I would, however, like to ask the Senator from Kentucky, whose judgment is so important in this matter, this question: Is not the real nub of this problem what we can do for ourselves, rather than what others can do for us? If we cease the bombing, it is up to Hanoi whether they will negotiate. If the United Nations takes jurisdiction, it is up to the United Nations as to whether anything will happen, with the Russian veto and everything else in the book. But is it not necessary also that something be up to us?

I call attention to the Senator's statement, which I believe every American should read and reread, which says:

> I believe also that the ability of the United States to determine the course of another country is limited.

And the further statement:

> It is clear that the United States cannot prescribe the affairs of another country, and cannot intervene throughout the world.

And so on. Now, the President directly challenges that. The President says—and I think this is the quotation for which the Senator from Arkansas was searching—

> I would rather stand in Vietnam in our time and, by meeting this danger now, reduce the danger for our children and grandchildren.

So the President places it strictly upon the basis of a war for survival of the United States.

I ask the Senator, Is not the real issue before Congress, whether this is our war, or is it the war of South Vietnam? Do we help them until they demonstrate that they do or do not have the capacity for helping themselves, or do we help them forever, even if the country becomes empty and everybody lays down his arms except the U.S. Army.

This is the issue the United States has to face, in my judgment, Mr. President, and I say to the Senator, we will not face it until we rewrite the Gulf of Tonkin resolution. We do not have to repeal it; we do not have to embarrass the President and the country by canceling it; but we have to write a new one, and we ought to, by now, have enough courage to know that he is not going to ask us for it, and we will have to do it ourselves.

We must delimit a new commitment, which is not a blank check. That is the only way, in my opinion, to proceed.

We can start with these three things: An experiment in ceasing the bombing; submitting the matter to the United Nations, if it will take it; and rewriting the Tonkin resolution to give us a tolerable posture, where we are not locked in on only one basis, so that we have to stay there forever, and commit all the resources of the United States, and unless we do, we are nationally disgraced.

I do not believe that. The Senator from Kentucky does not believe it. I think the majortiy of the Senate does not believe it. It is high time the President's hand was called. I believe that the Senator from Kentucky has put the issue very succinctly and very clearly.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New York. I know that his long and deep interest, his faithful work, his creative thought, and his speeches have played an important role in bringing some light and reason to this situation.

We have to face the fact that we are in Vietnam, and ask ourselves, how can we help end the war? How do we try to perform our mission, to help South Vietnam?

I have just proposed in my speech, as I have done before, a method and means of determining whether the war could be brought to a close. I frankly do not think anything significant is going to happen to the people of South Vietnam until the war is ended.

I do believe that if reforms to benefit the people do not take place—and they have not taken place yet of any substance because land reform is denied, just as it was under the French—and if no substantial reforms come to the people of Vietnam, we will have fought the war for nothing. Although we cannot direct them or order their government to do things, we can say: "If you do not undertake these reforms, we will have no further responsibility."

I have always thought that we could have gotten out in 1959 and 1960. I thought, too, Diem, although he had done some good, would not accomplish any of the reforms prescribed by President Eisenhower. I thought that if President Kennedy had taken the same course of action when he took over, it might have helped. It was admittedly difficult when President Johnson came in because the troops were already committed.

That does not mean, however, that the matter is closed. We must reverse our present course of action or, it seems to me, we will not have done any good for ourselves or for South Vietnam, but will have sustained a great loss of American and Vietnamese lives.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator for a great address.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Kentucky for once again thinking through a very difficult problem and giving us a great deal of food for thought.

I particularly would like to indicate my longstanding association with his position that our vast power should be concentrated in the bombing of those infiltration routes leading into the south and directly bringing supplies and manpower from North Vietnam to wage war against our forces and our allied forces in South Vietnam.

I want to comment for a few moments on what I think is another aspect of the problem which has not been touched on this afternoon. That concerns what this war is doing to our own people.

I think it is dividing our people and separating them from this administration because of the frustration and bitterness and discontent which I see existing from one end of the country to the other on the problem on Vietnam.

I do not think we can overemphasize what this dissension which is growing and mounting is doing to our people with respect to the programs that we must carry on not only in the world but also here at home.

I have just returned from my sixth visit to Illinois for the express purpose of having a "listen-in" with the people of Illinois.

I had a desk moved down to the ground floor of a Federal building in one of our cities and listened to anyone who wanted to come in.

The No. 1 topic in those "listen-ins" and in all of the correspondence I have received since I have arrived in the Senate has been Vietnam.

I can well remember how the people dissented from some positions taken by

the administration, such as the time when the President in Chicago tried to characterize all those who disagreed with him as "nervous Nellies" and put them in the position of showing an almost unpatriotic attitude toward our country.

We are deeply sympathetic with the problems encountered by the President in this tragic war, I think it is a necessity that we speak out and try to analyze why more and more unhappiness is displaying itself in our country.

Last Friday night President Johnson made a very stong argument against unilateral withdrawal from Vietnam. Few Americans, and few, if any, Members of Congress are asking for unilateral withdrawal. The President, by suggesting that his critics want unilateral withdrawal, is, I think, attempting to dishonor all of them.

Nearly half the American people today disagree with the manner in which the President is conducting the war. But only about 10 percent of them favor unilateral withdrawal.

The President's problem is with the vast majority who are dissatisfied with his performance in Vietnam, not with the 10 percent who urge withdrawal.

How has the President failed to win the support of the majority for his war in Vietnam? I would say that the President has had seven failures in Vietnam and that these failures are at the root of his problem with the American people.

First is his failure to persuade the South Vietnamese Government to institute truly democratic reforms which would win the support of the people of their own country.

Second is his failure to persuade the South Vietnamese Army to carry its rightful share of the combat, so that our American men will not have to bear the heaviest burden of the fighting by themselves.

Third is his failure to persuade our other Asian allies to participate substantially in the military, economic, psychological, and diplomatic tasks confronting us in Vietnam. Further, he has been unable to persuade a single country in Western Europe to provide any meaningful help or support.

Fourth is his failure to pursue every possibility for negotiations leading to a settlement of the war.

Fifth is his failure to learn from experience that every U.S. escalation is matched by the enemy and only brings more casualties.

Sixth is his failure to recognize that bombing so near China has already caused the Chinese and the Soviets to massively increase their military role in support of Hanoi. Thus, for limited military gain, he has provoked heavier military pressure against our own military forces.

Seventh is his failure to understand that widespread dissent indicates something may be wrong with his policy, rather than with his critics.

These are the seven failures of Lyndon Johnson in his Vietnam policy. He is not being criticized for refusing to withdraw unilaterally. He is being criticized because he has failed to succeed either with military force or with diplomatic initiative.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. PERCY. I have only 1 additional minute. However, I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, is there evidence of massive Chinese and Russian forces now being massed on the borders there?

Mr. PERCY. I understand from the best information I have that there are some 400,000 Chinese forces in South China now. We know, of course, that they have 2½ million soldiers under arms and additional millions in reserve.

I was in Peoria last weekend. I asked everyone who came up to my desk whether he was aware of the fact that there are already 40,000 or 50,000 Chinese forces in North Vietnam manning AA installations, repairing roads, and repairing railroads. I do not think that one out of five or six had any idea that the Chinese were already that deeply involved.

We do know that the Russians have agreed to escalate and step up their technical assistance.

Mr. MURPHY. That was my reason for speaking. I have just returned from Vietnam. I saw an entirely different picture there than I had obtained from reading the press and the reports.

All reports seem to indicate that we were in a stalemate. Our military people there do not reflect this view. They have continually said that we are winning and could win a lot faster if we were not fighting a limited war.

I want to get out of Vietnam as fast as anybody. However, I want this to be done in the best interests of our Country and not to accommodate a troublemaker.

Our military people have said, and I have said, that certain basic things will make it impossible for the enemy to continue fighting.

We have said we would cut off his supplies.

The administration, for one reason or another, refuses to do this.

I agree that the quickest way out is the way we should go. However, it must be an honorable and proper way.

I never hear discussed many of these things that I found on visiting areas in Vietnam.

Also, I have heard here that we are fighting the entire war. I was told there by our military people that this is not true, that the South Vietnamese are doing an excellent job, and possibly the toughest job. I was told that we are doing the conventional job.

I spent a day and a night with the Marines, and they said that if they had their choice, they would rather be where they are than to be in another part of the war which they consider tougher. I heard expressions of approval for the magnificent job they are doing.

Much danger is involved because of the urgency of the situation. However, we must consider all sides. I sometimes worry about this aspect of the matter. I do not say that the military is always right. However, certainly these men have been trained in their careers to study and become experts on the conduct of war.

I have said for 3 years, and I continue to say, that I think more attention should be paid to their desires.

A few months ago, the great Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], who has worked for a year and a half to get a battleship into the waters of Vietnam in order to save our fliers, finally secured agreement for this action.

Many of these things have been going on, and every time we make the accommodation, we continue to make the accommodation.

I disagree with the President's policy. I disagree with the President on many things. I believe I am one of the most outspoken Senators, perhaps too outspoken for a freshman Senator; but, then, I have not too much time to be here. I disagree with many things the President does. But I am convinced that it is in our best interests to be in South Vietnam. I am convinced, having spoken with people in four areas of the country who know exactly the problem, that they are not under any misapprehension.

I spoke with an old man in Hue, and he said:

> Naturally, we would like to have a civilian government, but now our country is at war. When we are at war, we want military people who can get us out of it, and when peace is here again, we'll have another election and elect civilian people.

They know the story forward and backward, and I believe most of us in the Senate know the story; and if we do not, we should. I have been studying it for 25 years, and I am concerned when I hear that the only option we are given is to stop bombing. The record shows that bombing has been most effective psychologically.

We also know that the number of North Vietnamese coming over to the south has doubled in the last 3 months—each month the number has doubled. They all speak about the bombing.

More than anything else, my concern is for the division about which the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] has spoken. Our military people in Vietnam point out that the French did not lose in South Vietnam. They lost in Paris, because of pressures that were put on the continued character of the war, as it was delivered to the people. I am afraid that exactly the same thing is happening here—that we are being denied some of the options that should be ours.

I rise to make this point because, having just returned from Vietnam, I am kind of full of it. I believe we are there properly and that the Vietnamese want our help. I believe if we got out, all of Southeast Asia would be lost. I do know that Indonesia straightened out its problems without any military help from us, once we had exploded the theory that America was a paper tiger and would never come to the assistance of anybody.

This has been the story for 15 or 20 years. It did not just start here. The tactic here is not a new one. It is an old one.

I rise to make these remarks so that the record may show that I want to get out. Members of my family are in the armed services, and I am as concerned as anyone. But I want to make sure that we get out in a manner that is to the best interests of the security of the United States, as the Senator has said,

not only the immediate interests but also the long-range interests of the United States.

Mr. PERCY. The distinguished Senator has raised a number of provocative questions. I disagree as strongly and as respectfully with some of the positions the Senator has just taken as I did two weekends ago, when the distinguished Senator spoke in St. Louis and I spoke in Kansas City on different aspects of the war.

The distinguished Senator said that if we unleashed the military, we could win this war in 30 days. Sometime I should like to have an explanation as to how we can win this war in 30 days if we unleash the military. I believe if we could do that with conventional weapons, with nonnuclear weapons, we might give someone 30 days, if we could end this war.

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

Mr. PERCY. I yield.

Mr. MURPHY. Actually, this statement was not an invention of my imagination. Many military experts, most of whom are now retired, have been saying this for a year. They did not just start it.

I pointed out how it could be done. If you cut off the supplies of the North Vietnamese, he cannot continue to fight over 30 days. It is the most painless and simplest method.

I assure the Senator that experts in Vietnam, including people at our Embassy, say that some of the reasons why Ho Chi Minh and Hanoi continue this effort is that they are told from time to time that we are divided at home, and if they continue a little longer, our division will be so great that our entire capability in Vietnam will be impaired.

I heard one of my colleagues suggest the other day, "Get out under any conditions. Get out." It is similar to saying, "My goodness, the dam has burst." I do not believe it is that bad.

I will give the Senator a couple of speeches that were made a year ago, and I will be glad to supply him at another time with all the information I have been able to gather. I am convinced that these experts were not really making pipedreams. They are quite serious about the matter and believe that the war could be ended in 30 days.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, in concluding my comments, I should like to return to the distinguished Senator's comment about one of the points I raised, as to whether or not it is valid to indicate that, as the distinguished Senator has pointed out, in his judgment, the South Vietnamese forces are assuming a major share of the burden and are doing a great deal of the dirty fighting that is going on. All the evidence I have been able to secure is completely to the contrary. More and more, increasingly, the tough burden of this responsibility is falling on the backs of American forces, and less and less, relatively speaking, is being done by South Vietnamese forces. The evidence I have comes not from detailed military knowledge but from analyses by responsible reporters. It comes from boys with whom I have spoken as recently as a week ago. A young, fresh, wonderful looking Negro boy, an amputee, hobbled in with a wooden leg and a wooden arm—the result of a hand grenade. Listen to this boy say what kind of a dirty job the Americans have to do and how willing or unwilling the South Vietnamese forces are.

A year ago I went to the amputee ward at Great Lakes Naval Hospital, and an amputee there, among many, said to me:

> The difference between this war now and when we went out there is that when we went there, we thought we were going out to help them with their war. But increasingly, our experience has been that they are ready to hold our coat while we go in and do the fighting.

That is the difference. As we have gradually escalated our effort, we have not asked for commensurate commitments from the South Vietnamese, that they fight their war; and increasingly it has become an American effort, with less and less effort from the Asian nations, as well as the South Vietnamese.

Mr. MURPHY. Will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. PERCY. I yield for a question.

Mr. MURPHY. As I have said, I am not a military expert. I have had experience with amputees. As a matter of record, in World War II, I made the first trip through 25 hospitals, and I greeted the first ships which came back from Normandy, and I was abroad just before that time. So I know of this aspect. I know of the horror. I know that it is a dirty, nasty, foul, evil business. I know as well as anybody in this Chamber that at this point in our so-called progress in civilization, God knows, we should have found a better way to solve our problems. Unfortunately, we have not.

The next to the last experience I had in South Vietnam, which was 3 weeks ago, was a briefing by a general who detailed exactly the activities and the deployment of our brigades, where they were fighting, where the enemy divisions were set up; and when I say that the South Vietnamese are taking up a pretty dirty side of the war, I am using his language, not mine. I must assume that he did not achieve the rank of general by not knowing his business. I know that the Army is just as competitive as many other fields in American life, and I must assume that he is telling the truth. I had the privilege of living with General Westmoreland for 4 days, and if that general was not telling the truth, I am certain that General Westmoreland would not permit him to brief people such as I, who come there to learn what the facts are.

I thank the Senator for allowing me to interrupt. I did not mean to speak at this length, but I felt that since the picture was going so quickly in one direction, and many facets are being glossed over, I should like to attract attention for a moment to the facts I have stated.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on the last point?

Mr. PERCY. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, in my committee we have had direct conflict in the evidence on this question about the ARVN Army. The representatives of the Pentagon have stated very much what the Senator from California has said. We had a very high-ranking civilian member of the administration who had been out there. Mr. Komer—

Mr. COOPER. I believe it was Mr. Porter.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes. Mr. Porter, the Deputy Ambassador. His testimony was the opposite. It was in accord with what the Senator said in his overwhelming evidence. I can say from my experience, from letters I have received, and from my observation, that it accords with what the real facts are.

Mr. PERCY. I thank the Senator for this additional statement.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] has the floor.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the Senator from California has raised some valid questions. But we are not talking about the same matter. He is talking about how a military victory might be won. The President said that is not our purpose.

What I have been talking about and what I think others have been talking about is how to bring the war to an end by negotiations and to achieve our purpose in Vietnam without war, under conditions of peace—which is the only way I think these goals can be achieved.

Mr. President, I am prepared to yield the floor. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I find myself in somewhat of a double-barreled situation because I had hoped to participate in dialog with the Senator from Kentucky, and in waiting for my turn I found myself caught in the crossfire of a separate and unrelated matter.

I hope that the junior Senator from Illinois is willing to remain in the Chamber until he and I might get the floor and discuss the seven points he sets forth. If we can set those aside for a moment——

Mr. COOPER. I have not addressed my remarks to any domestic or political situation.

Mr. McGEE. That is why I wish to ask the Senator a question or two about his speech. The Senator, as he always does, provokes what to me is helpful dialog on this very troublesome question.

First of all, I wonder if the Senator from Kentucky means to suggest to us, as I thought he said, that because of our preponderance of strength, power, and force, that we can do more about the aftermath of a bombing suspension in Vietnam than can the North Vietnamese. Did I understand the Senator correctly in that suggestion?

Mr. COOPER. I have two points. First, we have great power, force, and influence in the world. We can take a step toward bringing about peace without loss of face because of our power and influence, that a smaller nation could not take. Second, suppose the stopping of bombing does not bring about negotia-

tions. I spoke to that point. I said if we have to fight, we can fight just as well in South Vietnam, protected by our fire power which now is spread over all of Vietnam. I spent my 4 years in the Army in the war in Europe but I am not a military expert. The confinement of the war seems a better road to negotiations and our security than the present policy of ever-increasing escalation.

Mr. McGEE. The reason for my question is, if my memory serves me correctly, in previous bombing pauses the interruption of the bombing was not met by Vietnamese inaction. The best evidence we have is that they took advantage of it by bringing up and sending in more supplies and men. It looks to me as if it is wrong to point the finger to us and suggest that because of our preponderance of power and if we take a breather that is all they ask. That does not seem to be all they ask. They move in in a hurry the moment they get extra squirming room and send in more men and supplies.

Mr. COOPER. I raised that question. I said, in my view, they past pauses—and "pause" is the correct word because they were only pauses—were hedged with time limitations or done during religious holidays when time ran out.

What has been required, although we do not like it much, is unconditional cessation of bombing.

I gave reasons why I believe the North Vietnamese insist on "unconditional." It is because they consider the United States an aggressor against their territory.

Let us try this approach. If it brings negotiations for peace the world would be happy, the United States would be happy, and North and South Vietnam would be happy. If it does not work I suggest confinement of the battlefield to South Vietnam, and according to testimony many have given, including the Secretary of Defense, our bombing has not hindered much the actual infiltration and passage of supplies from North Vietnam to South Vietnam. That is the point.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, my friend, the Senator from Kentucky, in the colloquy which followed his very thought-provoking speech, was asked to comment on the American national interest in this whole area and what we had at stake in this matter.

It seemed to me, as I listened to that colloquy, that conspicuous by its absence was the suggestion that there was realistically much more at stake than what happened to the Vietnamese.

As I remembered in listening to the President on Saturday night, as many of us have been saying for some time, as these leaders have been saying, what we are doing has already made a difference.

Does it mean nothing that President Marcos of the Philippines said that if it was not for our effort in Vietnam it would only be a matter of time, and they would face the same problem; that the Foreign Minister of Thailand said that they would be next to face the threat if we do not hold the line; that Lee Kuan Yew of Singapore said, "If you do not hold out we are finished"?

What about the Burmese who now are saying that our presence there will determine their future? What about Malaysia who advised the United Nations, a few weeks ago, that they are only one step removed, and that if we do not hold, then they are next? What about the shift in position of Sihanouk of Cambodia, who is now discovering that his problems are closing in?

Mr. COOPER. I would not rely too much on Sihanouk.

Mr. McGEE. What about the poor Indonesians who told me, after I had visited there not long ago, that their chance for constructive change stemmed largely from our presence in Vietnam?

That is a part of the question of Vietnam, really, which gives us a more proper and basic perspective of the issue, than just to talk about how we are bogged down there. What happens in this country could have very much more of a bearing on our security. Is the Senator's position that we let those areas go, that they do not make much difference anyway to our national interest?

Mr. COOPER. I am well aware of these problems. I have thought a great deal about them. The Senators and I have discussed these points before, earlier this year in this Chamber, and in other places as well.

I have visited some of the countries the Senator has mentioned, Thailand, the Philippines, and I was told that our presence in Vietnam was important to them. I am sure that if those countries should be invaded by China or North Vietnam, their governments would be very glad for us to come to their aid.

Mr. President, my judgment is that these countries will settle their own destinies. Sometimes I believe that they will settle them better if we are not there. When we go in, we are welcomed, for our generosity and good will. But, after a time, the spirit of nationalism asserts itself, disagreements occur, the people begin to dislike us, and finally we are asked to leave.

Our position and purpose is not colonial, but the human instinct of people is the same toward the domination or long continued pressure of the armed forces of other countries.

I draw a little bit upon my own experience in India. I remember, when I went there, it was difficult for our people in the United States to understand what we called India's neutralism, which the Indians called nonalinement. Some felt that they were morally at fault because they would not commit themselves to our side of democratic government.

I listened while I was there, and I learned something of what they meant by nonalinement. It is that the first desire is to be independent—independent of outside domination; free to make their own decisions.

I must say this, that even if we intervene in other countries, with the best of intentions, I do not believe in the long run that we can do much about prescribing what their governments and what their societies should be. In fact, our presence can stir up the spirit of nationalism against the regime we assist.

But the Senators have asked the more immediate question; should we get out of Vietnam and would it endanger other countries?

It might affect Thailand because of our large forces there. Of course, we are faced with the same danger in Thailand that we faced in Vietnam—involvement in war, but if we could help settle the war in Vietnam and withdraw, the countries in the area will have a better opportunity to develop their governments and societies by agreement among themselves without our presence, without war, and aggression from the Communists.

Mr. McGEE. I think that the Senator and I are talking about two different things.

Mr. COOPER. I do not think so.

Mr. McGEE. I suggest that because I agree with him that I do not believe we should make little Americans or little Democrats out of these people. That is their business. They have to evolve in their own way. What they have been saying to us, as their leaders remind us, is the importance of our presence there, that might give them the opportunity to achieve their full-blown independence. They want the chance to evolve whatever form of government they think best fits their part of the world.

They feel they will not get that chance if there are skillfully calculated outside forces already underway that by infiltration, terrorism, try to take them over through violence, and not through the peaceful evolution of change and under conditions of stability.

At the very time Vietnam became the critical question in our foreign policy, it seemed to me that the evidence of the presence of trained guerrilla cadres was already apparent in northeastern Thailand. Thailand will tell us that they thought their days were numbered at that time if we had not intervened.

Mao Tse-tung bragged that the Thais were next.

Still, 9,000 trained cadres from Hanoi were in the eastern third or half of Laos, in violation of the truce.

Whose independence are they interested in?

There are now cadres of the National Liberation Front which Cambodia affirms are present in two of their northeastern provinces.

Whose independence are they interested in?

What the Philippines, the Thais, the Vietnamese, the Malaysians, and the people in Singapore are trying to say is that they want that opportunity. As President Marcos of the Philippines reminded us, the only power in the world in Asia today capable of winning them that chance is the United States.

They ask for that chance.

I think that is the essence of our presence there. We are the wall, the umbrella, or whatever figure of speech you wish to describe it. That is our role.

They want to do it themselves, if they can achieve stability, political sophistication, and economic viability which will permit them independence. They do not want to be confronted by a new regime forced upon them by the mobilizing of terrorist groups from the outside. It is as simple and as elementary as that.

Our role is to help them win that

time, in the desperate hope that some day they will architect the new infrastructure of Asia, that they will be the keeper of the peace in Asia. The sooner that comes about the happier we shall all be. But they have to have that chance to achieve that opportunity.

Thus, it seems to me that is why we are talking about two different things, not about making democrats out of them, or even achieving their independence now, because their independence was in jeopardy before we were ever there, because a number of designs were already being practiced in the field by the National Liberation Front on more than one frontier at the same time.

That is the reason I raised that question with the Senator from Kentucky. I agree with him that they should go their own way and should build the institutions and systems which fit them best. But they must have the opportunity to do so, and we must oppose someone imposing on them from the outside by force. That is the reason for this.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. McGEE. I yield.

Mr. MURPHY. I should like to point out that from my experience as an observer at the recent elections, at the request of the President of the United States, we have records that over 1,000 persons were killed by terrorists trying to stop the election, trying to impede the election, trying to frighten people from exercising their right to vote in a democratic process.

Our purpose there was not to try to influence an election. We were sent there merely to find out how it was being conducted. We found that it was being conducted very well—much better than many elections in our own country, let me say.

However, we never heard very much about the 1,000 people who were killed in order to keep them from exercising their right to vote. The Senator, I am glad to say, has put his finger on the important part.

The propaganda against us is that we are the aggressors. If one listened to the Russian ambassador to the United Nations, we have been the aggressor for 30 years in every instance. I said at one time:

> If he is telling the truth, the United States, should be put out of the United Nations because we have broken the rule, and if he is not telling the truth, he should be put out for breaking the rule, that is, being dishonest.

The Senator has pointed out a most important question, which is that we are not there as conquerors or to impose our ideas or ideals of our own, but merely to protect these people, as stated by four American Presidents, in their right of self-determination, with some degree of safety.

If my colleagues do not recognize the importance of this, I suggest that they read the record of the imposition of tyranny through Europe and the results of the conquest there.

We had an example of this in Korea at one time. My friend General "Rosie" O'Donnell said he wanted to take out the Yalu bridges so that the supplies could be cut off. He said he could do it with 10 aircraft and no casualties. He was taken out of command and sent to March Field. I met him when it was done a year later. He said he had not been able to find out what the casualties were and how many Americans had been killed by that time.

I say this is not a simple proposition. It is not one-sided. But all the considerations and all the options should be placed on the table, and not just that of those who say let us get out of Southeast Asia at any price.

I agree with the Senator when he says if we get out of Southeast Asia, then that entire area, including Australia, New Zealand, and the Philippines, are in jeopardy. Where then do we finally make the decision?

We have the same problem building up in Latin America. My distinguished colleague speaks about the safety of this hemisphere. It does not exist any more.

These are questions involved in this particular problem, and it is a problem that needs solving, but we must look at the board, overall problem.

I congratulate the Senator for making this point about the situation so clear in his remarks.

Mr. McGEE. I thank my friend the Senator from California, and conclude by suggesting that where we get off the track is to try to reduce this to a separable Vietnam problem. The Vietnam question is incidental. It happened to happen. It could have happened in half a dozen other places. Therefore, we ought to invoke some order in the suggestions which are made to keep them in their proper order and priority.

The real issue at stake is all of eastern Asia. Lee Kuang Yew has said:

> If we can prevail, all of eastern Asia will be closer to stability than at any time in this century.

I do not know whether that is right or not. I think most of them think they are edging toward that kind of condition. I think independence is a pretty cardinal principle that we have tried to write. It reads the same in all languages. But it is more than that. Southeast Asia makes a difference to the future structuring of Asia. We are a Pacific Ocean nation, and our future lies in that direction. The shape it takes will be determined to a large extent by what happens in Southeast Asia. As Lin Piao has said China is interested in this area because if she can move in there, she will outflank India, she will face headon the Philippines, and stand face to face with Malaysia. So this is indeed a calculable prize that some desire.

I think the shape of the new Asia will be conditioned by whether we seek to let people in Southeast Asia who are not Chinese structure their own countries or whether we forfeit them to the domination of the mainland group.

Mr. President, this is an area of a couple of hundred million people. It is an area rich in bauxite and tin and rice and other natural resources of great abundance. The Japanese thought enough of it to strike there as one of the objectives of its war. Other nations have recognized this area as of great significance. It lies astride the great trade route between East and West. It has a bountiful supply of resources and products that makes a great difference to the economic advance of its people. To me this is also a national interest reason for our country.

Finally, this area is of concern to us because, for the most part, as I see it, we brought about this condition. How did this vacuum occur in Southeast Asia that has tempted the predators of violence and terror to try to move in there? It was done by the United States. We destroyed Japan. We won the war. We made the British move out. We were instrumental in running the French and Dutch out of Indonesia and Southeast Asia. There were no allies who were in a very substantial role in World War II in the Pacific. It was an American undertaking in our own interest.

As a consequence can we now go home and say, "All right, we left it in a mess. We left a vacuum," or are we to shoulder that responsibility to try to put those pieces back together as meaningfully and as intelligently as mortals are empowered to do?

This is why we cannot dismiss the question lightly by saying it does not make any difference or that we do not have an obligation to be there. I say we have an obligation to be there because we turned out to be the fortunate victors in World War II. I appreciate that the role of the victor, under the old saying, used to be "the devil with the loser." I think the people expect a better statement from us, especially in view of the times in which we live.

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

Mr. McGEE. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I do not want to keep the floor all afternoon, because I know other Senators have business to transact; but my speech, although narrow in its terms, was, I hope, broad in its concept. I have not talked about withdrawal of forces from Vietnam. I said nothing about surrender. I stand for my country. I said we should try to find a means to bring about the war to a close and also to avoid an expansion of the war. That is what I have talked about and offered a plan.

I do not agree that Vietnam has such significance that we should accept a military solution which could involve this country in a larger war in Asia, with the predictable intervention of the Communist Chinese with the support of the Soviet Union. Such counsel, I think, blows the situation up beyond any sensible meaning. That is what I am arguing about.

We ought to confine this war to some reasonable scope and at the same time do all we can do to prevent its disastrous expansion, which will occur unless we change our course. That is what I have been arguing today.

Mr. McGEE. I want the Senator to know that I read his speech very carefully, but his speech did surface many comments. I was addressing myself to the comments which the speech provoked.

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

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, did not the Senator from Kentucky have the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky has the floor unless he yields.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CURTIS. Who will have the floor when the Senator from Kentucky yields it? What is the order of business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unanimous-consent agreement provided a limitless and endless amount of time to conclude this debate. As the Chair recalls the way the unanimous-consent agreement was ordered, it did not specify that the Senator from Kentucky had control of the floor throughout all the tenure of the debate. At the termination of the debate, the motion which was before the Senate earlier would be the pending order of business, and the Senator from Nebraska would be recognized, of course, to pursue this matter.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McGEE. Does that mean, then, that the colloquy that I asked permission to join in after the Senator from Kentucky leaves the floor, with the Senator from Illinois, to respond to his seven points, would be in order, under that unanimous-consent agreement?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the opinion of the Chair that that would be a legitimate part of the entire area of debate, which revolves around the speech and discussion of the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. McGEE. I thank the Presiding Officer.

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Kentucky. Like all of us, I appreciate what he is trying to do. He is conscientiously trying to help us achieve some kind of a method for bringing this unfortunate war to an honorable conclusion.

What bothers me about the idea of this unilaterial cessation of bombing—and I am sure the Senator can check this—is that we have had testimony upon testimony from responsible military leaders, under whom troops are serving, leaders who go down to the hospitals every morning to see their men who have been wounded during the night, who tell us that a unilateral cessation of the bombing would cost us more and more casualties.

Now, I must say that testimony from people in that position of responsibility carries great weight with the Senator from Iowa. Certainly, I am sure the Senator from Kentucky is not advocating some step that would cost us more casualties, more men in hospitals, and more who will not come home. I wonder why the Senator does not accept the testimony of those people.

Mr. COOPER. I will respond by saying I addressed myself to this very question in the speech I made.

First, it is my hope that a cessation of bombing would be followed by negotiations. If that were true, then the problem the Senator has suggested would not be relevant.

Mr. MILLER. Will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. COOPER. Surely.

Mr. MILLER. Negotiations, possibly, yes. But there is nothing that I know of which indicates that negotiations might not proceed while fighting goes on, or while the enemy would take advantage of a cessation of the bombing to lock itself in more deeply.

Mr. COOPER. That is possible.

Mr. MILLER. That is, as I recall, what happened in Korea for a while; and it was the concern that there is no commitment from the other side, I am sure, that led President Johnson, last Friday night, to say very carefully—and this, I might say, was not picked up as much as it might have been in some of the stories I read about the speech—that we assume that while these talks are going on, there will not be an advantage taken by the other side.

I suggest that that assumption is absolutely indispensable to the idea of negotiations. If we cannot assume that, and if the enemy takes advantage of the pause and causes us more casualties, then it seems to me that that is not likely to help shorten the war.

Mr. COOPER. I have had to be frank. I said, first, my belief is that there will be no negotiations unless the bombing is stopped. That is my position. Second, I said that if bombing was stopped, and negotiations did not ensue, then the question of danger to the security of forces would arise. I question whether there would be any more danger with a cessation of bombing than has occurred with bombing. We have had to place 500,000 men over there, the casualty losses have steadily risen, and where we have reached the point where the danger of an expanded war increases—and since bombing started.

I have further said that I foresee the possibility that, with a constriction of the war, a gradual de-escalation on both sides might occur, and eventually bring the war to a conclusion.

Of course, these are questions that cannot be answered; and they will not be answered finally until the effort is made.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I follow up my first question with this: Does not the Senator from Kentucky recognize that throughout 1966, as the testimony before the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, which has been released to all Senators, pointed out, only 1 percent of all of the sorties flown in the north were directed at what might be called key military targets, and that it has only been within the last 60 days or so that there has been attention focused on the quality of military targets, which might persuade the enemy that it is paying too high a price, between what is taking place in the south and what is taking place in the north, and that thus by holding back this air and sea arm, which we have the advantage of possessing, we might actually be causing the war to be still more prolonged than if we used it to its best advantage to shorten the war?

Mr. COOPER. Yes, I am certainly aware of the testimony and of the report, and I have heard some of the generals testify. I have also been briefed on South Vietnam, and have received, I may say, a very thorough and I think absolutely honest briefing.

I am acquainted with briefings. I have heard them during World War II, as did the Senator from Iowa.

I recognize that the function and mission of military men is to win the war. They have what is called a military mission. The Senator knows, having been in the military service, that they propose courses of action under the doctrine of military necessity, to do whatever is necessary to accomplish the mission.

That is the function of the military man. It is his duty and humble duty. I am not getting into the military field at all.

The President said we do not have a military mission to win the war, that we have a mission to help South Vietnam become a free and viable state. I am merely proposing what others have proposed, that we take steps to see if we can accomplish our correct mission by peaceful, political and not by military means.

That is the only answer I can give.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator knows that every Senator would like to see our objectives attained by peaceful means and not by war.

Mr. COOPER. I know that, and nothing that I have said here would in any way derogate that. All in the Chamber, in the House, our President, want the same objective.

Mr. MILLER. Does not the Senator recognize that in order to attain the political objective which he just stated, it is essential that people in South Vietnam be free from terror and outside aggression? Does the Senator think that political objective can be obtained if the South Vietnamese are not free from terror and subversion and outside aggression?

Mr. COOPER. I know that objective has not been attained by war, and I am proposing another course.

Mr. MILLER. It has not been attained so far.

Mr. COOPER. The matters and decisions which relate to the shape of South Vietnam will have to be made, in my judgment, in negotiations. The negotiations will come at some time. Then, whether South Vietnam achieves those objectives will depend upon what the government and the people of South Vietnam do.

We can help every country in that area with military forces and money, but unless they reform and provide some advancements in the living standards of the people, in time revolution will occur. That is my judgment.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I thoroughly agree. However, I would like to make one point.

It is true that the war has not so far

brought about the situation which is necessary to provide for the political objective we seek. It has in some parts of Vietnam, but not in the country as a whole.

I wonder why that statement could not have been made during the course of World War II by somebody saying: "We are not obtaining our objectives in restoring Europe to freedom and taking back the islands in the Pacific." That statement would not mean that we could not hope to achieve those objectives as the war progressed.

Now that the bombing is obviously causing the north to pay a price they do not want to pay, it seems to me this is an unfortunate time for us, in effect, to stop what we are doing.

It appears to me that we have hopes of attaining our objectives much sooner than many of us might think. However, to say that we have not attained our objectives in a matter of about 2 years in a country which is most difficult to fight a war in, I think is denying the fact that we have hoped that our military power could provide the very atmosphere that is necessary to attain the objectives.

I am afraid that if we do not do it, we will have an atmosphere which will not provide for this political objective for a very long time, and it will not help to say that there may be hope for insurrection over there. The people in Cuba have lost hope for insurrection. The people in the captive nations of Europe have lost hope for insurrection.

I hope that the people in South Vietnam will not have to lose hope, too.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I have great respect for the views of the Senator from Iowa, and I thank him.

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

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I have promised to yield first to the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], and then to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK].

Mr. PELL. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I did not have a chance to hear the Senator's speech. However, I read it carefully.

I congratulate him and commend him on his speech.

I felt and have said from the beginning that the bombing has been counterproductive to our interest, to the interest of Vietnam, and to the interest of the world.

Our objective originally was threefold: first to hurt the morale of the North Vietnamese; second, to improve the morale of the South Vietnamese; and, third, to stop the flow of men and supplies from North Vietnam to South Vietnam. Actually, just the reverse has happened. First, the morale of the North Vietnamese, or, at least, their leaders, has been hardened, not weakened. This, too, is what history shows us to be the case when a country starts being subjected to civilian bombing. Second, Truong Dinh Dzu the candidate who stood for peace and a cessation of bombing, is the candidate who, after the Government-sponsored slate, polled most strongly in the recent election. And, third, Secretary of Defense McNamara himself has said:

> I don't believe that the bombing up to the present has significantly reduced, nor any bombing that I could contemplate in the future, would significantly reduce the actual flow of men and material to the South.

I think the speech of the Senator was altogether excellent. I congratulate him on it.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the Senator. Only recently he made a very thoughtful and constructive speech on the problem of Vietnam—which should be read and studied widely.

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

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I express some concern with the speech which is well thought out, well expressed, and highly thoughtful in trying to suggest some method by which we can arrive at a peaceful settlement of the dispute.

I know that this is exactly what the Senator is trying to do. The difficulty with it is, it seems to me, that we look at this only from our side and not from the point of view of some of the statements that have been made out of North Vietnam.

Just last Sunday, David Schoenbrun had an article in the Washington Post, a copy of which I do not nave present. However, it was an article that I read with great interest because under no circumstances can he be called a hawk.

He had had an interview with the North Vietnamese Prime Minister and was discussing this very issue.

The Prime Minister of North Vietnam said that in trying to determine when negotiations would be possible, he would refer back to the interview of August 27, I believe it was. It listed the four points, once again, that he had made.

One was the definitive and unconditional stopping of our bombing raids on North Vietnam. That is the point the Senator addressed himself to. However, it goes much further than that. It then says "and all other acts of war."

Point No. 2 is that we have to withdraw all our troops and all the troops of our allies out of Vietnam.

Point No. 3 is that we have to recognize the Vietcong, the National Liberation Front, as the sole representative of the Vietnamese people.

Point No. 4 is that the Vietnamese people can then settle their own affairs among themselves.

The difficulty with this is that there is no room here for the optimism, as far as I can see, to say that the simple matter of stopping the bombing is going to result in negotiations. If it does not result in negotiations, then we are in about the same position we were in before we started the bombings. However, in the meantime we will have given them the opportunity to repair the damage that has been done there and to concentrate their forces near the South Vietnamese borders where it will hurt us the most.

I think there is this fundamental distinction which has not been brought out here. As far as the North Vietnamese are concerned, there are not two countries there. There is only one country, and since there is only one country, there is no boundary by which they are obligated under a treaty or anything else to recognize.

They feel, consequently, that they can go through the country at will and do what they want to impose their own will on both the north and the south.

It is this problem, it seems to me, that creates the major danger in trying to forecast that we will get negotiations with a cessation of bombing.

In order to obtain negotiations, there are three or perhaps four other things that we would have to do before they would enter into negotiations. And if we do not get negotiations this way, then I think we have placed our own position and that of the South Vietnamese in more jeopardy than at present.

This is the reason why it seems to me we should approach this matter very carefully.

I might say, in passing, that when I was in Vietnam in May of this year, I discussed these possibilities at some length with our State Department representatives in the area as well as with the military. The State Department personnel, so far as I know, did then and would now reflect, I believe, a great reluctance to cut off the damage that is being inflicted on North Vietnam, and I believe they would do this from the diplomatic point of view that I have just mentioned. We have no assurances of any reciprocity if we start to deescalate.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I will respond briefly.

I may say that everything the Senator from Colorado has said is precise and thoughtful. What he has said with respect to the statement of conditions that at times have been laid down to the North Vietnamese is absolutely correct. In referring to the response of Ho Chi Minh to President Johnson's letter of February 10 of this year, I said that Ho Chi Minh laid down the same list of requirements; but that he emphasized, at the close, that the cessation of bombing had to occur.

U Thant has also reported this. Premier Kosygin told President Johnson that if cessation of bombing occurred, negotiations would result.

I know that other requirements have been laid down, but I have said that cessation has been emphasized again and again.

It is also correct that North Vietnam considers Vietnam as a whole. That was contemplated by the Geneva agreement. But unless we take some affirmative means other than we have been taking, I see no change at all—just more of what we have been doing.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. MURPHY. I believe the Senator has said that the Geneva agreement pointed out that North Vietnam considered the entire country as one.

Mr. COOPER. No, not the Geneva agreement. The Geneva agreement itself considered the whole country as one. The 17th parallel was to be a temporary arrangement.

Mr. MURPHY. I thought that was a

result of the Geneva agreement, which was agreed to by the North but never agreed to by the South Vietnamese or the United States.

Mr. COOPER. The Geneva Conference agreed that Vietnam was one state. But for the purposes of arranging affairs preparatory to election and arranging the withdrawal of troops and the movement of people from one area to another, the 17th parallel was established as a temporary dividing line, with the understanding that 2 years later there would be an election throughout the entire country.

Mr. MURPHY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. COOPER. And to constitute a government for the whole country. The only agreement signed was an armistice agreement between France and the Vietminh. A statement was issued—as my colleague [Mr. MORTON] knows so well, because he was an Assistant Secretary of State at that time—approved by all the parties except South Vietnam and the United States.

Mr. MURPHY. I thank the Senator. I just desired to make certain in my mind that I understood the facts correctly.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I have said that I would yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. I thank the able Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. President, I respect very highly the able Senator from Kentucky, as he knows, but I could not disagree with him more violently on any matter than to put into effect the cessation of bombing in North Vietnam.

I do not know whether the Senator has had occasion to read some of the testimony before the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services with respect to the air war against North Vietnam. I would invite his attention to the statement of General Johnson, the Chief of Staff of the Army, and I shall quote two paragraphs which I believe are pertinent to this matter:

> First, the air campaign is making it more difficult for the North Vietnamese to support enemy forces in the South. They have had to divert an estimated 500,000 to 600,000 personnel to full and part-time war-related tasks to counteract the effects of the air campaign. These individuals represent a work effort and, perhaps more sigificantly, management and technical skills that might otherwise be more directly engaged in support of activities in the South. The high level of attacks since the advent of good weather in April, particularly against the lines of communication in the northeast quadrant, has resulted in a major increase in the level of damage inflicted. Although trucks, rail cars, and equipment are replaceable, and bridges and rail lines repairable, valuable North Vietnamese resources must be diverted to accomplish this repair and replacement. Thus, these resources are unavailable for commitment to South Vietnam.
>
> Second, the air campaign is exacting a cost from North Vietnam for her aggression. In this regard we have also achieved some success. All or substantial segments of the militarily important elements of North Vietnam's limited industrial bases have been destroyed; for example, her explosives, pig iron, and cement production facilities as well as her thermal power plants have suffered major damage.
>
> In summary, I believe that air attacks in the North have contributed significantly to the success we have achieved thus far in South Vietnam.

According to General Johnson, the Chief of Staff of the Army, if we did not bomb, 500,000 to 600,000 personnel would not have to be diverted as they are being diverted because of our bombing. It seems to me that is a very important point and is very significant in substantiation of the bombing. I did not know whether or not the Senator had seen that statement, and I thought he would like it called to his attention, if he had not.

Mr. COOPER. May I say that I have read the statement.

Mr. THURMOND. Also, the new Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Moorer, testified, in a very short paragraph, to this effect:

> Well, I think there is no question about the fact that the bombing has certainly reduced their capability to conduct operations in South Vietnam. It has greatly increased the difficulty with respect to repairing roads and mobilizing forces and increased the effort they have had to take to repair their facilities that are struck, and so on. Had we not conducted the bombing, there is no question about the fact that the effort they are putting forth in South Vietnam would be much larger.

In other words, Admiral Moorer's view is that if we had not conducted the bombing, the effort by the North Vietnamese would have been much stronger, much more powerful, much greater, and, naturally, would have caused the loss of many more lives.

So the evidence is clear, in the testimony of these people whom I am quoting very briefly, that the air war has been a tremendous asset to our side in this war.

General McConnell, the Air Force Chief of Staff, was asked this question:

> What is your assessment of what the impact of halting the bombing north of the 20th parallel would be; what impact would that have on the war in the south?
>
> General MCCONNELL. If you stopped that I think it would enable them, in a matter of time, to recover all of their normal ways of life up there. They would be able to bring in a lot more equipment, and they could certainly increase their rate of infiltration. They undoubtedly would move their defenses, which they have already done, down into the Route Packages [deleted] and we would find it pretty hot down there.

General McConnell takes the same position as the others I have mentioned.

General Wheeler, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, was asked this question by the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH]:

> General Wheeler, you have stated that the war in Vietnam is a single war, and that air strikes in North Vietnam have an important influence on combat operations in South Vietnam.
>
> Is it your belief that a reduction or restriction of the bombing of the North would result in increased casualties of allied forces in the South because of the increased support which the enemy would receive there?
>
> General WHEELER. That is correct, Senator Smith; that is my belief.

Then, Admiral Sharp, our commander in the Pacific, who has command over General Westmoreland and that entire area, was asked this question by me:

> Admiral Sharp, this morning you stated that the less bombing we do, the more troops we would need in South Vietnam. That was the effect of your statement, was it not?
>
> Admiral SHARP. If we stop bombing.
>
> Senator THURMOND. If we stop bombing, we would have to have more troops?
>
> Admiral SHARP. That's right.

Mr. President, what does this mean? It simply means, as I see it—and as has been testified to by General Johnson, General McConnell, General Wheeler, and Admiral Sharp, our commander in chief in that area; and all of these people take the same position—it would be a great mistake to bring about a cessation of bombing.

They say, first, that the bombing is now diverting 500,000 to 600,000 people from aiding the north in the war against the south. That is one strong reason. They say further that if we stop the bombing, more troops will be required. That is exactly what the American people do not want. The American people do not want to have to send more troops to Vietnam.

My answer is that we should do more bombing. Every one of those gentlemen who testified took that position. All the military people took the position that they would like to see the restrictions lifted on the bombing. If we would do that and permit them to bomb all military targets they wish to bomb to win the war, and close the port of Haiphong, through which 85 percent of the supplies pass for the enemy, as well as the other two ports, we could cut off the north from receiving essential, and otherwise unavailable, supplies.

Without the help of the Soviets I do not believe the war could last but a brief while. The Soviets supply surface-to-air missiles, the Soviets supply Mig planes, the Soviets supply antiaircraft artillery, communications, complex radar, and all the equipment necessary in order to assist the north in fighting this war.

Red China is supplying some small arms and ammunition, but most of this equipment is supplied by the Soviets. If we had the courage to close the port of Haiphong and the other ports, and cut off supplies and remove restrictions on the bombing—and military men want both of these things—we could bring the war to a close in a reasonable time.

We have had a cessation of bombing several times. What happened? Military people tell us that the North used that cessation of bombing every time—not once, but every time—to increase their supply line south, to regroup and repair damaged facilities without fear of danger from the air, to fortify themselves in all respects to continue the war even more aggressively.

Does the Senator have any evidence that if we have a cessation of bombing the north is not going to use that opportunity to fortify itself again, to bring in more supplies, to get ready to continue this fight longer? If so, it is new information, it is vital information, and it would be most helpful. We have had no assurance.

My argument with the President has been that we have not used our power properly over there. In World War II, we put all of the power necessary, and in a

proper fashion, to win it. The Senator was in that war and he knows.

We put in the power necessary to win it and win it as quickly as we could. We have not done that in Vietnam. We have fought with one hand behind our backs, as we did in Korea. We are only fighting for a stalemate, not a military victory. The President has said that over and over. I predict if we do not have a military victory there, we will have to fight again and maybe the next time it will be nearer home where our people will be endangered to a greater extent.

This is not a war between the north and the south. This is not a civil war. This is a war by the Communists to take over the world. This is just another battleground chosen by the Communists to wage another war in their goal of world domination.

We have the power to win. They could not stand it if we were to bomb as we ought to; they could not stand it if we were to cut off all supplies. We could win this war in a brief period, I firmly believe, if we put the power there and made it so hot for them that they could not take it.

Mr. President, I went to Vietnam a few months ago. I talked to our men. I not only talked to our generals, but I also talked to noncommissioned officers and privates. I went out on a battleship; I was in touch with the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marines, all of them. The opinion among our military people is practically unanimous. They want to win it and they want to fight. They know what it takes to do it. But they are not allowed to do it.

The Senator may have reached the conclusion that we are not going to win it and that we are not going to put our power in there. The Senator advocates a cessation of bombing. From the way in which we have been fighting this war, I can see how it is so frustrating, and it might bring about a temptation for a cessation. However, the Communists do not operate that way. The Communists choose the time and place. The Communists make the decisions. They choose whether to stand and fight in South Vietnam. They are the ones who precipitated the war.

Who started this war; who came into South Vietnam; who inspired these guerrillas; who is supplying these guerrillas; who is giving leadership and training to the guerrillas and the Vietcong? It is the Communists of the Soviet Union and Red China and North Vietnam.

In my judgment, this will continue as long as the people of America appear divided. I think one of the greatest harms we can do in this country is to give the impression that our people would stop bombing. One of the greatest harms we can do is to give the impression that our people are divided. I can tell the Senate that in my experience in traveling throughout this country, speaking with the American people, the American people want this war won; they want to win it in a hurry, and get our American boys home. In my opinion, a cessation of bombing will not do that. A cessation of bombing will increase the timespan before we can bring the boys home.

These men I have mentioned are top military people in this administration; the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, every chief of staff, and our commander in the Pacific, the top man, every one of them feels that we should lift the restrictions on the bombing, close the ports, and cut off enemy supplies.

Mr. President, I want to call the attention of the Senator to this, because I do not know whether he has read the testimony of all of these people or not. But again, I say, I can see that he might feel frustrated because we have not gone ahead and won the war, but I firmly believe that what he is advocating will not be in our best interests, but on the contrary. I would advocate putting more power in there as quickly as possible, and ending the war. We have got to have the will to win as well as the power to win. We have not said yet that we are going to win. All we say is defend, defend. That is what we did in Korea and we are still there—just defending. We have a stalemate there. The same thing will happen in Vietnam. If we have a stalemate there, we will have to keep troops there for years and years unless the Communists are allowed to take it over.

I hope that public opinion in this country will rise to the point that it will demand the President win the war.

We can win. We should win. We should do it as promptly as possible so that we will not have to send more troops there, so that we will be able to bring our American boys back home as soon as possible.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I must respond to the Senator's remarks. The Senator has spoken at some length so I think I should be permitted to respond briefly.

The position taken by the Senator from South Carolina is a position held by some people in this country. I do not know how many, but it is an opinion held by many.

As I stated to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], it is a perfectly reasonable position for the military to take, because their responsibility is to achieve a military mission by whatever means is necessary. They have to take that position.

I take issue with the Senator from South Carolina in saying that the military people should have the right and the authority over the President of the United States.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. THURMOND. I am sure that the Senator would not wish to misquote what I said, but——

Mr. COOPER. The Senator implied it by saying that we should follow their decisions.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I did not——

Mr. COOPER. Well, I say that——

Mr. THURMOND. I said that the military people know how to win the war.

Mr. COOPER. All right.

Mr. THURMOND. At least, that they advocate a certain policy. But the President makes the decisions. The President does not have to follow their recommendations. He is not obliged to follow them.

Mr. COOPER. But the President of the United States speaks for all the people. He has got to decide whether a policy recommended by the military is one which will be in the best interests of the country, or whether it might go far beyond the immediate military objectives which the military commanders might want to obtain.

He has got to determine whether that course of action would lead to far more difficult and possibly terrible consequences. To say that they should be let loose—as fine and as honorable men as they are—in performing their duty, which is to accomplish a military mission, so that their determination should be accepted, although that might lead us into a war on a greater land mass with Communist China, or perhaps the Soviet Union, is just beyond any kind of serious contemplation.

Let me say also, and I will close, why should we follow their judgments? They are chiefly responsible for our being in this war.

I have great admiration and respect for Gen. Maxwell Tayor, who advised President Kennedy. I respect him as a very attractive, brilliant, military man, very able military tactician. But unfortunately, he gave political advice to President Kennedy and again to President Johnson which I do not believe has been most helpful.

The thing we have to determine is: Which is the chicken and which is the egg?

These military men say that if we did not bomb, the great flow and volume of supplies would continue to come down into South Vietnam. But those supplies were not coming down in such quantity until we began the bombing.

Mr. THURMOND. Oh, yes; they were.

Mr. COOPER. Some supplies, yes; but it needed only 24,000 American soldiers to help contain them. Now we have over 500,000 and, in spite of the bombing, the flow of supplies has not been substantially reduced in the sense that it helps the South Vietnamese.

I appreciate the Senator's comments. We are old friends under arms, but I cannot agree with him.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, will my colleague from Kentucky yield to me?

Mr. COOPER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MORTON. I am sorry that I could not be in the Chamber to listen to my colleague's remarks. I have read them with much interest. I have followed some of this colloquy for some time now. I want to associate myself with my colleague and point out that total military victory, which might mean complete destruction and the complete surrender of North Vietnam, would leave us with a policing job for years to come in a country located right on the borders of Communist China.

I wonder what we would do if the Chinese Communists decided to invade India. A commitment of 5 million men, perhaps, would be necessary. These are some of the problems we shall have to consider.

I commend my colleague for an excellent statement.

Mr. COOPER. I thank my friend and colleague very much. I appreciate his statement.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I did not hear all the debate which has raged on this floor all day, but I did read the Senator's speech and I read it with some care. I think it is important that debate on Vietnam should not become a partisan matter. It is too important a question.

I commend the Senator for what he said. I agree with everything he said.

I note that at least one and possibly more Members on my side of the aisle have also commended the Senator, and I am glad that they have.

I note that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] has commended his colleague, and others, who feel quite differently about it. There is no doubt about the fact that the Senate is divided on this question of whether the bombing should be stopped.

It seems to me the more we think about it, the more we discuss it, the more we read about it, the clearer it becomes that the calculated risk of stopping the bombing, in the hope that we can stop the war and get to the negotiating table, is well worth taking.

I find myself in complete disagreement with the Senator from South Carolina whose comments I did hear.

As a Democrat, I want to commend the Senator from Kentucky, a Republican, for what he has just said. I assure him that I do not think this is a partisan political matter. I hope it will not become one. In my opinion, the course of action outlined by both Senators from Kentucky is completely sound.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the Senator. I read the Senator's statement last Friday on the same subject, and I also remember his statement last year calling for cessation of bombing.

This issue could become a partisan matter. That is one of the reasons I hope action will be taken before it becomes so partisan as to be a shambles.

The war affects all parties, the entire country. We must consider it from that viewpoint.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I ask for the floor at this time because my good friend from Illinois [Mr. PERCY] has made a statement here and by agreement I should like to address myself to it. The Senator is not in the Chamber at the moment, and I therefore suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPONG in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S STAND IN VIETNAM WILL BE CONFIRMED BY HISTORY

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, in a succinct, logical, and unemotional manner, the President of the United States last week restated the rationale of the American commitment in Vietnam.

In a serious speech to a gathering of elected State officials from all over the country, Lyndon B. Johnson again told the American nation what it already knew: that we are fighting in Vietnam so that our grandchildren may not have to fight; that the American commitment is vigorously approved by almost every free leader of Asia.

The President cited our commitments under the SEATO Treaty. Is there anyone recommending now that we nullify this treaty because it is being severely tested?

He cited our willingness to meet the postwar challenges of Greece, Turkey, Berlin, Korea, and Cuba. Is there anyone recommending that we now abdicate our responsibility to continue meeting such challenges?

He cited the Communists' belief that the United States would tire, become divided, withdraw. Is that the course for "the land of the free and the home of the brave?"

The President said—and I believe the Nation stands with him—that the United States will persevere until there is a sign that Hanoi seeks an honorable negotiated settlement which does not sacrifice South Vietnam to expediency.

The President said—and I believe the Nation stands with him—that the true peacekeepers are the men in Vietnam on the line and in the demilitarized zone who are preventing the takeover by one nation of another nation.

I commend this serious address of the President to the country and the people.

I ask unanimous consent that the President's speech before the National Legislative Conference be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT BEFORE THE NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE CONFERENCE, VILLITA ASSEMBLY HALL, SAN ANTONIO, TEX.

Speaker Barnes, Governor Hughes, Governor Smith, Congressman Kazen, Representative Graham, most distinguished legislators, ladies and gentlemen:

I deeply appreciate this opportunity to appear before an organization whose members contribute every day such important work to the public affairs of our State and of our country.

This evening I came here to speak to you about Vietnam.

I do not have to tell you that our people are profoundly concerned about that struggle.

There are passionate convictions about the wisest course for our nation to follow. There are many sincere and patriotic Americans who harbor doubts about sustaining the commitment that three Presidents and a half a million of our young men have made.

Doubt and debate are enlarged because the problems of Vietnam are quite complex. They are a mixture of political turmoil—of poverty—of religious and factional strife—of ancient servitude and modern longing for freedom. Vietnam is all of these things.

Vietnam is also the scene of a powerful aggression that is spurred by an appetite for conquest.

It is the arena where Communist expansionism is most aggressively at work in the world today—where it is crossing international frontiers in violation of international agreements; where it is killing and kidnapping; where it is ruthlessly attempting to bend free people to its will.

Into this mixture of subversion and war, of terror and hope, America has entered—with its material power and with its moral commitment.

Why?

Why should three Presidents and the elected representatives of our people have chosen to defend this Asian nation more than ten thousand miles from American shores?

We cherish freedom—yes. We cherish self-determination for all people—yes. We abhor the political murder of any state by another, and the bodily murder of any people by gangsters of whatever ideology. And for 27 years—since the days of Lend-Lease—we have sought to strengthen free people against domination by aggressive foreign powers.

But the key to all we have done is really our own security. At times of crisis—before asking Americans to fight and die to resist aggression in a foreign land—every American President has finally had to answer this question:

Is the aggression a threat—not only to the immediate victim—but to the United States of America and to the peace and security of the entire world of which we in America are a very vital part?

That is the question which Dwight Eisenhower and John Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson had to answer in facing the issue in Vietnam.

That is the question that the Senate of the United States answered by a vote of 82 to 1 when it ratified and approved the SEATO treaty in 1955, and to which the members of the United States Congress responded in a resolution that it passed in 1964 by a vote of 504 to 2. "The United States is, therefore, prepared, as the President determines, to take all necessary steps, including the use of armed forces, to assist any member or protocol state of the Southeast Asia collective defense treaty requesting assistance in defense of its freedom."

Those who tell us us now that we should abandon our commitment—that securing South Vietnam from armed domination is not worth the price we are paying—must also answer this question. And the test they must meet is this: What would be the consequence of letting armed aggression against South Vietnam succeed? What would follow in the time ahead? What kind of world are they prepared to live in five months or five years from tonight?

For those who have borne the responsibility for decision during these past 10 years, the stakes to us have seemed clear—and have seemed high.

President Dwight Eisenhower said in 1959:

"Strategically, South Vietnam's capture by the Communists would bring their power several hundred miles into a hitherto free region. The remaining countries in Southeast Asia would be menaced by a great flanking movement. The freedom of 12 million people would be lost immediately, and that of 150 million in adjacent lands would be seriously endangered. The loss of South Vietnam would set in motion a crumbling process that could, as it progressed, have grave consequences for us and for freedom. . .".

And President John F. Kennedy said in 1962:

". . . Withdrawal in the case of Vietnam and the case of Thailand might mean a collapse of the entire area."

A year later, he reaffirmed that:

"We are not going to withdraw from that effort. In my opinion, for us to withdraw from that effort would mean a collapse not only of South Vietnam, but Southeast Asia. So we are going to stay there."

This is not simply an American viewpoint, I would have you legislative leaders know. I am going to call the roll now of those who live in that part of the world—in the great arc of Asian and Pacific nations—and who

bear the responsibility for leading their people, and the responsibility for the fate of their people.

The President of the Philippines has this to say:

"Vietnam is the focus of attention now . . . It may happen to Thailand or the Philippines, or anywhere, wherever there is misery, disease, ignorance . . . For you to renounce your position of leadership in Asia is to allow the Red Chinese to gobble up all of Asia."

The Foreign Minister of Thailand said:

"(The American) decision will go down in history as the move that prevented the world from having to face another major conflagration."

The Prime Minister of Australia said:

"We are there because while Communist aggression persists the whole of Southeast Asia is threatened."

President Park of Korea said:

"For the first time in our history, we decided to dispatch our combat troops overseas . . . because in our belief any aggression against the Republic of Vietnam represented a direct and grave menace against the security and peace of free Asia, and therefore directly jeopardized the very security and freedom of our own people."

The Prime Minister of Malaysia warned his people that if the United States pulled out of South Vietnam, it would go to the Communists, and after that, it would only be a matter of time until they moved against neighboring states.

The Prime Minister of New Zealand said:

"We can thank God that America at least regards aggression in Asia with the same concern as it regards aggression in Europe—and is prepared to back up its concern with action."

The Prime Minister of Singapore said:

"I feel the fate of Asia—South and Southeast Asia—will be decided in the next few years by what happens out in Vietnam."

I cannot tell you tonight as your President—with certainty—that a Communist conquest of South Vietnam would be followed by a Communist conquest of Southeast Asia. But I do know there are North Vietnamese troops in Laos. I do know that there are North Vietnamese trained guerrillas tonight in Northeast Thailand. I do know that there are Communist-supported guerrilla forces operating in Burma. And a Communist coup was barely averted in Indonesia, the fifth largest nation in the world.

So your American President cannot tell you—with certainty—that a Southeast Asia, dominated by Communist power would bring a third world war much closer to terrible reality. One could hope that this would not be so.

But all that we have learned in this tragic century strongly suggests to me that it would be so. As President of the United States, I am not prepared to gamble on the chance that it is not so. I am not prepared to risk the security—indeed, the survival—of this American Nation on mere hope and wishful thinking. I am convinced that by seeing this struggle through now, we are greatly reducing the chances of a much larger war—perhaps a nuclear war. I would rather stand in Vietnam, in our time, and by meeting this danger now, and facing up to it, thereby reduce the danger for our children and for our grandchildren.

I want to turn now to the struggle in Vietnam itself.

There are questions about this difficult war that must trouble every really thoughtful person. I am going to put some of these questions. I am going to give you the very best answers that I can give you.

First, are the Vietnamese—with our help, and that of their other allies—really making any progress? Is there a forward movement? The reports I see make it clear that there is. Certainly there is a positive movement toward constitutional government. Thus far the Vietnamese have met the political schedule that they laid down in January 1966.

The people wanted an elected, responsive government. They wanted it strongly enough to brave a vicious campaign of Communist terror and assassination to vote for it. It has been said that they killed more civilians in four weeks trying to keep them from voting before the election than our American bombers have killed in the big cities of North Vietnam in bombing military targets.

On November 1, subject to the action, of course, of the constituent assembly, an elected government will be inaugurated and an elected Senate and Legislature will be installed. Their responsibility is clear: To answer the desires of the South Vietnamese people for self-determination and for peace, for an attack on corruption, for economic development and for social justice.

There is progress in the war itself, steady progress considering the war that we are fighting; rather dramatic progress considering the situation that actually prevailed when we sent our troops there in 1965; when we intervened to prevent the dismemberment of the country by the Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese.

The campaigns of the last year drove the enemy from many of their major interior bases. The military victory almost within Hanoi's grasp in 1965 has now been denied them. The grip of the Viet Cong on the people is being broken.

Since our commitment of major forces in July 1965 the proportion of the population living under Communist control has been reduced to well under 20 percent. Tonight the secure proportion of the population has grown from about 45 percent to 65 percent—and in the contested areas, the tide continues to run with us.

But the struggle remains hard. The South Vietnamese have suffered severely, as have we—particularly in the First Corps area in the North, where the enemy has mounted his heaviest attacks, and where his lines of communication to North Vietnam are shortest. Our casualties in the war have reached about 13,500 killed in action, and about 85,000 wounded. Of those 85,000 wounded, we thank God that 79,000 of the 85,000 have been returned, or will return to duty shortly. Thanks to our great American medical science and the helicopter.

I know there are other questions on your minds, and on the minds of many sincere, troubled Americans: "Why not negotiate now?" so many ask me. The answer is that we and our South Vietnamese allies are wholly prepared to negotiate tonight.

I am ready to talk with Ho Chi Minh, and other chiefs of state concerned, tomorrow.

I am ready to have Secretary Rusk meet with their Foreign Minister tomorrow.

I am ready to send a trusted representative of America to any spot on this earth to talk in public or private with a spokesman of Hanoi.

We have twice sought to have the issue of Vietnam dealt with by the United Nations—and twice Hanoi has refused.

Our desire to negotiate peace—through the United Nations or out—has been made very, very clear to Hanoi—directly and many times through third parties.

As we have told Hanoi time and time and time again, the heart of the matter really is this: The United States is willing to stop all aerial and naval bombardment of North Vietnam when this will lead promptly to productive discussions. We, of course, assume that while discussions proceed, North Vietnam would not take advantage of the bombing cessation or limitation.

But Hanoi has not accepted any of these proposals.

So it is by Hanoi's choice—and not ours, and not the rest of the world's—that the war continues.

Why, in the face of military and political progress in the South, and the burden of our bombing in the North, do they insist and persist with the war?

From many sources the answer is the same. They still hope that the people of the United States will not see this struggle through to the very end. As one Western diplomat reported to me only this week—he had just been in Hanoi—"They believe their staying power is greater than ours and that they can't lose." A visitor from a Communist capital had this to say: "They expect the war to be long, and that the Americans in the end will be defeated by a breakdown in morale, fatigue, and psychological factors." The Premier of North Vietnam said as far back as 1962: "Americans do not like long, inconclusive war . . . Thus we are sure to win in the end."

Are the North Vietnamese right about us?

I think not. No. I think they are wrong. I think it is the common failing of totalitarian regimes, that they cannot really understand the nature of our democracy:

They mistake dissent for disloyalty;

They mistake restlessness for a rejection of policy;

They mistake a few committees for a country;

They misjudge individual speeches for public policy.

They are no better suited to judge the strength and perseverance of America than the Nazi and the Stalinist propagandists were able to judge it. It is a tragedy that they must discover these qualities in the American people, and discover them through a bloody war.

And, soon or late, they will discover them.

In the meantime, it shall be our policy to continue to seek negotiations—confident that reason will some day prevail; that Hanoi will realize that it just can never win; that it will turn away from fighting and start building for its own people.

Since World War II, this nation has met and has mastered many challenges—challenges in Greece and Turkey, in Berlin, in Korea, in Cuba.

We met them because brave men were willing to risk their lives for their nation's security. And braver men have never lived than those who carry our colors in Vietnam at this very hour.

The price of these efforts, of course, has been heavy. But the price of not having made them at all, not having seen them through, in my judgment would have been vastly greater.

Our goal has been the same—in Europe, in Asia, in our own hemisphere. It has been—and it is now—peace.

And peace cannot be secured by wishes; peace cannot be preserved by noble words and pure intentions. Enduring peace—Franklin D. Roosevelt said—cannot be bought at the cost of other people's freedom.

The late President Kennedy put it precisely in November 1961, when he said: "We are neither war mongers nor appeasers, neither hard nor soft. We are Americans determined to defend the frontiers of freedom by an honorable peace if peace is possible but by arms if arms are used against us."

The true peace-keepers in the world tonight are not those who urge us to retire from the field in Vietnam—who tell us to try to find the quickest, cheapest exit from that tormented land, no matter what the consequences to us may be.

The true peace-keepers are those men who stand out there on the DMZ at this very hour, taking the worst that the enemy can give. The true peace-keepers are the soldiers who are breaking the terrorist's grip around the villages of Vietnam—the civilians who are bringing medical care and food and education to people who have already suffered a generation of war.

And so I report to you that we are going

to continue to press forward. Two things we must do. Two things we shall do.

First, we must not mislead our enemy. Let him not think that debate and dissent will produce wavering and withdrawal. For I can assure you they won't. Let him not think that protests will produce surrender. Because they won't. Let him not think that he will wait us out. For he won't.

Second, we will provide all that our brave men require to do the job that must be done. And that job is going to be done.

These gallant men have our prayers—have our thanks—have our heart-felt praise—and our deepest gratitude.

Let the world know that the keepers of peace will endure through every trial—that with the full backing of their countrymen, they are going to prevail.

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

In other words, Mr. President, there will be no morning hour tomorrow; and I hope that tonight we can get started on the Curtis amendment, which is the pending business. After the prayer, and the disposition of the reading of the Journal, we will be back on limited time, and will take up the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska.

I apologize to Senators to whom I sent telegrams telling them there might be a vote at 3 o'clock today; but I am sure they will understand the circumstances.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none and it is so ordered.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield for a question with respect to his unanimous-consent request?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I made a statement on the floor earlier today that toward the end of the morning hour tomorrow, I would make a 5-minute statement on Vietnam, upon returning from my trip.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Well, I am sure the Senator can get 5 minutes, if that is what he wants. But we are operating on a debate limitation agreement on the pending amendment.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I already have the agreement. I will be glad to yield, if the Senator wants me to.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I ask the majority leader to yield, because I would not wish to be in a position where there could not be any discussion of an idea that I have with respect to the possibility of obtaining peace in Vietnam.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Would the Senator like us to come in at 9:30? In that way, he could be assured of a half hour.

Mr. SYMINGTON. No; I withhold my objection, but I am not particularly happy about it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator could get his 5 minutes. But if he wants a discussion, I would suggest coming in at 9:30.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I do not ask my fellow Senators to come in at 9:30; and I shall be very happy to abide by the majority leader's wishes.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an inquiry?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Is it, then, expected that my amendment will be the pending business on tomorrow?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes; although it is hoped that as much debate as possible can be obtained on the amendment this evening.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (S.J. Res. 109) to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation commemorating 50 years of service to the Nation by the Langley Research Center.

VIETNAM

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I take the floor now to continue a colloquy with my friend, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY], who, a little while ago, expressed some views in connection with and as the aftermath to a speech by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER]. Because I did not want to distract from the remarks that were being addressed to Senator COOPER at that time, we asked for consent to have our own colloquy at this time.

I wanted to raise with the distinguished Senator from Illinois some points of view in regard to his remarks. Since listening to him on the floor, I have been kindly supplied a copy of the Senator's remarks. I wanted to address myself to the seven points contained in the Senator's release. The burden of the seven points in the release, as I understand them, is that the President of the United States has had seven failures in Vietnam, and these failures are at the root of his problem with the American people.

We can take them up however the Senator would prefer, one at a time, or would he prefer that I address myself to the seven quickly and then take them up en masse?

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I should think it might be well for the distinguished Senator from Wyoming to make all of the points on the seven points that he cares to, and I shall be happy to respond. However, I am happy to do it in any way that the Senator wishes.

Mr. McGEE. Very good.

The first point that the Senator from Illinois makes is that the failure of the Government of the United States to institute truly democratic reforms in South Vietnam has contributed to the failure to win the support of the American people.

I think we have to ask ourselves, Mr. President, what our primary objectives and our priorities there are. I have made it clear on many occasions—and we heard more of it this afternoon here on the Senate floor—that it probably is not one of our greatest foreign policy efforts to try to make little democrats out of everyone, and that there are parts of the world that may never be able to prosper under what we call democracy; that, indeed, they would suffer political indigestion from it, if nothing else.

As the late Winston Churchill once said, it is the most difficult of all forms of government, not the simplest, and different patterns of government fit different part of the world, different cultures, different nationalities, in different ways than they happen to fit us.

Therefore, I would submit that, most importantly of all, our priority in our presence over there has to do with trying to win the chance for all of Southeast Asia to effect whatever changes fit them best, without violence, without war, without being forced from the outside to accept somebody else's domination.

But now to the particular question itself. As a matter of fact, if we even want to argue the question of democracy in South Vietnam, I think we ought to remind ourselves from whence we ourselves have come. We have heard a great deal of loose talk about free elections in Vietnam. We ought to remind ourselves, with due modesty, that we have been asking the questions attendent to free elections in our own country for 200 years, and there are still a couple of places that would readily come to mind where they are far less than perfect. Yet we expect the Vietnamese to have free elections in 2 months. When are we going to begin keeping our perspective of political change in focus?

I think we ought likewise to bear in mind that it was only a year ago—I do not think the Senator from Illinois would have been involved at that time, because he was busy with other endeavors about a year ago—that critics on this floor were saying to us, "We dare you to call a constituent assembly; we do not believe you can call one over there. We dare you to try to write a constitution, because we do not think they know how to write a constitution in Vietnam."

Then, after they achieved those small steps forward, there were those who began to say, "Well, let us see them hold a national election."

I do not know how fair the national elections just held were. It would be hard to find very many elections that some people did not think unfair. The candidate who loses always thinks they were unfair. That is part of the static we are hearing from Vietnam right now.

But I think the comment of one of the losing candidates for President over there was very significant. When he was asked, by the American press:

Were these elections fair?

He said:

Of course they were not fair, but they were the fairest ones we have ever had in our history.

What that says is that they are trying to move ahead, even though some try to torpedo their efforts on the floor of

the Senate day after day by pronouncing in advance that it is a hoax, a fraud, and a phony job.

I say we ought to give them half a chance, because they are moving. Whether it is going to work, time alone can tell. It is hardly democratic, for us to try to measure our role in Southeast Asia in terms of how democratic the South Vietnamese are going to become. For in that part of the world they have been denied for many centuries any meaningful experience in self-government.

My real guess is that they will probably not be very democratic in our lifetime—let us say in my lifetime, not in the lifetime of the junior Senator from Illinois. He has a much longer life ahead of him. Maybe we will never see it there, I do not know. But I do not think we dare let that become a criterion.

Other Senators on this floor, Mr. President, have suggested that, if we do not satisfy ourselves that the Vietnamese are really determined to be democratic, we better pull out.

Nothing could miss the point farther than an assertion of that type. It ought to have nothing to do with the matter. I do not care who is in Saigon; the issue happens to affect the Philippines, it happens to affect Burma, Thailand, Cambodia, Malaysia, and Indonesia. It is not the politics of Saigon, nor the military background of Saigon, nor the democracy or lack of it, in Saigon, that colors their concern with what happens there.

That is why I say, Mr. President, let us put first things first; and the first thing there is that we help them achieve the chance to develop the kind of infrastructure in their own government that they think they can live with. That ought to be their business. It cannot be our business, when the chips are down. We try to help them achieve the chance.

Now, the second mistake of the President of the United States, according to my friend from Illinois——

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. McGEE. Yes, I am glad to yield. I thought the Senator asked me to go ahead with the whole series.

Mr. PERCY. Before we miss the thread, I wanted to be sure that I understood the points the Senator from Wyoming was making on my first point.

Is the Senator maintaining that we have not had, as a national goal for the South Vietnamese Government, truly democratic reforms, and that that has not been our policy under the past three administrations?

Mr. McGEE. I think what the Senator from Illinois and I would quarrel over would be the semantics of "democratic institutions" and "democratic framework of government."

Our goal, under three Presidents, according to my understanding, has been to try to achieve a stable and responsive representative government.

Representative government is a relative term. There is democracy, and then there is democracy. Our own Government started at a time when one male in eight had a chance to vote, and no women could vote; and yet we were calling it a democratic republic.

So it is a case of relative terms.

I only say we cannot apply this as our priority yardstick, that this is an incidental that flows in the wake of the other events in Southeast Asia.

Mr. PERCY. Well, I would accept the last statement made by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, as to a reasonable goal. I would think it might be stated another way, that we simply want to have a government out there that would serve the people rather than, in a sense, exploit the people, as have the province chiefs and the governors of the provinces over a period of a number of years.

But does the Senator feel, then, having had that objective over a period of three administrations, that we have succeeded in achieving sufficient democratic reform, over the period of the last 7 or 8 years when we have been deeply involved, so as to win the support of the South Vietnamese people, as would be indicated in the last election, when the winning candidate received only 34.8 percent of the vote?

Mr. McGEE. I say to my friend from Illinois that if we are going to play with the percentages of an election vote, then we should start with France, and suggest that we can think of a whole succession of French prime ministers who should never have been recognized by this country, because they got in with a fraction of the vote.

We have had fractional votes for American Presidents. What they have, however, is a government, with whatever percentage, that went through the test at the polls, that came up with the most votes, under the infrastructure of their constitutional system, that entitles them to the right to make up the Government. It is not like ours, but it is like theirs, as it should be, and there has been very considerable headway.

May I say that in the 4 or 5 years that this kind of concern has been expressed, there has been more progress in South Vietnam, given the point from which they began, from a totally unrepresentative colonial structure, than the United States made in the 5 years from 1787 to 1792, in our own history. Also our changes did not come about for almost 50 years, until the Jacksonian Revolution; and until then, we kept imposed on this country a rigid failure to change.

So my answer to the Senator is, "Yes, they have made some startling headway in the processes of a more representative approach to government."

Mr. PERCY. If I could just conclude on this point of the statement that the Senator makes that we ought to put back in perspective the percentage points, I was trying to analyze why the American people, by every indication we have today, do not support the policies of this administration.

I think one reason is the judgment of the people that there has not been sufficient social reform, to date, over the period of many years that we have been in Vietnam, to win the support, not only of the South Vietnamese people, but to give to the American people the confidence that sufficient progress is being made to have warranted the kind of expenditure that has been made to date, in treasure as well as in American casualties.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I appreciate the point the Senator made in response.

I think we ought to put the finger of responsibility, however, where it belongs—on the development of this as an issue. The war was being waged there from the outset. The decision was made in January of 1965 that some effort had to be made to stop the flow of large trained units of North Vietnamese—professional military, if you will.

The static then began to appear. It was said, "But, look at the kind of characters we have in Saigon. Look at General Ky. Why don't we have responsible elections?"

This was because we had to take the course of action of those who had to make the decision as to whether to stand in Vietnam. There was a steady staccato of assault from the Senate floor. And this builds up into a crescendo of opposition, and for the wrong reasons, about the need for our presence there.

The opinion was built up as a secondary issue to the tertiary issue to the point where there had to be an attempt to meet the criticism of some of the critics on the floor. Efforts had to be made.

It was said that someone like General Ky could hold out even though he is a professional military man. The hope was expressed that there might be a constitutional government.

This was in response to the critics who were talking about the issues on the floor.

As a consequence, this has been continuing over the last 2½ years.

They first said, "All we ask is that you write a constitution. We don't think you can do it, but we challenge you."

A constitutional convention was called and a constitution was written. But that did not calm the critics. They slipped off of that one and they moved to the next one.

They said, "We dare you to call an election in a wartime in a country in which they have never had experience with an election. We challenge you to call a national election."

That was a new line being pursued by the critics. This was a fresh assault on a new front.

Those elections were held, and they were held under very difficult, tortuous, and unlikely circumstances.

The fact that this happened there, it seemed to me, was significant.

This newest tirade from the critics was called, and called successfully, and now they have receded again to the next position.

They now say, "Look, there are some complainants as a result of the election. They are meeting with the voice of protest there. Why were the elections not more democratic? Why were they not better than they were?"

This is a new assault.

My point is that the critics will never be satisfied in their criticism until we pull out of Vietnam. That is why we ought to lock horns with the basic grow-

ing issue as to whether we have to be in Southeast Asia, and not what the South Vietnamese Government is doing in the course of an election. That is where the debate on this issue ought to center, because this is what the policy position is all about.

That is the reason that I think we are playing a slippery game in trying to keep up with the critics. They slip off one assault after another. The latest one came on the floor today after we have had a succession of bombing pauses. We have had these bombing pauses, even though they have produced nothing. We have given the other side a chance to say, "Well, we ought to try another one."

Maybe we should. I do not think we dare leave a single chance unexploited here. However, I think we ought to keep our shirts on about what we have a right to expect or demand concerning what constructive criticism is in terms of our basic policy position.

I think those who want to be honest with the people and with themselves ought to be digging into the question of why we are there. If they then say we ought to get out, let us debate it on those grounds.

I do not think this happens to be the number one priority consideration.

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

Mr. McGEE. We have six more issues to move to.

Mr. MILLER. But this is very important colloquy concerning the statement on the critics.

I think we must be careful not to put all critics in the same basket.

Mr. McGEE. As well as all supporters of the war in the same basket; because some of them are supporting it for the wrong reason.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator is correct. There are critics who want to criticize for no particular reason. And if a responsive argument is given to one of their criticisms, as the Senator has said, they will slip away and try something else.

Mr. McGEE. And those are the ones I had in mind while making my comments.

Mr. MILLER. I wanted to bring this out because there are other critics of the conduct of the war. They are not critics of the policy or the reason that we are there. However, they are critics of the conduct of the war.

Mr. McGEE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MILLER. It seems to me that if this war has to become a prolonged war, there will be a snowballing of criticism of all kinds.

I said earlier this year that I did not believe the American people would tolerate a 5-year war or a war for a longer period, if they thought the war could be a shorter war than that.

I expressed myself then and have said many times since that I hope the President would get on the national television and tell the American people why we are not taking certain action to shorten the war. I said that until the President did that, the criticism would not stop. If anything, it will grow larger. I had hoped that this would be forthcoming on the television last Friday night. It was not.

I am not saying that the President can give persuasive arguments as to why the war must be a prolonged war. However, I think he ought to try. If his arguments are persuasive, perhaps the American people will tolerate a prolonged war.

I personally do not think they will. I personally do not think the President will be able to give them persuasive arguments. However, he should try. If the President does not do so and the war continues on, the criticism will become louder and, I am sorry to say, it will tend more and more to split the country.

Mr. McGEE. I say to my friend, the Senator from Iowa, that the point I was making here—and I apologize for not being sufficiently clear and articulate in expressing it—was to account for why in the public mind the kind of election in Vietnam had become all of a sudden such a big issue.

In my analysis it has become such a big issue because of what the Senator has alluded to. I agree that the little fuzzier class of critics who want to be heard but who make a slippery attack and then slip off of that argument and go to the next one have contributed to the public overexpectation of what we have any reason to expect in a political way from a country at the present stage of South Vietnam.

That was the basis for that allegation. I do not include in my suggestion anything more than the suggestions about the democratizing of South Vietnam. That has been a constant drum beat on this floor for a long time.

I think the question of the Senator from Iowa is directed at the kind of basic question we ought to be grappling with on the floor of the Senate. With respect to that, I disagree for reasons that I may have occasion to spell out later.

That is a good question. It is a proper question, and it is the kind of question we ought to be discussing.

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

Mr. McGEE. I yield.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I am grateful to the Senator from Iowa for bringing the colloquy back to the principal point of my very brief—what I thought were to be my very brief—remarks of 2 minutes this afternoon.

I was trying to say that the President has made the mistake, I believe, in his address of last Friday night of equating all the critics of this administration's policy on Vietnam, that he made a year ago in calling them nervous Nellies. This time the President has equated them with all those who would call for unilateral withdrawal. And that is what he announced.

He was only then responding to the demands of a very small percentage of people in this country. I do not know of anyone in this body who has called for unilateral withdrawal. Perhaps there are one or two. But certainly the majority, the overwhelming majority, of the Senate would oppose that policy.

I recall that in the midst of a political campaign a year ago, the National Student Association was meeting in Champaign with a thousand delegates, and I received word, while out on the road, that they were going to adopt a resolution that night, in a liberal caucus, calling for unilateral withdrawal. I sent a wire stating that I wanted to meet with them. I broke up my campaign and flew down, arriving at 10:30, and denounced 600 of them, who were on the verge of doing that, as doing something irrational and irresponsible. We quickly answered that criticism at that meeting, and they did not adopt such a policy. I do not believe that particular group is present very frequently.

The President should address himself to the critics of the war who feel that there can be an escalated victory and show why, then, his policy does not lead in that direction; and he should address himself to those others who feel that we should in every conceivable way work toward what I felt was the consensus of the Senate—88 to 2—when this body said we should work toward an honorable, negotiated settlement.

I believe that we cannot have the will of the Asian people and the South Vietnamese fighting for their own territorial integrity, their own political freedom, unless they have the social reform which President Eisenhower called for in his letter of 1954, in which he laid down certain conditions for economic assistance. Thirteen years later, land reform was presented to the Assembly, and it was overwhelmingly voted down. The type of reform that is necessary to gain the support of the people to rise up and fight for their own economic, social, and political well being simply has not been carried on by this government.

I do not believe it would be appropriate for me to comment on the fairness of the elections in South Vietnam, and I have not done so. I do not believe that a politician from Cook County should set himself up as an expert on free elections. Today, the constituent assembly did validate the Vietnamese election results, but only by a vote of 58 to 43, and the speaker resigned in protest. So, apparently, there is much dissention in the country about the election. But in my remarks I did not even address myself to the election. I addressed myself to the fact that people in this country and in South Vietnam are unhappy about the conduct of the war in Vietnam. And I mean the other wars as well, because sufficient social and economic progress is not being made; and I truly believe that the distinguished Senator from Wyoming would agree that inadequate progress is being made, and this is why we have a certain amount of dissatisfaction.

Mr. McGEE. May I say facetiously that all progress is inadequate except the progress that I decree or that you decree and try to move along. We are relative in our judgments on those things. But as an outsider looking in, I believe most of us in America rather marvel at the type of progress that is being made in Vietnam in many ways, and that, therefore, it ill behooves us to raise this matter to the top as a number one yardstick that we apply in measuring whether this is the place where we should stand or whether we should continue our position there.

I do not know whether I detected in the Senator's comment just now that he

was wishing to leave the impression that we were even questioning the sincerity of their judgment of their last elections because the vote was 58 to 43.

The Senator knows as well as I that we are lucky sometimes to get a vote of 58 to 57, and we feel pretty great about it. That is one of the processes of responsible government. You have to make a decision. You have to count the votes, and you will not get unanimous votes. Therefore, we should be applauding the fact that the assembly took the action that it did in saying:

We are speaking for those who sent us here, and in our judgment the elections were good enough to stand.

Let us give them credit for a vote. I am sure that if the issue had lost by one vote, we would have been hearing much oratory on the floor of the Senate about what a tremendous revolution or overturning of something or other this reflected in South Vietnam. That game can be played two ways. Let us give them the marks for having tried. They are moving toward greater stability.

Let me turn to the Senator's second point.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a comment at this point?

Mr. McGEE. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. Is it not interesting that many of the critics of the election in South Vietnam are so myopic that they have nothing to say about the lack of any elections whatever in North Vietnam?

Mr. McGEE. The Senator is correct. I do not believe that the people of South Vietnam are especially myopic in that respect, quite so much as some people who can be heard clearly in this country. They never remind us that North Vietnam abolished elections, that Ho Chi Minh abolished political parties. Nobody is talking about that. That is not wrong for North Vietnam. It is only wrong when it happens in the South. We have a double standard, largely because all the TV cameras and visitors got to South Vietnam. They cannot get to North Vietnam. It is an unfair judgment. The Senator has made a good point.

The second presidential failure, as described by my friend, the Senator from Illinois, is the President's failure to persuade the South Vietnamese army to carry its rightful share of the combat so that our American men will not have to bear the heaviest burden of the fighting by themselves.

I believe we should face up to some facts. The first is that in reporting on a war, most of the reporting is of the activities of American troops. And why? Because an editor back home says, "We want to know what the boys are doing. The people want to read about the boys in their neighborhood." The news is loaded, to begin with, with American action, as it was in World War II. We had to wait until the war was over to learn what the Russians did at Stalingrad to Hitler's army, because we were reading about the Yanks and their heroic efforts on other fronts. And this is understandable. But we overread and we overreport on the action of our effort, and we underreport on the action on the other fronts.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a column by Joseph Alsop—if it has not been put in the RECORD already—that appeared in this morning's newspaper, because it makes a very good point; namely, that some of the dirtiest, ugliest, and meanest fighting of this war has been turned over to the South Vietnamese.

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

THIRD NORTH VIETNAMESE DIVISION REDUCED TO WRETCHED RABBLE

(By Joseph Alsop)

AN LAO, BINH DINH PROVINCE, VIETNAM.—The helicopter put down here as an Eagle might land in its eyrie among the clouds. Infinitely far below, to the east, there lay the rich, flat Bong Son rice plain. And to the west, the mountain plunged steeply downwards into the An Lao valley, once a major V.C. paradise.

It was a V.C. paradise in the old days because it was difficult of access, richly productive, and had many people who could be made to do the will of the V.C. They did not wish for this. Most of the An Lao people spontaneously moved out a year ago, when the First Air Cavalry Division ran a brief operation into the valley that briefly broke the grip of the V.C. But at the time, no proper arrangements to receive the people in the refugee camps had yet been made, so the majority trickled back again.

"You won't recognize the place now," said Col. James McKenna, commander of the Air Cavalry's 3rd Brigade, which has its command post here at Landing Zone Sandra. In proof, he led the way to a lookout post, where the whole valley lay spread out below. The mountain slopes were half defoliated. The rice fields were abandoned. The little villages were gone. The place was empty of all but war, for a minor air strike was going on, and smoke plumed lazily upwards from bombs dropping on the opposite mountain wall.

Some time ago, in fact, the needed arrangements were made to receive the An Lao people, and they were all moved out, as were the people of the other V.C. paradise in in this province, the Kim Son valley. At one stroke, in this manner, the enemy was deprived of food, porters, conscript candidates and places for rest and recreation—everything he most needed, in fact, except arms.

Now therefore, the units of the 3rd North Vietnamese Division must either rot and starve in the mountains, or come down into the coastal plain and meet the terrible Air Cavalry.

One of those units, the 81st Battalion of the 22nd North Vietnamese Division, had been trapped recently in the grim waste that is now the An Lao valley, however, "lets go and have a look," said Col. McKenna. The chopper took off swiftly, and this time the landing was like a kittiwakes on its nesting ledge—for the narrowest imaginable ledge on the steepest possible slope was the landing zone of A Company, 1st Battalion, 7th Air Cavalry Regiment. A Company had been toilsomely combing the valley slopes for over a week, but Capt. Thomas C. Richardson was as debonair a host as the giver of a successful cocktail party when he welcomed us to his bleak C.P.

As we seated ourselves on the ledge, Sgt. Robert Leopold, a slender former Peace Corpsman, scaled the lip of the rocky cliff that fell away below us, and one by one, the men of his platoon followed him onto the landing zone. "If there are any V.C. in this damn draw, they must be using rapelling ropes," the sergeant said amiably, and his giant Negro machine gunner, festooned with heavy skeins of ammunition, yet not even out of breath, nodded an enthusiastic assent.

"All the same," said Sgt. Leopold seriously, "there's plenty of water in this draw. (One could see and hear it, plunging down the mountainside in a series of silvery, loud-splashing waterfalls.) And where there's water, there can be V.C. So we've got to finish combing it out."

Again, there was assent from the rest of the platoon. And there, on that high ledge, among these hardy youngsters of every sort our country can produce, the story of the fate of the 8th Battalion of the 22nd North Vietnamese Regiment was unfolded bit by gruesome bit.

The battalion had come back into Binh Dinh Province in fair shape, after resting, replacing and refitting beyond reach of the Air Cavalry in a refuge further to the north. Now, they were down again to about 300 men.

Worse still, the relentless pursuit by the Air Cavalry battalion assigned to track them had reduced the men of this once proud and formidable North Vietnamese outfit to a wretched rabble. Their whole battalion armament—two 75-millimeter recoilless, two 57-millimeter recoilless mortar tubes and much else besides—had been found in one hide-hole in the rocks. Their stock of mortar rounds had turned up in another hide-hole. They were mere fugitives, ranging the valley in groups of 2 to 10 men, without communications, without weapons in some cases (for abandoned rifles had also been found here and there), and almost without food. Three rice cakes a day was the ration reported by prisoners, and one little group had been run across tragically scrabbling in the garbage dump of an abandoned American C.P.

"We're wearing them down or picking them up by 3s and 4s and 5s and sometimes 8s and 10s each day, and if we just keep at it, this historic North Vietnamese battalion will be finished for good and all."

To those few who know the history of this strange war in Vietnam, the foregoing news from Col. McKenna in the An Lao valley will speak volumes.

Mr. McGEE. This is the platoon-level fighting. This is the five-man terrorist squad fighting. And that is where the casualties are, also.

But because the reporters sometimes like to travel where the transportation is such that they can get back to the communication line to call back home and get another column, we do not get a balanced share of the reporting on what else is going on in Vietnam.

I am sure that many of the Vietnamese military elements are goofing off. I suspect that it would not be the first case in the annals of military history in which some units have been less military than others in their propensities for carrying on the noble fight. This is the problem at any time with any army—and I say "any army."

Some people have spoken about the men with whom they have discussed this question when the men came home. We have all spoken with the boys who have come home.

I had a boy in my office last week who said that he wished he knew how to counteract this impact, that he had just completed serving an assignment in the delta for 18 months with a South Vietnames unit. He said:

I want you to know that I didn't cringe for one minute, knowing that my life depended on what the guy next to me was going to do

or not do. I'd like to have a chance to tell the people that.

You can get anybody's reaction to this matter, depending on his experience. The man who lost a leg or an arm because somebody else did not live up to his obligation will always be understandably moved to this question. That is the casualty, the horror, and the unfairness at any time, in any place, in any war.

I spent a little time with several South Vietnamese units on two trips to Vietnam, the last one only a few months ago.

Many of those troops are some of the finest our military people say that they have seen. They are doing an excellent job; some are not so fine; but these men have been at war for 20 years.

We have people in our country wondering if we can stick it out for 4 years, 3 years, or another year. This has been a way of life, as one of these young lads said to me. He said, "I was born in war. I have never known anything else." Yet, he thought his group was right; he felt he had no option, no alternative.

The kind of assignment to which the ARVN is being shifted is in the rough, paddy fighting, and not unit fighting, to try to set up security around villages. This will happen more and more. It is not glamorous. It is the kind of place in which your chances remain uncertain 24 hours a day. There is no rest. Do not sell them short.

There are great ones and there are malingerers. The casualty list is one way in which we, at least, measure who suffers the most casualties. South Vietnamese casualties outrun ours several times over. Mr. President, you have to be in the middle of something if you are going to get shot up.

It is time that we dispense with this relatively secondary matter and say that the South Vietnamese are carrying their fair share. The task of moving in this kind of warfare is always preponderantly more difficult for those trying to maintain law and order than it is for those who have to destroy. In Malaysia the proportion was 10 to 1; at least, that is what the Malaysians, or the British told us.

Let us not overexpect, but in the final analysis the finest service we can get from the South Vietnamese is not enough. That is not the issue.

The issue is whether we hold successfully so that the Cambodians, Laotians, Filipinos, Malaysians, Burmese, and Indonesians have a chance to restructure their part of the world in their own way.

That is the measure and that is a much bigger question than what the South Vietnamese Army is doing. It is time that we put the matter in proper proportions.

Perhaps the Senator would like to comment on that point while we are on it.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article recently published by the Wall St. Journal, from a distinguished correspondent, who commented in detail on the degree of effort being exerted by the South Vietnamese Army.

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

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 17, 1967]

WANTED: SOUTH VIETNAM ARMY HEROES

(By Frederick Taylor)

SAIGON.—"We need more ARVN heroes," Barry Zorthian, the top U.S. public relations man here, told a group of military public information officers the other day. And so Mr. Zorthian, whose resounding title is Director of the Joint U.S. Public Affairs Office, Vietnam, and Minister-Counselor for Information of the American Embassy, Saigon, kicked off another drive to burnish the image of the Army of the Republic of Vietnam, known as ARVN for short and pronounced to rhyme with Marvin.

This image-building campaign is aimed at the American press in South Vietnam, and through it, the American people. It stems from a fear among U.S. officials that, as the U.S. troop commitment continues to mount, Americans will get the impression that the South Vietnamese army is doing little to defend its own country.

There are those who would say this is precisely the case, but that's unfair. Only about 80% of the entire South Vietnamese army is ineffective.

UNUSUAL CONGLOMERATE

The South Vietnamese military force is an unusual conglomerate. It is composed of 320,000 regular army troops and about 300,000 Regional and Popular Force troops; regional forces are somewhat akin to U.S. National Guard outfits, mainly assigned to their home areas, while popular forces are mainly assigned to defensive tasks such as manning guard posts and supplying security for individual villages and hamlets. Technically the regular army is the ARVN, but the term is used loosely to include all South Vietnamese military forces.

In addition, there are about 100,000 paramilitary forces, including combat youth; civil irregular defense groups, which are the government's counterpart of the Viet Cong; and national police. But it is the 620,000 men in the regular army, regional and popular forces that are generally counted in enumerating South Vietnam's fighting forces.

In Washington last week at a White House news conference, the U.S. field commander, Gen. William Westmoreland, heaped praise on the ARVN, saying "They are fighting much better than they were a year ago." But reservations persist.

There are many reasons for the ARVN's ineffectiveness. One of them is that when the U.S. advisory effort began more than a dozen years ago the plan was to train the South Vietnamese to fight a Korean-style war, not the insurgency with which they became involved. There are others:

After 20 years of fighting, much of the ARVN leadership is war-weary and sees no hurry in pursuing the enemy; the war ends at noon Saturday and begins again Monday morning after the officers have relaxed in Saigon. This reporter, in the Delta with an artillery battalion of the ARVN's seventh division, one of the country's best, spent a rainy afternoon in the battalion commander's jeep; while his troops fired their artillery in desultory fashion (six rounds in five hours) between squalls at the Viet Cong five miles away, the commander was in town for a leisurely lunch. He returned at 5 p.m. to take his men back to camp.

Officers are picked for their educational achievement, not their leadership qualities, and too often are promoted or keep their jobs because of political loyalty.

Brig. Gen. Phan Truong Chinh is the commander of the 25th division, recognized as the worst in Vietnam. (Gen. Cao Vien, the ARVN chief of staff and the only general officer ever wounded in combat, has called it not only the worst ARVN division but "possibly the worst division in any army.") The 25th division won't move at night; when U.S. advisers coerce Gen. Chinh into sending his troops out against a known VC unit, he's likely to direct his men carefully to a spot three or four miles away from where the VC were spotted. The common explanation of how he remains in command: He's a friend of his corps commander, and his corps commander is a close friend and supporter of Premier Nguyen Cao Ky.

The officer corps, never good to begin with, has been spread thin by the 50% expansion of the army over the past three years. Coups have resulted in exile or retirement of some skilled officers. The common practice of appointing officers as province and district chiefs and to government jobs in Saigon has further reduced the supply of leaders.

The ARVN aren't as well equipped as U.S. forces. An ARVN division has only two artillery battalions; a U.S. division has four. The U.S. Army expects to have air support from three to five fighter squadrons of 12 to 20 planes each during any given fight; the ARVN have only six fighter squadrons to support 10 army divisions. While U.S. artillery and U.S. planes support the ARVN when they get into a fight, the Americans support their own forces first, and in many cases there are long delays before aid reaches the South Vietnamese, because of communications difficulties.

CONNECTIONS AND KICKBACKS

Corruption is widespread among the officers, at least partially because of their deep involvement in politics; as the province chief is frequently a military man, it is easy for him and the local military commander to shake down local merchants, using the army to back them up. Promotions are frequently based on favoritism, family connections and the size of kickbacks to the commander.

Most Americans in Vietnam have no doubts about the courage and native ability of the Vietnamese soldier; they have only to look at the Viet Cong to know that, when motivated, the Vietnamese are tough soldiers. But the ARVN obviously are poorly motivated. One indication is the desertion rate: Despite great improvement from last year, in the first quarter of 1967 the rate still was 22 per 1,000 men per month; that means of every 1,000 troops, only 736 would remain at the end of a year. (U.S. advisers take some comfort in the fact that ARVN don't usually go over to the enemy but return home; still, they aren't on hand to fight.)

It almost all goes back to leadership. "Almost everything we see is a failure of leadership," says a U.S. general in Saigon.

The chronicle of disasters resulting from this failure seems endless. In mid-May a Vietnamese army battalion command post was overrun and 29 ARVN and three American advisers were killed; only one VC body was found after the attack. Three hundred yards away three ARVN companies were in place; they didn't move to help.

In the Union II operation south of Da Nang, two ARVN battalions were assigned as a blocking force to cut off the North Vietnamese under attack by U.S. Marines. But they refused to block, and the North Vietnamese escaped. (A high U.S. general's comment: "Nobody blocks in this war.") U.S. advisers—the captains, majors and lieutenant colonels who work with the ARVN on the battalion and company level—tell of ARVN battalions melting away during battles, of stopping their attacks after an hour or so of fighting ("When they've got all the battlefield souvenirs they can carry"), or refusing to leave camp at night, of deliberately playing transistor radios out on patrol to warn the enemy. (Some of the radios come from the U.S. Agency for International Development.)

Many U.S. advisers discount one argument frequently used to prove that the ARVN are doing their share: That ARVN battle casualties regularly outstrip U.S. casualties. Vari-

ous studies indicate that the regional and popular forces, which make up less than half of the regular military, suffer about three-fourth of the fatalities, and because of the nature of these forces the fatalities are incurred while they are in defensive positions, such as a popular force outpost that is overrun by the VC. Its members are just as dead as if they'd been killed on an offensive mission, but they haven't killed many of the enemy.

In an attempt to make some use of the ARVN, and on the theory that only the Vietnamese can root out the VC infrastructure, about half of the 320,000-man regular army has lately been assigned to the pacification program, responsible for (1) guarding the revolutionary development teams being sent into South Vietnam's villages and hamlets to conduct civic welfare and political indoctrination programs, and (2) killing Viet Cong guerrillas, rather than engaging in big search-and-destroy operations against main force enemy units. It is still too early to tell whether this change will prove successful. There have been initial difficulties: The regular army troops so assigned come under the command of the province chief; some battalion commanders have shown their displeasure at having their authority curtailed and have refused to obey his orders.

EXPERIMENTAL BOOSTERS

To counter the ARVN's failings, a variety of experiments are being tried—pairing squads of ARVN with squads of U.S. soldiers; attaching ARVN companies to U.S. companies; teaming U.S. squads, ARVN squads and popular force platoons, all in hope that U.S. experties will rub off. The ARVN failings also inevitably have led to proposals for a unified command in South Vietnam, which would permit the U.S. to remove incompetent ARVN commanders. But so far this hasn't taken place, primarily because of fear that any kind of unification would play into the hands of the North Vietnamese, who already charge that the South Vietnamese are only U.S. puppets.

In the meantime, senior U.S. generals here fall back on the tired comparison with the South Korean army in 1950 and the vast improvement it has shown in fighting in Vietnam today. "I spent 16 months in Korea and we had all the same things said then," recalls one. "There were great Korean leaders and there were others who didn't have the guts to lead their outfits. In time they disappeared from the scene."

But what the generals ignore is that it took 15 years for the Koreans to reach their present level of competence. Is there that much time in Vietnam?

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I feel that when we mention accumulative and total overall casualties, we must bear in mind that we are dealing with current events, and that in 1 month in this past summer American casualties were double the casualties of the South Vietnamese army. It would seem to be a most unusual thing for an army that is coming to help another nation to have twice the casualties that the army has which is defending its own people on its own soil.

Perhaps this is attributable to the fact that there have been increasing reports that the South Vietnamese Army is really on a 5½-day work week; perhaps we do not win a war and get it over as quickly as those who believe it should be brought to a final conclusion, on a 5½-day workweek.

There have also been considerable reports that the brunt of the fighting after dark must be taken up by American forces; that the South Vietnamese forces at dusk are not really as active as their counterpart forces, the American forces.

It would seem to me that the brunt of the attack of the Vietcong is at nighttime; in the stealth of the night they have their ambushes, and make sneak attacks and otherwise. To have the local army, which knows the territory and the terrain there, and which is better adapted to living in it not carrying its full fighting force at night would certainly seem to me to be a situation that we have every right to insist that the military forces and the government correct over there.

Mr. McGEE. In response to that statement I would suggest that the assignment of the South Vietnamese, which is to preserve security at the village level, rather than to search-and-destroy missions, to throw the enemy off balance, is to use five-man and seven-man teams, and in some instances 19-man teams. These are specific numbers because I have just had an opportunity to go over the pattern of some of these tasks with some of our people who have just returned from there.

These missions are on a 24-hour basis. Every night these outfits can count on casualties. These casualties are not dramatic casualties. Perhaps there will be a casualty over in this village, and another casualty over in this village, and perhaps one over here gets shot at. If one wanted to trace the statistics, perhaps 20 percent are shot but it is not news enough for a news story and there are not many newspaper men who wish to crawl around on their bellies at night with the ARVN forces. I think it is all relatively irrelevant.

The real issue is that the line must be held, whatever the performance of the Vietnamese, the Laotians, or the Cambodians. The line has to be held if they are to win this chance. That is the proper priority and let us keep the priority in proper dimension.

Mr. PERCY. I wish to keep the matter in balance and in perspective. I am not a military expert and I do not pretend to be.

I attempt to present to the administration, if it does not know already, the reasons why a vast majority of the American public does not now support the policies of this administration in the conduct of the war. It is my general impression, after talking with thousands of people personally in all parts of the country that most of the people in this country—whether right or wrong I cannot personally judge, other than by sorting and sifting the evidence—believe that the South Vietnamese Army and the military forces are not carrying the main burden of the war, and that the main burden of the war has now been shifted to the American forces. That was my second point in my prepared remarks.

Mr. McGEE. I think that if the Senator is really concerned about keeping this matter in balance and perspective, to which he refers, that his help would be very gratefully received in bringing the public to a level of understanding. These American newspaper column reports are written by reports who are responding to demands back home. It is a hard way to win a war or to firm up a policy in the national interest.

For that reason I think we probably have more substantive evidence on this question outside the pages of a newspaper than we have from the signed columns which are sent back home. I would only suggest, therefore, that there inescapably is a great deal more to this on behalf of the South Vietnamese military than meets the columns in the newspapers.

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

Mr. McGEE. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in that connection, on August 23, I pointed out that so far over 50,000 members of the Army of South Vietnam had been killed in action. I think American forces have suffered about 12,000 killed in action.

Mr. McGEE. At that time.

Mr. MILLER. At that time. That is very recent. I do not believe it is proper to say that the South Vietnamese Army has not borne the brunt of the casualties in the war.

When I was in Vietnam, I talked about the Army of South Vietnam with many of our military leaders. The story was pretty much what we might expect to find about almost any army. Some of the divisions, regiments, and battalions of the South Vietnamese are of top quality and others are not. There is the problem of good young leadership. Many of their finer and better educated young officer potentials were killed off. It takes time to develop that kind of leadership and develop a first-rate unit.

I also talked with some Marine commanders recently, who have been intimately concerned with the South Vietnamese division which is fighting with the Marines along the DMZ, and they had nothing but praise for them.

Thus, we might go to another place in the country and find a second- or third-rate unit which perhaps some member of the press happens to be visiting, and we get an entirely different impression.

But, I must say, if I were a South Vietnamese Army officer, I would point to the fact that 50,000 members of the Army of South Vietnam have been killed. That is a pretty good indication of their desire to maintain their freedom.

Mr. McGEE. I thank the Senator for his additional information. It is very well received.

The third of the points made by the Senator from Illinois is the failure of the President to persuade our other Asian allies to participate substantially in the military, economic, psychological, and diplomatic risks confronting us in Vietnam.

Again, this reminds me of World War II. These are always relative things. The Russians disliked the Americans because we were opening a second front in Europe, and they thought we were not going to help them. We were unhappy with the Russians because they would not enter the war against Japan in the Pacific. The other guy never does help us enough, particularly when we are actually on the firing line. I think we should not look in too cursory a way toward our Asian allies as they are described here.

The Koreans are not "nobodys." They happen to be Asian allies. They have more men in Vietnam in proportion to their population than we have. That speaks rather well for an ally.

In the second instance, the Philippines have—what?—3,000 combat engineers, yet the Philippines lie off short a couple of hundred miles.

The Thais have openly committed manpower to the fighting line, and have been involved in the fighting. The position of the Thai Army has made a considerable difference about that crucial flank. In fact, in Vietman, the Australians have been committing men. New Zealand has committed less men. Malaysia and Indonesia have been in the throes of their own little wars until very recent months, which they have finally settled.

Indonesia is going through the throes of starting up its government with a new structure of stability, and is hardly in a direct position to make a contribution here. We should be grateful that they have made a great turn in a more hopeful direction. We should be grateful that Malaysia is able to pull its own weight without compounding the difficulties which have confronted them since their independence.

I do not believe we have a right to expect any measurable manpower contribution from Singapore. It is a brand new country now. It is a very compact, small area in many ways, and yet they, too, have switched their position in terms of their attitude toward our efforts in Vietnam.

Thus, those countries more closely involved in that area are involved at the front. At the same time, every one of those countries I have just mentioned has committed economic teams, psychological warfare teams, and hospital teams to Vietnam. This includes Taiwan, the Philippines, Australia, and a host of other so-called neutral countries—33 in all—who are committed in some meaningful way to the present endeavor in Vietnam.

Accordingly, let us stop making quite so much light of what our allies in Asia are doing in this conflict. None of them can do over-all what we are capable of doing. One of the reasons we are there is that there is no power or combination of power capability in that part of Asia. We are bound to be disproportionately larger than all of the rest who are there. That is why we are there. That is why it makes a difference that we are there.

Even the presence of the British in Singapore, where they still have in excess of 40,000 men, has made a difference. This, too, is part of the weight of the scales of the balance of force in that part of Asia. It protects and carries a bit of atmosphere of relative stability in a very crucial flank in all of Southeast Asia.

So it is not correct to assert, as this suggestion does, that there is too little activity. There is always too little from our point of view. We wish they would do more.

I conclude this point with the suggestion that these men themselves, if they could win the chance and achieve the chance at a stable government and an economy that can produce, long for the opportunity to take this over themselves, to restructure the balance of stability in Asia. They ask for the time to win that chance. I think that is crucial to our concept and understanding of our role regarding point 3.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I can only say this, in response, that if they truly want to take it over and long to take back this responsibility, there will be a great many persons in this country who would be very happy to give them that opportunity, including 500,000 American boys in Vietnam who would like to get home to their families.

I have merely made the statement here—and I have not heard any evidence, really, to refute it at all—that our Asian allies have not contributed enough to convince the American people that the administration has done enough to ask them to carry their fair share of the load.

In illustration, I offer the incredible comment made by Clark Clifford, when he returned from Southeast Asia as an emissary of the President—and Gen. Maxwell Taylor—when he was asked the question: "Did you ask the Asian nations for additional support?"

He said, "No."

They had not even asked for additional support.

I should like to come back to the Asian nations in just a moment, but I should like to give my distinguished colleague an opportunity to comment and perhaps interpret, because I think that also contributes to the dissatisfaction over the policies of this administration.

My last sentence under point 3, "further has been unable to persuade a single country in Western Europe to provide any meaningful help or support." Why is it, after all that we have done in Europe to rebuild Europe, enemy and ally alike, why is it that the overwhelming burden of evidence, as the administration indicates, is that the freedom of the free world depends upon our actions in South Vietnam, but we have not yet been able to convince a single European ally to give us any meaningful support?

Is this an untrue statement that I have made, and does the distinguished Senator feel that that fact does not contribute to certain dissatisfaction which exists a great deal about our conduct of the war?

Mr. McGEE. I would say partially, it is untrue. The Senator asks me why the Western European nations cannot help us even though they were our allies in the last war and look what we have done for them.

I think the best way to put that in its proper setting is to remind the Senator that that is exactly the question the British were asking of us about 1935 and 1936 when Britain had the responsibility for maintaining relative stability in power politics around the world. They wanted to know where the Americans were. We had to squirm a little bit and admit that we were isolationists. There was a long process of building up American understanding of British policy in World War II. It was a ticklish and decisive process, but we finally came through.

I think we have a right to ask the British this question today. The British Prime Minister made no bones about where he stood. He is catching a little flak back home as a result, but that is a part of the life of politicians. He has taken his position.

The only politician in Western Europe in opposition—except the Scandinavian countries—happens to be that "Batman"—you know who—in Paris. The man who can analyze the motivations there can probably answer a lot of other questions. It has to do with the rather embarrassing action of the French there. It has to do with the shabby way in which the allies in France sometimes treated De Gaulle. This leaves scars, and it is still leaving scars.

The role of the allies must be relegated to their proper role, which is a secondary role. Do not sell the British short. The world is round. The British are still maintaining a semblance of stability in other parts of the world where she still has a commitment.

I recall the words of a top official of Australia, who said:

> For the life of me, I cannot understand our friends, some of our own family in Western Europe, and why they cannot see that what is happening in eastern Asia is as important to them today as what was happening to them in Germany was important to us 15,000 miles away in Australia.

It is a question of who is wearing the shoe, or which foot the shoe fits. It is human nature that the farther away something is, the less one seems to think that he will suffer immediate consequences. I remember reading articles in the British press, and clipping some of them for use in my classes, dramatizing how the British and French were saying to the Australians and New Zealanders, "You do not do enough to stop Hitler. Why don't you see that Hitler is your enemy?"

It is the reverse of the story now. It is understandable, even though it is not right. It is part of human nature that the farther away people are, the less they concern themselves with the problem.

Our role is different. Not only are we concerned in it by geography, history, and policy; we happen to be the largest single force in that part of the world capable of trying to achieve a less violent method of change than the creation of those vacuums which would have occurred had we not moved in.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McGEE. Yes; I am pleased to yield.

Mr. PERCY. Is it the opinion of the distinguished Senator from Wyoming that European countries, allies of this country in Western Europe, should be doing more than they are now doing to help us in this effort which we maintain is not just to protect ourselves but to protect the interests of the free world?

Mr. McGEE. I would say, in response to the Senator, that at any time "the other guy" ought to be doing more than he is at any one time. It would be difficult to imagine anyone saying that someone is doing all he can to help him. But our

role with regard to that of the British is now reversed. We happen to be responsible for a good bit of what goes on in the world. The British have had to retreat. Therefore, they cannot take over as they were in a position to do in 1938, even though they have committed themselves where they have not been severed in other parts of the world from their commitments.

Mr. PERCY. Does the Senator feel that any reasonable man, taking into commensurate account the economic strength, prosperity, and available resources of the European nations, feels those countries are now contributing what is a reasonable contribution toward this effort? We have been unsuccessful to date, as I have pointed out, in convincing them to make that kind of contribution, and this is one of the underlying reasons why the American people are so dissatisfied when they see no European nation willing to help us in this effort.

Mr. McGEE. I think the dissatisfaction arises as a result of having focused a television camera on one spot. In Europe, we have a rather integrated military force to which the Europeans have made a contribution, and still are. That is a commitment, and the firmness of the NATO commitment right now is one of the factors in restraining other capabilities which would have a bearing on Southeast Asia. It is one of the great balancing factors. So I think it would be totally unfair to dismiss the Europeans for doing nothing. I wish they would do more. If the British could have kept the job, it would have been a great thing, as far as I am concerned. But that was not fate or history. We emerged as the most powerful nation. We had to move into that nation's role whether we liked it or not. They are doing a great deal in Europe militarily. I do not think it is fair to dismiss it as not being one of the restraining factors on the other side's being willing to take greater chances in Southeast Asia. So my answer is that they are making a contribution, and a very meaningful one.

Mr. PERCY. I could not disagree more with the distinguished Senator. I think their relative contribution is virtually zero. In fact, it is less than zero, because we have now stationed in Europe, for their defense, as well as ours——

Mr. McGEE. As well as ours.

Mr. PERCY. A quarter of a million in American forces. Yet they contribute nothing for our help where we are fighting and where the action is in Southeast Asia. As the Senator has pointed out, there is a gentleman in Paris who is obstructing the forward movement to help, but maybe it is because of the fact that De Gaulle cuts more mustard in Europe than does President Johnson. Maybe he is more eloquent and forceful in putting forth the view that that is the wrong course, and that there should be no intervention of European forces there, than we are in persuading our allies that it is a right war and that their freedom is conditioned upon achievement of success there.

I am simply making the point that whereas we did have a situation in World War II where we did not rush in to help, it is significant that many of the hawks of today who would have us greatly expand our activities were the very bastions of support for the isolationist policy which kept us out of the war in Europe which was for our own well-being and security. It was the eloquence, it was the patience, it was the perseverance of a Churchill that worked on this problem steadily to get the American Government more and more deeply involved, short of a declaration of war—lend-lease, money, ships, equipment, and then manpower.

That is not the kind of help being given us by the European nations. These European nations are doing virtually nothing. In fact, Great Britain has notified us that she intends to withdraw additional support, leaving the burden on us for defending Europe——

Mr. McGEE. By the 1970's.

Mr. PERCY. Yes; but they have given us due notice. I hope that we will be more persuasive in persuading them that, even though their facilities are taxed, we have a problem as to how much more we can continue to finance this whole commitment to the world.

I would now like to turn to Asia, because the distinguished Senator made the comment that the South Koreans are making a major contribution of 45,000 in fighting forces. I acknowledge this. This is a tremendous contribution to put their forces into a fighting war. They have been so effective that this is why for 2 years I have called for more Asian forces, because I think Ho Chi Minh is going to be much more impressed with multination action than he will with merely unilateral action by us. But I really must, in fairness to the whole picture, point out that the situation in South Korea is a unique one. We did save her freedom at the cost of 54,000 American lives and $18 billion. They have 45,000 men in forces in South Vietnam. But that is sort of washed out. In fact, we end up short because we have today 50,000 in American forces tied down in South Korea. So we are still out 5,000 men in forces, and we are equipping all the 45,000 men in forces that they have in Vietnam.

I would simply say we must do more to get more forces of the Asians there. I have indicated, in numerous conversations with our military and our State Department, that I thought another 30,000 or 40,000 South Koreans would be far more effective than 30,000 or 40,000 more American forces.

Mr. McGEE. The Senator must know that as he makes this plea to get more individual nations to do even more than they are doing, he really flies in the face of history; that at any time in history the disproportionate sharing of this kind of responsibility is a harsh fact of life. For most of our history, it has redounded to our advantage.

For the first 140 years of the history of this Republic, we had a ring of friendly nations who fought most of our battles for us. They shielded us. But the times changed because of what the war did to England, to France, and to us, in opposite ways.

I would hesitate to share the comparison that the Senator suggested in asking what it is that De Gaulle has that L.B.J. does not have, or what it is he is doing that persuades, that L. B. J. cannot do to persuade.

I will tell you what the difference is. De Gaulle is enjoying the luxury of irresponsibility. He does not have to take the consequences of what he says or advocates now. The President of the United States has to live with what he decides, because what he decides makes a difference. He has to take the consequences.

It is interesting to note that Mr. de Gaulle was not taking any such divisive position at the time that Russia was the great question mark of Europe. In those very severely testing days, De Gaulle was strangely silent. It is only now that the success of our position, of our policy, of our firmness has achieved a kind of diplomatic ease in Europe, that De Gaulle feels emboldened to sound off—again because he does not have to take the consequences. That is the great difference between the leader of France and the leader of the United States of America.

We are not going to change that difference. It is an unfair difference, but it is a fact of life; and De Gaulle will continue to exploit it to his advantage. The President of our country does not dare live quite that recklessly, in terms of the kinds of decisions that we have to make.

Finally, on this same point, I think the Senator should understand, too, as I am sure he does, that Vietnam is not World War I or World War II, and we hope not world war III. This is a part of the difference. I think it still would have been impossible for the great Winston Churchill to have persuaded the Americans to help stop the Nazi onslaught in Austria, or to have stopped it somewhere else in Eastern Europe. It was only when it began to run away that we finally were brought into it; and thus it became the big war.

The chances of persuasion go up the worse the war becomes, rather than the better it becomes; and thus the task of persuading somebody in Western Europe or somewhere else around the globe to stand with us, with more men in South Vietnam, is made more difficult and more unlikely because the decision in Southeast Asia, in part, was premised upon the conviction that the place to stop it was at the start, at the beginning, rather than after it blew up into something much more difficult to contain, to control, or to put down.

Therefore, I say the Senator argues in the face of history. There is no valid parallel between South Vietnam, in terms of international psychology or persuasiveness of the vital interests of the other countries, and the movement of Hitler to the Atlantic coast of Europe, which had a tremendous shocking effect on a great many people who thought it could not happen. So did England's survival, when they thought she was going down.

So I do not think the analogy that the Senator has chosen to refer to here is totally appropriate, in the context of historical experience.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. McGEE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I have been listening with great interest to the colloquy between the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Wyoming.

I think that the Senator from Illinois has a very valid point. I run into great dissatisfaction, wherever I go, over what is deemed to be improper or inadequate support of our war commitment and our war effort on the part of many of our allies.

It is understandable. I have rationalized and explained the situation just as has the Senator from Wyoming. That is an explanation, but it is not really an excuse. I know that we can recognize human nature for what it is; but that does not excuse it.

I have been more inclined to be critical of the failure of some of our allies to cease and desist from permitting any ships bearing their flags to visit the port of Haiphong. That is the very least we ought to expect of them. I think the very most we might expect them to do is to share in the burden of the war; but at the same time, I must say that I would wonder about how effective it would be if, for example, one of the European allies should offer to send a division of troops to fight over in South Vietnam. I think it is entirely understandable and entirely proper for the Australians to be there; but I would far rather see a division from one of the Asian countries.

The question is, then, why can we not get more Asian nations to join in the fighting? I think that the Koreans are bearing about all of the burden that they can properly be expected to bear. The Philippines could undoubtedly provide more troops over there.

My guess is that President Marcos would like to be able to do it. It may take more urging and more diplomatic relations to get it to happen; but at the same time, if I were one of the Asian nations' leaders, and the question came to me whether I would recommend sending a division of my troops to fight with the allies in South Vietnam, and my military leaders or advisers told me that from the way the United States was conducting the war in South Vietnam, it appeared that it was on a prolonged war basis rather than a shortened war basis, I am not so sure that I would be in such a big hurry to send a contingent of my people down there to fight.

I think that there is a point to be brought out, and that is that the way this war has been conducted, the gradualism approach to which former President Eisenhower referred, would have had a tendency to discourage would-be allies from sending military personnel there to share in the fighting.

I add further that if there is a cessation of bombing directed without a quid pro quo and without a clear understanding that no advantage will be taken by the enemy during such a cessation of bombing, but that genuine negotiations will take place, I think that we had better forget about any more people coming in from any other country. If we have a cessation of bombing, it will indicate to them that we are willing to sacrifice the lives of our fighting men for the sake of securing negotiations without any guarantees that our fighting men will not be put in further jeopardy as a result of the enemy's taking advantage of the lull in the bombing.

I think that those two points ought to be remembered when we start to talk about receiving more contributions from other forces apart from Southeast Asia.

I repeat that if there is any way I know of to discourage any would-be allies from sending fighting men into Southeast Asia to help us, it is to let them pick up their newspaper and read that the United States has called a unilateral cessation of the bombing in the face of warnings from our military leaders that this action will cost us casualties among our fighting men without a genuine quid pro quo from the other side.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, let me state quickly to my friend, the Senator from Iowa, that some of the Asians, I suppose, are a little more sophisticated than we are in this matter. They have been living under this kind of tension for a long while and it is a way of life with them.

I noted with interest the other day that two of the Asian leaders, President Marcos of the Philippines and Kuang Yew of Malaysia, both made the following point: that in their judgment this kind of restraint and limited concept would be best for the American policy position vis-a-vis Vietnam, and was the only kind of restraint, because they thought there would be a risk in a nuclear age and that it would take a very long process of pressure and attrition to effect a clear change over the long pull.

I do not think they would be about to give up if there were some restraints that ought to be exhibited. What those ought to be, I personally leave to the President and those who again take the course of action.

I think we ought to allow for the role of the newly independent Asian countries. They are brand new, and they also have stability problems. Their armed forces are not armed forces such as ours.

The Thai are probably the major exception in that part of the world and also the Koreans, because of what they were through 15 years ago. However, for the most part, those nations are still building their military capabilities and they have some stability problems. They have to make sure their Government stays on top, as our own Government did in the years following the gaining of our independence.

I should also call to mind, when we talk about the contributions that these Asians are making, that the whole continent of Asia is very large. It includes India.

Who would have thought 10 years ago that India would have a half million troops on the Chinese borders? If someone had said that 10 years ago, they would have been called crazy. Yet, India has that many troops there now. Those Indian troops need to be counted and placed on the scales with which we equate the participation by Asians, because they contribute to the options that are available to those who play loose or close games in Vietnam.

I think we must keep the whole picture in front of us.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I recognize that they are making a contribution with respect to other areas of Asia. I think they are to be praised for this action. However, when the Senator talks about the restraints, I guarantee to him that the restraint they do not want would be a restraint which would cause more casualties to the troops fighting in Vietnam. And if they have an understanding that we will exercise that kind of restraint—and I do not think that is a very good name for it—we should not expect them to send their fighting forces to join ours to be needlessly destroyed or sacrificed.

There are restraints and there are restraints. However, they are very perceptive people, and they understand very well what can happen.

If there is a cessation of the bombing as a result of which more United States and South Vietnamese and Korean troops can be killed, I think we ought to understand, if we want more of them to come in—and some more can come in from the Philippines, Thailand, and Malaysia—that our action in having a cessation of bombing will cause them not to send their fighting forces there.

I am not talking about a division from each country, but merely about more troops that can come in. If we want to discourage that from happening, we should just start to exercise that kind of a restraint, which I would not really call a restraint except in name only. If we do that, we should not expect them to send any more fighting men there to join us.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I am very delighted that the distinguished Senator from Iowa agrees with my premise that there should be more Asian forces there and that there can and must be more Asian forces there.

I think it is our job as public officeholders and representatives of the American people not to continue to find excuses why those forces cannot come in. I think we must find reasons why they should be there and eloquently persuade them that they must be there. We must open the doors so that they can be.

I have a great deal of sympathy for the unhappy role that the Senator from Wyoming has in defending this particular point on behalf of the administration. And I have considered it to be a failure to date.

There is no point on which I feel more strongly than this one. When I left South Vietnam and Southeast Asia 2 years ago after visiting with and talking with the Chiefs of State of all the countries of Southeast Asia and with their Cabinets and with our own officials there, I came back convinced that the Southeast Asian nations really wanted us in South Vietnam and were willing to give a degree of assistance themselves.

I talked to the leader in Thailand at that time, Kittichorn, and asked if they would be willing to put forces in Vietnam. He said "Yes."

After a business council meeting, I had

a conversation with the American ambassador from Thailand to the United States who had addressed that group. I spoke to him and asked if they would be prepared to do so. He said "Yes."

I then went to the Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara—and I know that it is popular to condemn him, but I have a great deal of respect and admiration for him because of the burdens he carries which are occasioned by the war—and I mentioned to him that I wanted to be as helpful as I could, but that as an opening, I was hopeful that it would be the policy of our country to press in every possible way to have the Thais come in with direct force to make this a multination effort, as we had done in the case of the Korean war, which psychologically made it a different war than an American war with us taking the place of the hated French as the Communists claim.

Mr. McNamara told me about the problems in Thailand and told me that he felt it would not be wise that they do it, but that it would be wiser that the Philippines do it instead.

And it would be better for me not to insist that the Thais do it. I quietly and simply have always hoped that the Thais would, and I rejoiced when they finally came in.

Apparently, they came in after a reassessment of our policy there, and they recently came in with 2,000 or 2,500 fighting forces in South Vietnam. I believe this is good, much better than committing an additional 2,500 American boys. But I believe that Thailand, which has so much to lose—more than any other country—should South Vietnam fall, can afford this kind of effort; and it should have been the policy of our government for a long time to persuade them to come in directly.

I feel very deeply that the Philippines should send in fighting forces. They now have a 2,000-man noncombat military engineering unit in South Vietnam. I realize that internal politics makes it difficult to send combat forces. I know something of the political situation in the Philippines, though I am by no means an expert. But they have had experience with this type of war. The right kind of persuasion could convince them that their well-being is at stake, and I believe that they could usefully contribute substantial military training and pacification personnel to the allied effort, if they cannot contribute combat forces. They can go much further than they have thus far.

We can only ask the question: "What would their military cost be if we were not in South Vietnam, if we were not sacrificing as much as we are, if we were not stopping and having the Great Society in a shambles in the rubble of Newark and Detroit now, because of our incapability of carrying forward our own domestic programs, with a $28 billion deficit?"

In the face of that situation, I believe they can make more sacrifice.

Malaysia has a very small army, but I believe it could do far more in the training of the Vietnamese in counterinsurgent tactics. Presently, they train only 30 to 60 men a month. Considering the $47 million in U.S. foreign aid to Malaysia, it certainly should do more. They have had tremendous experience in this field, and they no longer have the threat they had from Indonesia. Their internal situation is much more secure with the new agreements than they were before. I believe they could ask themselves the question: "What if the United States were not doing this? Why don't we contribute, then, something substantially more than we are doing right now?"

Prime Minister Holyoake of New Zealand has acknowledged his country's responsibility to help South Vietnam, but he has provided fewer than 400 military personnel, and I believe he could be persuaded to provide more.

I should like to comment on Japan, because I realize an unusual situation exists there, with a constitution that prohibits combat forces. But when we consider what we have given, that we have strengthened the Japanese economy by $3 billion, that the war in Vietnam continues to provide a tremendous amount of economic trade for them, I believe that Japan can afford to provide more economic aid than the total $55 million it has given South Vietnam thus far.

I believe that agricultural experts from Japan would be more valuable than agricultural experts from the United States. Our technology is much different from the technology which Japan can provide. In the building of schools, aiding with education, and offering hope for future generations in South Vietnam, educators from Japan, the most literate nation on the face of the globe, would have a great impact and would lessen, once again, the tremendous burden that we are carrying ourselves.

Italy, which has been on the receiving end of $6 billion in U.S. foreign aid, has only sent one surgical team to Vietnam. Just one, period.

In terms of personnel, the United Kingdom has provided six civilian advisers, a single pediatric team of four doctors, and one English professor. This is incredibly small, compared with the stakes that they still have in Asia today, and compared with what they are capable of doing.

Mr. President, I certainly do not wish to sound in the spirit of Shylock, demanding a pound of flesh because of what we have done for these nations, but the administration has apparently failed to effectively remind these countries that freedom has survived in this century because freemen have helped each other in hours of danger and in hours of need. Certainly, if the need is as great as our Government thinks it is, their eloquence should be just as great in convincing others that they should do more to protect themselves.

As the President, himself, said:

> I am not about to send American boys 9,000 to 10,000 miles to Southeast Asia to do what Southeast Asian boys should be doing for themselves.

All through the campaign of 1964, the President spoke in moderating terms against those who would escalate the war. He spoke against those who would step up our effort, and he spoke in terms of what a people must do for themselves.

All I am attempting to do today—in my original 2-minute presentation on these seven points—is to indicate once again that the American people are disunited because they feel, as I mentioned in point No. 3, that the burden is now on the backs of the Americans, and increasingly the Asian nations are relatively contributing less, and they should be contributing more.

Mr. McGEE. In response to the Senator from Illinois, I would say, first, that he should be assured that I stand here not to make an apology for an administration position or an administration case.

I sought to cast the point of the thrust on his third issue—the failure of our Asian allies and those in Western Europe to carry their fair share—in its historic setting, to remind all of us that this is nothing new which was just invented. This has almost always been the plight of the big power in the world.

I should like to address myself, first, to the suggestion that somehow we have not put the squeeze on these people to do their fair share. The Senator knows as well as I that that is not true; that every time there is a confrontation, every time an ambassador makes a call, every time a private team makes a visit, the screws are turned again, urging and urging for still more. That is how these things have happened; that is how they have come to pass. The picture is entirely different now than it was 12 months ago. Then it was much different than it was 12 months before that.

It is a slow process, because you are not the dictator. You can command satellites. Allies happen to be equals, and you have to move along in some orderly way by persuasion. You cannot browbeat; you cannot kick. You have to persuade.

In every conference of which I have known, in every confrontation at which I have been present, this was always one of the great thrusts: Do more, do more, do more. But what it all says, really, is that whether they do or not, or when they do it, is still relatively less important than the fact that they get the job done. That is the big question, even if it means doing a disproportionate amount of it ourselves. That is a far more important issue than weighing the relative contributions of a multilateral effort.

We are the big guys. We are the victors of the last war. We are the only great power in that area, in terms of sheer power capability. For that reason, it will be this way for a long time to come.

But rather than getting worse, the situation is getting better. It is moving in the direction of a greater participation by more, in greater depth.

The Senator knows, also, that we dare not converse about some of the aspects of this matter on the floor of the Senate, in open session, and that four and possibly six Southeast Asian countries are involved in terms of the type of help that has been available all along. It does not happen to be a headline.

I believe that in wartime we must take those things in stride. For that reason, it ill behooves us to throw out rather quick generalizations about how little they are doing, when it is not possible to talk at all times about how much they are doing.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. McGEE. I yield.

Mr. PERCY. The source of the information that I have just related is the State Department. Either I have been misled, or this is all that those countries are doing. If the Senator from Wyoming refutes the statements I have made, as to the degree of support these countries have given, I should like to have more evidence and more facts.

Until I hear such facts I will stand firm on the ground that this administration has failed the American people and failed this war effort, and has failed our boys in South Vietnam by not getting sufficient help from our allies whose political integrity and whose well-being and personal freedom are at greater stake than ours.

When the Senator indicated that on every occasion we have asked for more help but have not gotten it, and that it is going to take time, I would ask: How much time? We have only been able to get 45,000 to 50,000 troops to match ours from all of the Asian nations and our allies in 7 years. How many more years do we have to wait?

If on every occasion we have asked for this kind of help, why did Clark Clifford, when he served as an emissary of the administration on a much heralded trip to Southeast Asia, when asked if he had asked for help, say, "No." Why, with all of the power that he carried with the voice of the President, did he come back and say he did not ask for help? Either his instructions failed to embrace what I feel and the Senator feels they should embrace or he did not tell us the truth when he got back, because he may have asked for help and was turned down and did not want to report that.

I do not make any implications. I accept the statement that he made when he returned, "I did not ask for help," which seems to repudiate the statement of the Senator that on every occasion we asked for help. The help is not there.

Denmark has provided medical supplies and has trained nurses in Denmark, but we have given nearly a billion dollars, or $920 million in aid to Denmark.

I am going country by country from a list supplied to me at my request by the State Department, when I asked what have we done for those countries and what are we doing now. As far as I know they reported a full disclosure and it is a minuscule effort compared with the gravity of the situation as announced day after day, month after month, and year after year by this administration.

It contributes to the misunderstanding, the disunity, frustration, and unhappiness of the American people which resoundingly, by a 69-percent vote, has indicated it does not support the policies of this administration. In my report I was simply trying to analyze this point.

Mr. McGEE. I suggest, first of all, that the Senator is fully aware that some of these things that are available to him are not available publicly, as he well knows. I suggest that the Senator go back and have another sit-down session. It would not make for a speech in the Senate Chamber. I was suggesting that perhaps we are more interested in headlines than in getting things done. I was suggesting that in perspective, in terms of what they are doing, I wish they would all do more and do a great deal more.

The suggestion from the Senator seems to be that we have not tried, which is a grossly unfair and wrong statement. The facts that he himself recites suggest that you have participation here in its overall complexities that does considerable credit to Southeast Asia and Southeast Asians. We went through this in Korea. Part of the price we learned there was the fact that the nation that emerges as the greatest power in the world is addled with that thankless burden.

Others helped us there for psychological reasons. However, it remained an American unilateral operation except for the freakishness of that Friday afternoon in the United Nations when we were able to slip through a helpful resolution in that body.

The Senator did say we should keep this matter in proper perspective. Our request and our hope for allies has hardly stretched over 7 years, however. The decision for the buildup came in January of 1965. The first large infusion of American troops was not until the spring of 1965, scarcely more than 2 years ago. I would request that the Senator not impinge on the facts any more than the facts suggest. It is a tough enough experience to treat allies as allies and not attempt to make light of the contribution of the Filipinos and the Thais, or other Southeast Asian countries, where it does make a difference.

Thus, I submit to my friend that we have to sophisticate our action to understand that the first requisite is that the job has to get done. The next consideration is how much help can we get to accomplish the job. I am afraid that the Senator's suggestion tends to at least turn it around a little, and too much the other way.

If it is agreeable to the Senator, let us shift to the fourth point that he has made. The fourth point, and I shall read it:

> Fourth is his failure to pursue every possibility for negotiations leading to a settlement of the war.

I say, with some frustration, Mr. President, that this comes as a considerable shock and it is going to be a position difficult not only to sell to the American people, least of all to ascribe to them.

Whatever conduct may be called into this, we have probed, pried, pushed, begged anybody, everybody, everywhere to try. We have made it clear, the President has made it clear, the Secretary of State has made it clear, and it has been reemphasized to ascertain if there is not some way, somehow we can sit down and talk. Just give it a try; the President will go anywhere. He repeated that on Friday night and he means it, I am sure. The Secretary of State said a while back, "Anywhere you can produce one North Vietnamese who is willing to talk, just one, anywhere."

The cruelest cut of all would be to suggest that we have failed to probe and to test not only the probable, or likely, or the official, but even improbable, unlikely, and unofficial, in the hope that some of them would meet at some time in a breakthrough; and that there might come that propitious moment when there might be a taker in Hanoi. It still takes two. Nowhere can anyone suggest any visible, measurable shifting of attitude, as far as Hanoi is concerned. It still takes two.

I do think that point No. 4 is a spurious suggestion in terms of explaining the problems of the attitude of frustration about the war. We all know that experience of frustration; we all do. I suggest that this point does not have depth or meaning to the man in the street.

Mr. PERCY. If this is a spurious suggestion and cannot be valid, it is a suggestion supported by a great many of my distinguished colleague's friends on his side of the aisle; in fact, far more Senator on that side than on my side of the aisle.

It has been the contention of a distinguished member of the Committee on Foreign Relations and others that we have failed to pursue every possibility for negotiations leading to a settlement of the war.

I only point to the past Ambassador to the United Nations, a distinguished member of the administration, who told a reliable reporter, as it was fully reported after his death, his great disappointment that we had—and I cannot remember the exact words—muffed the chances offered to us.

I do not ordinarily quote from Communists or Soviet officials as an authority, but Kosygin, and our allies such as Mr. Wilson, and many other powerful states which are not spurious, felt that there was an opportunity, if the bombing had been stopped, to begin negotiations. I do wish to point out that I did not consider the President's letter to Ho Chi Minh as a basis for successfully pursuing serious negotiations. As I remember that letter, the President simply indicated that if they would stop infiltrating and sending supplies to their forces already in South Vietnam, we would undertake negotiations.

I can just imagine what the reaction of the distinguished Senator from Wyoming would be if Ho Chi Minh had made an offer, presumably in good faith, that he would sit down at a negotiating table provided American ships would stop coming into South Vietnam, provided we would not send a single additional American soldier or a pound more of supplies into South Vietnam. If we would cut off the 500,000 American boys in South Vietnam, and then he would sit down and negotiate with us.

That is not the basis for serious negotiation. That is not even a letter coming from a responsible office that intends, really, seriously to negotiate. There is no human being of whom I know to be responsible who would feel that was a reasonable basis for negotiation.

I merely come back to the point that I think would be supported by a large number of Members on the other side of the aisle, when I say what I consider to be important and responsible, and a very moderate statement, that the administration has failed to pursue every possi-

bility for negotiation leading to a settlement of the war. The principal point that once again I wish to reiterate is that I am not trying to make it as a condemnation of the administration per se. That would serve no useful purpose. I am trying to explain, and am trying to understand myself as I pursue this question, why it is that the American people feel this way, and why it is that a large part of the American people feel that the administration has not successfully pursued negotiations in every way possible.

Mr. McGEE. In the course of the question on negotiations, over 2½ years now of the intense part of the war, there has been a recurring buildup of some kind of demand for a special kind of feeler or proposal. Invariably, the terms change as the war intensifies and the dimensions change. I think it is important, when we sketch this from 2 years ago, and the evolution through the letter last January to the declarations at the present time, that we keep them in their proper context at the moment they were projected and what they meant at that time. But the nub of them all is that every single proposed request advanced among the critics as an idea was encompassed in some phase of the approaches, sometimes through some source. Whether third parties, allies, agents of a private source, or individuals of a public sort, it matters not. The record is replete with them. I question seriously the real role that this has, as it may or may not lurk in the thoughts of the average American.

Because the record is so stark. We had the bombing interruptions, not once, twice, but three times, and each time with the door wide open and only a hardening of taking advantage of it, not even sitting still, but taking advantage of it. We have had every kind of proposal that has been tested and tried, and always the answers are the same. The only different answers we get are those which Ho Chi Minh used to give visting travelers of one sort or another, where he does not have to take the consequences. But when the chips are down, the blank wall is still there.

It takes two to negotiate. I would question any valid, reasonable, or even sometimes rather unlikely patterns of formulas, for testing the genuineness of the Vietnamese. The ultimate was just reached where now the President says and the Secretary says, "Just give us the assurance that you will really sit down." They do not ask for anything more than that. "Just give us the assurance that you will really sit down." And the same reply. It does not matter. But the degree of shift there must be compared in its proper context.

Now I know that the Senator has a dinner engagement, as I have——

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. McGEE. I am glad to yield briefly.

Mr. MILLER. I also have a dinner engagement, but what we are talking about here is important.

I should like to make one observation. It just could be that the way the offer of negotiations has been brought on by the administration and its spokesmen has tended to diminish the possibility of success.

I do not deny the good faith. I do not deny that any member of the administration, let alone any Member of the legislative branch, would infinitely rather have the problems in South Vietnam resolved by peaceful means than by war. But the Senator will recall a speech entitled "Unconditional Negotiations," when the President of the United States first came out and offered to negotiate without any conditions at all.

I am sure this did not convey to the North Vietnamese that the President was willing to have negotiations carried on without the basic understanding that the U.S. commitment in South Vietnam would be upheld. That was so basic to the whole war and the negotiations that might be carried out that I am quite sure the North Vietnamese understood this, very loud and clear, and that they were not impressed by the term "unconditional negotiations."

Thus, right there, I think we got off on the wrong foot.

If we had talked about the desire for negotiations, but letting it be understood that we did not expect to negotiate away the U.S. commitment, I think probably it would have been better received than it was.

Then, further, there has been so much publicity attendant on the offers to negotiate that we could well have caused the North Vietnamese to get the idea that we were so worried about the situation that if they just hung on long enough, the United States, might cave in, especially cave in here in Washington.

I talked to foreign diplomats. My guess is, and many colleagues feel this way, that all of the attendant publicity in connection with these offers and attempts to obtain peaceful negotiations, was not well received by foreign diplomats. They might have been well received by the American voting public but not by foreign diplomats. The best way to handle it would have been to do it quietly.

So I think the way in which this activity has been carried on has had an adverse effect. No one knows whether we could have had peaceful negotiations by using any other approach up until now. But knowledgeable persons have stated that we were going about them in the wrong way.

I think the Senator from Illinois has a point. I believe there has been good faith on the part of the administration. I do not deny that. But it has not borne fruit. I have heard just too many people who were much more knowledgeable than the Senator from Iowa say that we got off to a very bad start when the President said we would have unconditional negotiations, because certainly the leaders in Hanoi knew that that was not the case. The repetition of that statement and the publicity that has been attendant on those efforts has not done any good at all; as a matter of fact, I think it has probably given Hanoi cause for feeling that if it just hangs on long enough, the United States is so eager to enter into negotiations that maybe North Vietnam will win the war anyhow.

Mr. McGEE. The Senator from Iowa knows, as I do, that the negotiations that have been talked about or publicized are minimal. We could probably name them on the fingers of one hand. In contrast with this, I am sure that, in terms of general public knowledge, every avenue has been tried, whether public, private, secret, classified, prayerful, or hopeful. Whatever it was, every acceptable one was tried.

If in the fourth suggestion that the Senator from Illinois makes there is some better way to do it, some other way to do it, that we do not yet know about, or that might work, I think he owes it to somebody to be sure to spell out, privately or secretly, whatever it is.

I do not believe the record at all supports the suggestion that is alleged that these attempts have been ignored or have been goofed. I think everything has been tried. Nothing has been left untried, untested, or unattempted. Who is to say whether what was done was or was not wrong? We cannot know. We have to try and then, according to our best judgment, make the kind of attempt that we hope will be successful.

I would not want the impression left that those who have to take the consequences for making those attempts do not want to end the war. The Senator from Iowa and the Senator from Illinois would, I am sure, agree now that the President and the Secretary of State would give anything if they could bring the war to a close. They are not about to fumble or kick away an opportunity to end the war, if it is humanly possible to end it. I think this is the point we have to come back to every time. Such an allegation, it seems to me, is clearly out of line with the hard facts concerning negotiations, proposals, attempts, suspicions, inklings, or whatever we want to call them.

There have been more than 300 of them, according to what I have read. All of them have been pursued to the point where they were proved to be false, unyielding, or whatever the situation was.

Mr. PERCY. I have not the slightest doubt that the President, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of Defense would like to see the conflict come to a swift and satisfactory conclusion. I am certain that they are doing everything they can toward that end. But I believe that the Secretary of State, a man whom I respect greatly, a man to whom we are all indebted for the task he is performing for his country, is a victim of the problem the administration faces.

I think this is the credibility gap that exists between the American people and the administration, and the rest of the world and the American Government, today, and possibly it has even seeped into the enemy camp.

I think we have to try to analyze and understand as much as we can about the mentality of the enemy, because that is the mentality we have to negotiate with. For instance, the position taken by South Vietnam is that they will not negotiate with the Vietcong. If we do not have enough influence on the allies we are

helping and supporting to help them get off that deadend street and that unrealistic approach, there is something wrong with us. I can only judge this from something Ambassador Lodge said; namely, if we destroy the enemy force, we would still have 150,000 Vietcong in South Vietnam. We cannot pretend they do not exist or that we are killing them all off. They are probably being born faster than we can kill them today. So I do not think that is a realistic attitude.

I think we also have to look at the evidence that comes out of North Vietnam. An authoritative source indicated he had talked with high-ranking officials in Vietnam and asked them when they would be willing to negotiate with the Americans over this war. He said that that particular Vietnamese official looked at him and indicated the question how we would expect them to trust any negotiations with the American Government when even the American people do not trust the American Government and what it says at all. So this credibility gap is one of the great problems and one of the prices we pay.

We did face this problem in Korea. A man came along—I admit one in a century—who said, "I will go to Korea and try to settle this," and he did settle that war.

So maybe a change of face is necessary. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], who does not have a partisan bone in his body when it comes to saying what is right for this country, said that maybe a change of administration would give a face-saving door through which the enemy could walk, now that they realize—and certainly they must realize—that they cannot win this war, and sit down and negotiate, as so many Members of this body called for in a provision added to the defense appropriation bill.

Mr. McGEE. I cannot accept that that fanciful or real-meaning phrase "credibility" gap has in fact now become the deterrent in Hanoi for the Senator to peddle as the motivating reason why he cannot trust the United States, because the people do not trust the President of the United States. It seems to me that is so utterly ridiculous that I think it is very questionable in terms of good judgment.

The integrity and reputation of this government have been upheld, I think, beyond serious doubt all over the world, under rather trying circumstances. That has been a part of the record. I think the integrity of the President is the same.

For the reason I do not think we ought to give credence, or even the time of day, to whatever Hanoi might allege was its uncertainty in terms of whether they could trust an American negotiator.

I would think the Senator from Illinois might wish to withdraw that particular statement, or modify it in some way, because I cannot believe he believes it.

Mr. PERCY. I will expand on it.

Mr. McGEE. The Senator has learned the way of the Senate quickly.

Mr. PERCY. I will report it as a statement from an authoritative source. I was repeating it because it was germane to the argument and the understanding as to the mentality of the enemy and what is possibly going through their minds. But if the Senator from Wyoming is to maintain that this could not be a factor, I think it is unrealistic. How many times, through private persons and publicly, has the enemy condemned what they felt was an understanding and agreement in Geneva which was not lived up to, and of which they say they want no part? That is why it is going to be so difficult to get them to Geneva. They feel that an agreement was made—which we were not a party to; thank heavens that we were not a party to that agreement—was not carried out, namely honest elections—

Mr. McGEE. We were not a signatory to that.

Mr. PERCY. That is right. I say, thank heaven we were not, because that election was not held——

Mr. McGEE. I wondered why the Senator has held that up as an illustration.

Mr. PERCY. Because they have pointed that out as a reason for being suspicious of any negotiating settlement, and they have indicated their willingness to carry on the fight for 1,000 years rather than sit down at a conference table.

But if the question of the credibility of this administration, its integrity, is the point—I think it has been alluded to by the Senator that I am off base on it and that we should not waste the time of day talking about it—I can only say that millions and millions of words of some of the most responsible members of the press have referred to what is known as the credibility gap. We could cite chapter and verse for years as to what has been built up in the American mind as contributing to this credibility gap.

I am not saying that this administration alone is at fault, because I am positive that it has existed under Republican as well as Democratic administrations, that at times the whole truth and nothing but the truth was not told to the American public.

But a pattern of misleading statements has become so consistent that there is now a so-called credibility gap, which is not a term manufactured by me nor, to my knowledge, by any member of my party, but manufactured and developed by the members of the fourth estate, who are constantly, day by day, 24 hours a day, dealing with the administration, to indicate that they simply feel there has been a lack of good faith in the reporting to the American people of events that have transpired that affect the security, the well-being, and the future of the American people and the Nation.

Mr. McGEE. I was not intending to deal with the credibility gap as an issue, a question, or a factor in our dialog here, at all, and did not inject it. It was my understanding that the Senator from Illinois had suggested that because of the credibility gap Hanoi had told some responsible person in South Vietnam that they could not trust Americans in a negotiation because of whatever they meant by that term credibility gap. My suggestion had nothing to do with the import of that term here at home at all. It had to do with the idea that this was a valid element in understanding that the North Vietnamese would not negotiate, that they could not trust an American negotiator because of what they heard the American people saying in their debate.

I think it is germane to suggest at this point that I am sure that our divisiveness here at home has brought joy to Hanoi. But I happen to be one of those who thinks that is proper; that it is a part of the price we have to pay, in these times. I do not favor cutting off the allegations or the criticisms; I think we may have to face more of them, and that we must continue in that fashion; that the price we would pay for cutting them off would be far higher than I am prepared to pay. I think we have to be sophisticated enough to live with it. Hanoi will exploit that fact to the ultimate, but I reject that as an excuse for Hanoi not to sit down at the conference table, because they could not trust an American negotiator; and for that reason I raise the question with the Senator from Illinois, not because of the use of the term "credibility gap" here at home at all.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I realize that we should draw this colloquy to an end, out of consideration for Senators and staff who must stay until we finish; but we do have this problem, and it may be a contributing factor in our inability to get to the negotiating table.

There is always, in any negotiation, the question of the degree of sincerity of both parties. If one party does not believe, whether rightly or wrongly, that the other party is sincere in its professions and accurate in its statements and its representations, then I think it may understandably contribute to the fact that they are unwilling to get together to negotiate; because even if, under such circumstances, a satisfactory basis for negotiation were found, and it ended up signed, sealed, and delivered, the negotiator might not have the confidence that the terms would be carried out.

I wish to conclude by quoting, not a Republican, but a distinguished Democrat, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the U.S. Senate, who recently said:

> The country sickens for lack of moral leadership.

Moral leadership implies all that that term embraces, with respect to the ability to achieve credibility in negotiating a settlement of some sort with an adversary who is suspicious of you to begin with.

Mr. McGEE. I do not intend to get into the things that many Senators have said on the floor here. A great many things have been said, because, again, Senators do not have to take the consequences. This floor has produced a great many declarations that probably are not very illuminating in terms of policy problems at the time that they are uttered. They are uttered in the context of some irresponsibility.

The fifth of the Senator's points is the failure of the President to learn from experience that every U.S. escalation is matched by the enemy, and only brings more casualties.

It seems to me that the Senator has

this turned around, in reverse order; that there was no escalation until the other side began to escalate. That is why we are there. And I think it is imperative that we keep that in the right order, and to realize that we have to do what increasing pressures require.

The limited nature of the war, the dimension of the conflict when it began in 1965, has not changed. There has been reckless use of this quickie word "escalation," when the proper word would more properly and more clearly be "intensification." An escalation, in my judgment, would be a change of the dimension of the war, not an intensification of doing what we set out to do, as the commitment there became increasingly difficult within the confines and the jurisdiction of the original commitment; namely, to conduct the limited war, to simply seek to require that the north stop doing what it was doing. Our effort has been contained and confined to that. There has been no spreading of the conflict; there has been no slipping over into China in terms of the dimensions of the conflict; the broad outlines of the original undertaking have been adhered to, and thus, I think, a rather careless use of the word "escalation" every time another thousand marines lands there, when in fact once the commitment was determined upon, we could not put 500,000 men there the next Tuesday morning, because they had to be prepared for this special kind of warfare. It was a gradual buildup, as rapidly as we could make our manpower available; and yet every new landing was described as an escalation. To me, that is an abuse of the meaning of that word.

Thus, in those terms, I think we ought to keep things in the right order; and that is that we have kept this within its original dimensions. We have not expanded it recklessly and irresponsibly; in fact, it was charged by one of the Senator's Republican colleagues a few moments ago that we have leaned over too far backward to try to keep it under control and restraint.

Mr. President, we cannot play this game both ways. Either we have been too cautious, too fair, and too unescalating in our conduct of the war, or we have been the opposite; we cannot be both.

So I think sometimes the President is so caught between these barrages of words by which he is assaulted that he feels, "Damned if you do and damned if you don't," because he has to take the consequences; he has to live with the decision that is made, and not just talk about it in terms of what it might mean.

This fifth point of the Senator from Illinois does not contain, in my judgment, a valid explanation of where mistakes have been made, as he has described them.

Mr. PERCY. If the Senator will yield, because I was involved in a colloquy over the dictionary definition of another term, the word "opportunistic"—and I would not wish to be considered an opportunist now in this case—I would like to ask unanimous consent for the Webster definition of "escalate" to be printed in the RECORD, to see whether or not I am using the term in the proper sense.

I am trying to use a term which is understandable to the American people, because that is our problem, to communicate in understandable, unmistakable language what we mean.

I simply say that the war was escalated when we began taking the war to the north and bombing North Vietnam. That that was a distinct escalation; it was an upward movement of our effort, and it was done, as I understand it, for the purpose of making them pay a higher penalty for their involvement in the war. That end has certainly been accomplished. But also, it was presumed by some to mean that this "escalation" would weaken the will of the North Vietnamese people to resist, and would lessen the infiltration into South Vietnam, and thereby cut off supplies and manpower.

It has miserably failed in the last two categories; and anyone who could reassess the original position we had would say so, including Secretary McNamara, who maintains that was not even the original intention.

It has strengthened their will to resist. It has given them an enemy from the sky, raining down on civilian populations. I do not say that civilians can always be protected; but we must always measure how much value we get from bringing planes from Guam, 3,600 miles, to drop a bombload in the midst of a jungle, and merely kill a pig, a cow, or something like that, and then sending the planes all the way back to Guam, and whether this is a reasonable or sensible escalation.

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

Escalate. To ascend by or as by escalator.

Mr. PERCY. I thank the President. I should like to ask whether it is an escalation when, after having confined the bombing to areas well outside the Chinese borders—and the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense and the President of the United States clearly indicated that we did not want to involve the Chinese in it—we move up our bombers and two of them are shot down over China when we are bombing 7 miles from the Chinese border. Is that a proper use of that term as defined by Mr. Webster?

Mr. McGEE. In the opinion of the Senator from Wyoming, that is within the original definition of the limited development, vis-a-vis Hanoi and North Vietnam. If it were to involve an attack on the mainland of China, this would be a specific escalation in my judgment.

The aircraft shot down over China were not there as a matter of policy or escalation, but as a matter of accident. It has not been followed up since.

The escalation, it seems to me, has nothing to do with the number of men we have there or with the number of air strikes that are ordered as long as the demands remain roughly the same, and those have not changed. But the intensification of locking in combat has been changed. However, that, may I point out, was because the North Vietnamese began to build up very large launching platforms in the demilitarized zone, and whereas this was not an original area for assault on the part of our own troops, it became indispensable to move into some of those limited areas because of the advantage that was taken by the other side.

Mr. Webster's dictionary will not record on escalation that some umpteen thousands of North Vietnamese in large groups moved across the 17th parallel in the late weeks of 1964 and from there on into 1965, which provoked the decision to finally move into South Vietnam, which finally required the decision to bomb in the north.

And this is the order of things that makes the difference, and that is the reason I took exception to the statement of the Senator, because we did not provoke it. It was indeed perpetrated by the original action taken by the North Vietnamese.

I think that is an imperatively significant point that the Senator seems to take too lightly or gloss over here.

Mr. PERCY. My whole point is that we have to weigh the consequences of our action. And I know it has been said that these are military decisions and that we must leave it to the military. But it is going to be a political decision as to whether China comes in. It is going to be a political decision to tell the military, "We are in now. Move."

It will be the same as when there were a million Chinese forces who moved across the border of South Korea. They came over in human waves and mowed down our boys.

We provoked them into coming in, and we had a monopoly on the atomic bomb at that time. Certainly we could provoke them into coming in now.

The Secretary of State said that he could not give a guarantee that they would not come in. We could provoke them merely because they might want a common enemy in order to consolidate all the dissident elements that exist in China today.

We could provoke them to do something that it is said could not be done.

With all our electronic gadgets, we assured ourselves that we would not fly over China. Yet, two planes have been shot down over China.

We know that many of the great wars have been provoked over small incidents, and this might very well be the case here.

We were told that we could not lose an atomic bomb. Tell that to the Spaniards. We had great difficulty in getting it back.

How much of a gamble do we want to take? How much do we want to try to entice them?

Actually, if they were bombing America and the bombs fell in Mexico, 7 miles from the Rio Grande, Lyndon Baines Johnson would feel a little different than if the bombs fell farther away from his beloved Texas.

We can provoke this action if we are too reckless. It has been the policy of this administration to be prudent.

How many have said, "Bomb them back to the stone age"? We cannot take that kind of a risk. This is a limited war, but we have gradually escalated the effort, and it has always been matched by a new escalation from the enemy.

The Soviets have signed a new agreement for assistance, and the Chinese have stepped up their assistance.

What are we going to do next to en-

tice them to bring a whole series of armies down there?

This is all I am asking. I am not asking that we give up bombing the supply routes. I have advocated for months that we bomb the supply routes and pound away at those routes and concentrate on that. However, it is of limited value, it would seem to me, to take the risk of knocking out a bridge or a road 7 miles from China when that road could be taken out as effectively without doing it 60 seconds away from the Chinese border by jet plane.

The road can be taken out some place else without further endangering the outcome of the war and the lives of American men by taking needless risks.

As I said, point five is his failure to learn from experience that every U.S. escalation of this type is matched by the enemy and only brings more and more American casualties.

Mr. McGEE. The Senator has now moved on to the sixth point as well, because they are linked together. I think it makes it more convenient to tie them together.

The sixth point is that the President has failed to recognize that bombing so near China has already caused the Chinese and the Soviets to massively increase their military role in support of Hanoi.

Therefore, it ups the ante generally along the line.

This is a curious charge in many ways for the reason that the charge against the administration is that it has been forcing the men to fight with one hand tied down, that this has been limited and restrained, that it has been prudent. And I think that is the record of the whole conduct of this conflict, a consciousness and not taking any more steps to provoke a widening of the war in some irresponsible way. It is probably one of the heaviest considerations hanging over the head of every man in the Government tonight, whatever his philosophy may be.

For that reason, I do not see that any of this is out of that context. The tactical judgment in terms of whether to bomb within 10 miles or 7 miles is one of those hairline kinds of decisions that I will leave to those who are much closer to it.

I agree with the Senator that the presence of China is a conscious restraint at all times, but we cannot be so restrained that we fall flat on our faces, because the only way to have avoided that kind of decision was to not be there in the first place. I do not think the Senator agrees with that, that we should not have been there in the first place.

The Senator is simply interested, as we all are, in trying to find some way to deescalate the intensity of the combat and the loss of lives, and that somehow we can find a way to do it. But, if at some point we decide to take a stand, if we are called upon to take a position from which we will not retreat—namely, South Vietnam and the 17th parallel—we would have an instance then where we are going to have to reach that point where there is the risk of some kind of Chinese difficulty and we will be face to face with the policymaking.

The only way we can avoid that is not to have been there. That is the kind of close decisionmaking that must accompany every mission into the north, and I think it is to the credit of our system that those decisions have been reserved to the civilian commander of this country, and not to the generals.

The generals have to deliver on order. They are only tacticians, but the policy has remained political and diplomatic rather than military.

It is desperately important that we recognize it. It is one of the most frustrating things about the entire conflict. It is not a good, old-fashioned war. The old rules do not obtain. This is probably as frustrating an experience as any people can be expected to go through. It is my position that we have to go through with it and that we have to learn to live with that type of frustration, because the other side will not play fair—and they should not play fair, for the reason that they do not have the means to come out in the open and fight as they did in the old days. They are fighting the type of conflict they are best equipped to continue: guerrilla conflict, where they can hit and run.

We must learn to live with that type of conflict, without losing our composure or our tempers—and that means restraint. I would join the Senator in urging that type of restraint, in contemplation of where we ought to go or ought not to go vis-a-vis North Vietnam.

But that is not to suggest, therefore, that we are on the brink of plunging this country into war with China. I believe the Senator put it best of all when he suggested that, for all we know, the Chinese might decide to go to war for no reason. And that is part of the risk you have to take. To take any other type of approach to the matter would simply be to roll over and play dead, to forfeit the strategically important, critically significant vacuums, if you will, the filling of which makes a difference in terms of who does the filling and with what ingredients.

So, mindful as we all are that a nuclear conflict must be rejected, if we can; that war with China should be avoided, if somehow it can be, some things are even worse. One of those would be to contribute to the coming of that type of showdown because we were afraid to call their hand on the Rhineland in 1936, to call their hand in Manchuria in 1931.

What I am suggesting is that the parallels we should have learned from 30 years ago should warn us now that, with all the risks, the chances of succeeding are greater by stopping it at the beginning, at the outset, than to move away or look away and hope there is a cheaper time or a better place to do it, or some other way.

In a nuclear world, I suspect that this type of very limiting, frustrating war is the only kind of war that dare be risked. It is not a very happy one to cope with in terms of public opinion.

I share the point. I believe that the objection to the point does not reflect upon the President of the United States in his conduct of policy, that he has been mindful of—that this administration has been mindful of—the importance of trying to keep this matter localized, to keep it in its perimeter, rather than spreading it recklessly to some other area of the globe.

Mr. PERCY. I believe all it does is reflect on his judgment, and I believe the judgment of the administration has been incredibly bad. In my opinion, this is the contributing factor to so much dissatisfaction by the country and why an overwhelming and vast majority of the country indicates today their disagreement with the policy of this administration in the conduct of the war.

This judgment has been bad. And if I could speak just on behalf of, say, the superhawks—and I would be an unbecoming spokesman for that particular thought—I believe it would be their argument that the judgment of this administration should have been to not lull the country into a placid condition, to not promise that we could end this without sacrifice, that we would not have to, say, call up the Reserves or not have to sacrifice in all our domestic programs; that we could have a great society at home and we could wage a war abroad, and even promise a great society to Southeast Asia—and do all that without the sacrifices necessary, the sacrifices possibly necessary for a politician, a public officeholder, to stand up and say what the consequences must be.

I believe it is the position of those who feel we ought to get in and win this war, and get it over with once and for all, that by constantly piecing out forces, sending a thousand men now, a thousand men a few days later, never really telling the American people what the price is going to be, what the number of men will be, what it is going to take to win this war, to placate the American people and get them used to this escalation, we are really detracting from the effectiveness, instead of just saying, "This is what it is going to be, and we are going to do it," and doing it, and not giving the enemy time to constantly build up with forces that counter our forces, that cost America more lives and more American casualties.

This is why I cannot help trying to report as honestly, as reasonably, and as responsibly as I can. These are the seven reasons why the American people are so critical today of the conduct of the war—and critical on both sides.

I can only judge by results. So far as I can hear from the American people and report to the President and Congress, the results simply are not there, in the opinion of the American people; and that is why there is growing dissatisfaction with the conduct of the war and with the administration's policy.

I should like to say, however, that I deeply appreciate the spirit in which the distinguished Senator from Wyoming has addressed himself to my "2-minute" remarks this afternoon. I hope they were important remarks, and I hope someone would care about them. I have no omniscient feeling that my judgment is the absolute judgment on these matters. But I deeply appreciate the conscientious, careful, thoughtful, and reasonable approach that the distinguished Senator has taken to each of these points, and the eloquence with which

he has articulated and defended the administration's position—a position that I believe is eminently wrong and is being so judged by the American people and the people of the world, but which I do not believe could have been more persuasively argued than was done in the colloquy this afternoon.

Mr. McGEE. I thank my colleague, the Senator from Illinois, for his generous comments. I remind him that it is not often that one has a pleasant dialogue on a subject that is so charged with great fear and great feeling as is the difficult and complex question of Vietnam.

I pay tribute to the Senator for having the courage to bring this matter before the Senate.

I would urge upon him, however, that the dialogue itself should not be measured, as a contribution of a discussion between a Democrat and a Republican, or separated by an aisle or an administration; that the differences between the distinguished Senator from Illinois and some of his colleagues on his side of the aisle are as great as—perhaps even greater than—the differences between this Democrat and some of his colleagues on his side of the aisle. What that says is that it is less a political partisan sort of question. It is even less a question of liberals and conservatives than it is a question of such intermeshed difficulties and decisionmaking requirements that many of the decisions turn out to be, let us say, 51 percent good and 49 percent bad. Because it is so close, do we then not make a decision? The answer is that somebody had to decide each step along the way. And that is why it is deeply important that dialogues such as this continue, and not at the partisan level, not even at the liberal-conservative level, but rather at a level of trying to thrash out all the options, so that, if possible, the wiser of the options can be chosen or the least evil of the bad options can be chosen. Sometimes the answers are all bad. Some are just worse than others. I believe it is that type of reality in which we find ourselves, and in which some decisions must be made.

The fact we come down to, it seems to me, is that as we assess the picture in Southeast Asia, as we weigh the alternatives that confront us, there is very little wiggling room where rational people have to go. There is little wiggling room. We may disagree on the intensity of the moment on carrying out a particular aspect, but the basis is there, the direction is there, the concept of limiting this conflict is there, and the wish to end it and to somehow bring it to a close pervades everywhere. The disagreements are in the methods.

I express my appreciation in the hope that somehow we may have contributed a little in the differences we have exhibited here.

I think we are going to have more of this kind of difficult frustration with our constituents and each other in these times because it is the first time in our history that we have been called upon in the world to display this role of the chief victor in a world war of one whose responsibility it is to try to maintain enough stability that peaceful change can prevail over violent change if at all possible. If all of this means you cannot run the rules of the old days where somebody wins and somebody loses, I suspect we are living in a time where wars can never be won but can be lost. I think it is a hard fact of our times. The old cliches about victory and defeat no longer have meaning and no longer apply because you have to keep your priorities and objectives on what the main goals are. Our main goal, it seems to me, is a more peaceful world.

I believe what we seek to help to do in Southeast Asia is achieve the chance where we will move a little closer to that kind of opportunity in Eastern Asia. We have come close to it in Eastern Europe, and closer than some people think.

Mr. Lee Kuan Yew stated it better when he said:

> If you Americans succeed in standing firm in Vietnam, Eastern Asia will be closer to stability than at any time during this century.

I think there is much in what he said.

I thank the Senator from Illinois for his indulgence in this lengthy colloquy of what was to have been a 2-minute opening address.

Mr. PERCY. I thank the distinguished Senator. Any time he feels more comfortable on this side of the aisle, I know he would have the welcoming arms of 36 Senators welcoming him over.

This is not a partisan debate made on my side of the aisle. There are many Senators on my side of the aisle who would agree with the Senator's side of the argument, just as there is one man I have listened to, revered, respected, and admired more than most men I have met in my life, the distinguished majority leader of the Senate, who might tend to find points of agreement in my argument. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McGEE. I would say to the Senator from Illinois that in most other States, given his philosophy and point of view, he would have to run as a Democrat in order to be elected. These are matters that vary with the States.

Mr. PERCY. I have given my daughter. That is enough.

RECESS UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until 10 a.m. tomorrow, in accordance with the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate (at 7 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.) took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, October 3, 1967, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 2, 1967:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Harrison M. Symmes, of North Carolina, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, vice Findley Burns, Jr.

Hugh H. Smythe, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Malta.

Having designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, Vice Adm. John J. Hyland, U.S. Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate him for appointment to the grade of admiral.

Having designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, Rear Adm. William F. Bringle, U.S. Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate him for appointment to the grade of vice admiral.

Adm. Roy L. Johnson, U.S. Navy, when retired, for appointment to the grade of admiral pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 5233.

THE JUDICIARY

Erwin N. Griswold, of Massachusetts, to be Solicitor General of the United States, vice Thurgood Marshall.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 2, 1967:

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Emory S. McNider, Coffeeville.
Edna M. Usrey, Gurley.
Margaret S. Carter, Myrtlewood.
Pete Holman, Titus.

ARIZONA

Fern E. Morgan, Fort Defiance.
O'Reece T. Cleve, Inspiration.
M. Louise Zufelt, Kayenta.
Curtis L. Steveson, Kearny.
Betty L. Dunagan, Peach Springs.
Paul W. Strain, Sun City.

ARKANSAS

William C. McArthur, Dyess.
George E. Fryer, Russellville.
James F. Cannon, Saratoga.

CALIFORNIA

Morris A. Hoff, Aromas.
Charles E. Cotten, Boron.
Margaret Bridgham, Coloma.
Clarence J. Barry, Jr., Davis.
Lodema K. Cook, East Irvine.
LeRoy B. Stewart, El Cajon.
William A. Ellis, Exeter.
Raymond W. Gribbin, La Verne.
John W. Panighetti, Los Gatos.
Virginia F. Martin, Pioneer.
Bernice M. Willson, Richvale.

COLORADO

Russell C. Bowlby, Hideaway Park.
Cecil S. Hofmann, Iliff.
Donald G. Haynes, Jamestown.

FLORIDA

Richard M. Collins, Largo.

GEORGIA

R. Eldon Wilkinson, Leary.

IDAHO

Jasper E. Heller, Gooding.
Fay J. Evans, Malad City.
Phil Raymond Perkins, Montpelier.
Paul H. Boxleitner, Riggins.

ILLINOIS

James R. Huston, Braceville.
Francis L. Hogan, Byron.
Harold S. Gilvin, Cambridge.
Gordon R. McDowell, Cave in Rock.
Ralph J. Einhorn, Crete.
Richard W. Otto, Danvers.
Paul R. Hughes, Earlville.
Mary L. Yocum, Edgewood.
Jackie L. Moore, Gilson.
Paul E. Tucker, Jerseyville.
John R. Wallace, Omaha.
John J. Curbis, Panama.
Averil L. Keller, Sainte Marie.

Robert J. LaPointe, Westmont.
Pasquale C. Fiandaca, Winfield.

INDIANA

Wilma G. Rice, Helmsburg.
Edith E. Cain, Heltonville.
Mary J. Griepenstroh, Lamar.
Donald F. Reidy, Medaryville.
Edna M. Gatewood, Poseyville.
Sam D. Talbert, Russiaville.
Glenn Dougan, Spurgeon.
James R. Kirkwood, Summitville.
Walter P. Hoke, Tipton.
Joseph J. Sorota, Whiting.

IOWA

Wayne G. Smith, Adair.
Edward P. Farrell, Algona.
Walter C. Anawalt, Cedar Rapids.
Robert F. Miller, Clarence.
Roy B. Martin, Junior, Clear Lake.
Duane P. Conrad, Dallas.
Quincy I. Rice, Delta.
Vernon P. Tiefenthaler, Halbur.
Bernard J. Mullaley, Marion.
Edmund J. Langenberg, Tiffin.

KANSAS

James M. Cameron, Summerfield.

KENTUCKY

Ernestine Ward, Inez.
Harry H. Boaz, Mayfield.

LOUISIANA

Bessie R. Brumble, Bethany.
Eva M. Boudreaux, Centerville.
Edward O. Douglas, De Quincy.
Hubert J. Bayham, Senior, Grosse Tete.
Evelina F. Agoff, Lafitte.

MAINE

H. Lloyd Carey, Augusta.
Robert A. Winslow, East Boothbay.
Mary F. Worcester, Harrington.
Robert R. Kendall, Perry.

MARYLAND

Arthur G. Virts, Jr., Boyds.
L. Everett Marvel, Easton.
Dorothy C. Bowie, Faulkner.
William J. Thomas, IV, Sandy Spring.
Wilber B. Leizear, Silver Spring.

MASSACHUSETTS

Joseph P. Dahdah, Feeding Hills.
Norman W. Daunais, Graniteville.
Edward M. Bassett, Jr., Leominster.
Warren E. Ward, Lunenburg.
Walter D. Calnan, Merrimac.
Gerald C. Tucke, North Chelmsford.
Raymond L. Stauff, Scituate.
Kenneth H. Doulette, South Easton.
William T. Trant, Westfield.

MICHIGAN

Marion E. Cooper, Jeddo.
Shirley H. Fogarty, Smiths Creek.

MINNESOTA

Albin L. Zinda, Appleton.
John C. Webster, Beltrami.
David H. Jennings, Truman.

MISSISSIPPI

Joseph E. Martin, Bentonia.
Samantha M. Denton, Crowder.

MISSOURI

Kenneth P. Grace, Albany.
Harold M. Sliffe, Archie.
Lloyd J. McGeorge, Bismarck.
Buford A. Patten, Miller.
Warren D. Osborn, Patton.
Charles R. Sands, Sr., Rolla.

MONTANA

Rex P. Guthrie, Columbus.
Milton M. Sloan, Whitefish.

NEBRASKA

William J. Kleinow, Curtis.
Alvin G. Staben, Elkhorn.
Robert L. Johnson, St. Edward.
Freda T. Shubert, Shubert.
Carson C. Williams, Stamford.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Rudolph E. Curry, Hampstead.
Arthur R. Beauchesne, Newmarket.
Milton B. Paradis, North Stratford.

NEW JERSEY

William R. Connelly, Jr., Cedar Knolls.
Betty W. Dunfee, Chatsworth.
Frank J. Sedita, Lodi.
Leonora T. Harrison, Tabor.

NEW YORK

John F. Schumaker, Albany.
George O. Barden, Barton.
Raymond L. Sabre, Calcium.
Donald A. Krantz, Callicoon.
James P. O'Connor, Sr., East Northport.
Edward B. Bierman, Jr., East Syracuse.
John J. Collins, Glens Falls.
John M. O'Malley, Le Roy.
Harold F. Pierson, Painted Post.
Francis A. Hanigan, Phoenicia.
Dorothy B. Hall, Richville.
Ruth B. Fraser, South Wales.
Raymond M. Yahnke, Sylvan Beach.

NORTH CAROLINA

George D. Elliott, Jr., Bath.
Merdice T. Simmons, Hampstead.
James R. Breedlove, Lake Toxaway.
Henry Franklin Wilson, Mount Ulla.
George H. Wall, Rolesville.

NORTH DAKOTA

Ralph A. Pederson, Park River.

OHIO

M. Virginia Miller, Fletcher.
George R. Cotter, Glouster.
David W. Barnes, Homerville.
Nello F. Bianchi, Put-in-Bay.

OKLAHOMA

LaWanda M. Smith, Milburn.
Bobby G. Pitts, Noble.
Clarence D. Robertson, Jr., Wapanucka.

OREGON

Alma M. Elliott, Chiloquin.
Marjorie A. Stumbaugh, Crescent.

PENNSYLVANIA

Martin E. Breit, Beaver Falls.
Florence M. Hannan, Bradfordwoods.
Lora E. Eschenbach, Clarendon.
John F. Schupp, Fryburg.
Katherine A. Hart, Genesee.
Dorothy J. Osterberg, McKean.
David J. Florentine, New Brighton.
Albert M. Fry, Orefield.
Myrtle A. Palm, Renfrew.
Robert B. Myers, State Line.
Frank A. Fargo, Warren.

PUERTO RICO

Mario Arroyo-Lopez, Toa Baja.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Tillman W. Derrick, Fort Mill.

SOUTH DAKOTA

LaVerne V. Binger, Tulare.
Milo L. Godfrey, Woonsocket.

TENNESSEE

Howard I. Harris, Dukedom.
Edward L. McDonald, Gallatin.
John G. Mitchell, Smyrna.
Dennis L. Lewis, White Bluff.

TEXAS

William T. Zimmerman, Burkburnett.
Jefferson D. Collier, Cisco.
Homer R. Anderson, Forestburg.
Harry D. Anderson, McCamey.
Ruby M. Mouser, Spade.
Nezie L. Duncan, Willis.
William H. Kennedy, Woodsboro.

UTAH

Majorie C. Christiansen, Mayfield.
Richard C. Stevenson, West Jordan.

VERMONT

Lawrence A. Williams, Newfane.
William B. Holton, Westminster.

VIRGINIA

John W. Wood, Jr., Pearisburg.
George E. Kidd, Williamsburg.
Joseph C. Haines, Winchester.

WASHINGTON

Lawrence T. Baker, Airway Heights.
Gunnar R. Johnson, Chelan.

WEST VIRGINIA

Charles C. Tickle, Bluefield.
Patricia W. Noel, Pratt.

WISCONSIN

Norman E. Anderson, Hudson.
Wallace J. Regan, Kohler.
Chris E. Youssi, Muskego.
Eugene L. Hoeffling, Poplar.

WYOMING

Betty J. Leonard, Bairoil.
Bessie E. Lieuallen, Fort Laramie.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, OCTOBER 2, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

In God is my salvation and my glory; the rock of my strength and my refuge is in God.—Psalm 62: 7.

O God and Father of us all, we know of no better way to begin the week than by lifting our hearts unto Thee in prayer and by pledging unto Thee the desire of our hearts to serve Thee by devoting ourselves to the welfare of our country and to the well-being of our fellow man.

In these stirring days which search our souls, try our faith, and often dampen our spirits, we pray for guidance that we may know Thy will, for courage to walk in Thy way, and for uplifting strength to keep on without faltering and without fainting.

We pray for peace and as we seek it may we be determined to protect our freedom against any aggressor. Both militarily and morally may we stand strong, and filled with Thy spirit continue to labor for liberty and justice for all. In the Master's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, September 29, 1967, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S.J. Res. 109. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation commemorating 50 years of service to the Nation by the Langley Research Center.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees 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) entitled "An act 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 Presiding Officer of the Senate, pursuant to Public Law 115, 78th Congress, entitled "An act to provide for the disposal of certain records of the U.S. Government," appointed Mr. MONRONEY and Mr. CARLSON members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate for the Disposition of Executive Papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States No. 68–4.

WALTER CHANDLER, A FORMER MEMBER OF THE HOUSE

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to announce to the House today the death of a former and great colleague, Walter Chandler. This grand old man passed away this morning in Memphis, the city which he served so long and so well as both its Representative in Congress and as its mayor. He would have been 80 years old on October 5 and it is ironic that those of us now serving in Congress from the Memphis area were planning to surprise him with a joint telephone call of good wishes.

Walter Chandler was a great American in the finest sense of the word. He lived and worked for his community and its people and in serving them he served America. He was a fighter for those causes in which he believed, a dedicated proponent of justice, a tough but considerate adversary in debating those with whom he disagreed. His sudden and unexpected death was in the Chandler tradition, still on his feet, still looking ahead, still ready to accept new challenges.

Memphis has lost a revered and beloved citizen. The Nation has lost a soul filled with greatness, but Memphis and the Nation are better because Walter Chandler lived. No man can earn a more sincere tribute from his fellow citizens.

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KUYKENDALL. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVERETT].

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, it was with very great sadness that I learned of the passing of one of the most distinguished men who ever served in the House of Representatives. Walter Chandler served as a member of the Judiciary Committee during his two and one-half terms in the House and became nationally known as the author of the Chandler Bankruptcy Act, which completely revised bankruptcy laws.

Perhaps I knew him better than any Member of our present Tennessee delegation. All during my adult life he was my close neighbor in Tennessee and a man for whom I had the greatest admiration and respect.

Just 2 weeks ago he was in Washington and our friend, Cliff Davis, who succeeded Mr. Chandler in this body, had him up for luncheon. I was privileged to join Mr. Davis and Captain Chandler, along with Zeake Johnson, who was born in the same town as was Mr. Chandler, Jackson, Tenn., at luncheon. He appeared in excellent health though he was reaching his 80th birthday.

We had a delightful time reminiscing about many things. He was able to speak to our great Speaker, with whom he had served, and they shared a mutual admiration, along with WRIGHT PATMAN and others who served in the House when he was here, and he had a good time exchanging experiences.

On the floor of the House he was literally besieged by well wishers and made many new friends.

Mr. Chandler served in the Tennessee State Legislature, was an assistant attorney general, was city attorney, and twice served by draft as mayor of Memphis, before coming to the Congress. While he served here, the New York Times rated him as one of the 10 most valuable Members of Congress.

Not only was he active in the political life of his city, county, State, and Nation, but he had time to take a very deep interest in the cultural things of life. He served on an art gallery board and knew more of the State's history than anyone I have ever known.

He was most popularly addressed as Captain, though some called him Congressman and some Mister, because in World War I he was a captain and served in five major battles. Somehow he seemed to appreciate this title as much or more than any other.

He was a devoted husband to his late wife, close to his children, and very active in the Episcopal Church, which he had served so long and so faithfully.

Truly, the country has lost a very great man just 5 days before the city of Memphis was to celebrate a special occasion on his 80th birthday.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KUYKENDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, the people of Tennessee are saddened by the passing of one of our most esteemed elder statesmen, former Congressman Walter Chandler, of Memphis.

Mr. Chandler would have been 80 years old on October 5, and my colleagues Mr. EVERETT and Mr. KUYKENDALL and myself were going to participate in a special recognition party for him on that date. We learned of his passing on Sunday, and we share the sorrow of his son, Wythe, and the countless friends he made over many decades of unselfish public service.

Walter Clift Chandler was born in Madison County, Tenn., October 5, 1887. He graduated with a law degree from the University of Tennessee at Knoxville in 1909.

He began his life of dedicated public service in 1916 when he became assistant district attorney general in Memphis. He served in the Tennessee legislature in 1917 as a member of the House, and then served as State senator from 1921 to 1923. He became the city attorney for Memphis in 1928 to 1934.

During World War I, Walter Chandler served as a captain in the 114th Field Artillery, 13th Division, American Expeditionary Forces.

A lifelong Democrat, who attended his first national convention as a delegate in 1940, Mr. Chandler was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1934, and served in the 74th, 75th, and 76th Congresses, representing Shelby County, Tenn.

He resigned January 2, 1940, having been elected by an appreciative people of Memphis as their mayor. He was reelected to this office in 1943, served until September 1, 1946. He then entered the private practice of law for the first time in 35 years. He was greatly grieved at the passing of his beloved wife in 1949.

But his service to the people of Tennessee and Shelby County did not cease then. A leader in the move to update the State constitution, he was elected president of the Tennessee Constitutional Convention in 1953. He again entered public life in 1955 when he was elected mayor for the third time of his career.

Walter Chandler has been a symbol of progress for Memphis, Shelby County, and the State of Tennessee. If any elected official can truly be called a "people's man," Walter Chandler was that. He not only served, but took the initiative in leading his constituents.

He labored for the people of Memphis in the same selfless attitude that won him wide admiration far beyond the borders of any one county or State.

A chapter of Tennessee history passed with the death of Walter Chandler, but the sense of self-sacrifice which embodied his entire life will always guide those who knew him, were in a contest with him, and who were served by him.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks concerning the late Honorable Walter Chandler.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

THE BOSTON RED SOX CHAMPIONS OF THE AMERICAN LEAGUE

Mr. BOLAND. 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 request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, for the past 2 days, Boston has been the capital of the world of baseball and, today, the Boston Red Sox are the champions of the American League. All America, and many areas around the globe, have thrilled to the fantastic, incredible American League pennant race. When this season opened last April, the Boston Red

Sox were picked to finish at, or near, the bottom of the league. Through magnificent management by manager Dick Williams—by sheer determination, unbounded enthusiasm, and marked improvement of all of its players, the Red Sox stunned the baseball world by their constant, consistent uphill struggle to capture the American League crown. It is indeed the miracle team of 1967. No club deserved to win it more. No other baseball club in either league is as close to its fans as the Boston Red Sox, and no other club has done so much for the community—particularly by raising, through the Jimmy fund, thousands and thousands of dollars for the Children's Hospital—one of the finest institutions of its kind in the world. The owner of the Red Sox, Tom Yawkey, has always been one of baseball's best assets. His faith in his club and its players may have faltered through the years but it has never fallen. His faith and his spirit in his club has paid off.

The Massachusetts congressional delegation joins millions around the Nation in congratulating the Boston Red Sox, its players and its management.

Mr. Speaker, we challenge the Missouri delegation. We will put up the best in beans, cod, or lobster for the best in beer or whatever else they have in Missouri. The Boston Red Sox will win the World Series.

Under unanimous consent I place the final standings of the American League for the years 1967 and 1966 at this point in the RECORD. These standings indicate the spectacular performance of the Boston Red Sox:

Final standing of the American League, 1967

	Won	Lost
Boston	92	70
Detroit	91	71
Minnesota	91	71
Chicago	89	73
California	84	77
Washington	76	85
Baltimore	76	85
Cleveland	75	87
New York	72	90
Kansas City	62	99

Final standing of the American League, 1966

	Won	Lost
Baltimore	97	63
Minnesota	89	73
Detroit	88	74
Chicago	83	79
Cleveland	81	81
California	80	82
Kansas City	74	86
Washington	71	88
Boston	72	90
New York	70	89

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the Massachusetts congressional delegation salutes all of the Red Sox organization who contributed so much to bringing the American League championship to Boston and Massachusetts. We are proud to list them.

Manager Dick Williams, players Carl Yastrzemski, Tony Conigliaro, Jim Lonborg, George Scott, Gary Bell, Darrell Brandon, Bill Landis, Al Lyle, David Morehead, Dan Osinski, Bill Rohr, Jose Santiago, Lee Stange, Hank Fischer, Jerry Stephenson, Gary Waslewski, John Wyatt, Ken Brett, Elston Howard, Mike Ryan, Russ Gibson, Jerry Moses, Jerry Adair, Mike Andrews, Joe Foy, Dalton Jones, Rico Petrocelli, Norm Siebern, Ken Harrelson, Reggie Smith, Jose Tartabull and George Thomas; coaches Bobby Doerr, Al Lakeman, Sal Maglie, and Eddie Popowski; owner Tom Yawkey and his aids Dick O'Connell, Haywood Sullivan, Neil Mahoney, and Tom Dowd; trainer Buddy LeBoux; team physician Dr. Tom Tierney; equipment manager Don Fitzpatrick; groundskeeper Al Forrister and his crew; and bat-and-ball-boys Keith Rosenfield and Jimmy Jackson.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. I am happy to yield to my distinguished colleague from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. Is the gentleman from Massachusetts in a position to invite his colleagues up to see the Boston Red Sox play in the World Series?

Mr. BOLAND. We would be delighted to have you gentlemen up there. However, there is a question of tickets. I understand that there has been an allocation of a couple of hundred tickets to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and I would suggest that you place your request in the hands of the distinguished Speaker.

THE QUESTION OF TICKETS TO THE WORLD SERIES TO WATCH THE BOSTON CLUB PARTICIPATE THEREIN

Mr. ARENDS. 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 request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the attention of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] and to state that we extend congratulations to the Boston Red Sox upon winning the American League pennant race. Now all Boston has to do is to worry about the Cardinals.

We as Members of the House have always loved the distinguished gentleman from Boston, Mass. [Mr. MCCORMACK], the Speaker of the House of Representatives, but never have we loved the Speaker more than we love him now for the two tickets to the series that he is going to provide to each one of us—or is he?

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois.

IRRESPONSIBLE ACTION ON THE PART OF THE REPUBLICAN MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. EDMONDSON. 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 request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, last week the American people witnessed what must be classified as one of the most politically irresponsible acts of this century by the Republican Party. The U.S. Government, by what I am told was a unanimous Republican vote, was denied in the House the funds needed to permit it to continue to function as a government. And the curious thing about it is that this move to decree that the President make billion-dollar cuts without specifying whatsoever the areas in which the cuts should be made was led by the party which has contended for years to the American people that it believes in congressional and legislative responsibility, and has also contended that it did not believe in enlarging the powers of the executive.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the time has come to face up to our responsibility. It seems to me that our friends on the other side of the aisle cannot have it both ways. If they believe in congressional responsibility, if they believe in this body's exercising its power judiciously and wisely and effectively, then certainly they should abandon this attempt to hand over a $5 billion item veto authority to the President of the United States and should join us on this side of the aisle in meeting our responsibilities as a legislative body.

I feel that when this matter comes to the House on Tuesday that the House will decide to continue exercising its responsibility to the country in the traditional way, and that the effort on the Republican side to undermine congressional responsibility will be defeated.

VIGOROUS RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM NEEDED TO REVERSE POPULATION TREND

Mr. SIKES. 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 request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the finest opportunity in America to deal with the problems of sickness in the Nation's cities is receiving almost no attention. A vigorous rural development program to reverse the population trend from rural communities to city slums would provide a bigger step forward at less cost than any of the programs which are being offered to cure big-city problems.

Throughout our country there are wholesome, pleasant rural communities and small towns, many of which literally are dying on the vine. Their people are moving away to the city where they feel opportunities are better. To my mind, this is a poor thing to happen to any family, but economic pressures are bringing about a great shift from rural to urban living. One of the bad features which results is the buildup of slum areas and the attendant growth in welfare rolls, both

of which directly contribute to riots and to the crime problem.

This trend makes it harder and harder for small communities to support proper education, to build needed community facilities, to provide the jobs required to hold their young people, and just to stay alive. Steps to make rural living more attractive obviously would help to solve the urban problems which now plague the nation. In comparison with the enormous problems presented by the cities, a little help would go a very long way toward improving job opportunities, education, and community facilities in rural communities and small cities. Apparently few in the administration are giving really serious consideration to helping America by making rural living more attractive. It would appear that this may well be the best means by which to combat the aggravating and growing problems which confront the cities. Certainly it would be a more economical and a far more wholesome approach.

Regardless of its economic status, the average rural community or small town offers a pleasant and happy environment which is much more desirable than that of the crowded metropolitan area.

BIRTHDAY GREETINGS TO GUINEA

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. 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 request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the ninth anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Guinea is being celebrated today, October 2, I am pleased to call this occasion to the attention of the House and to extend my best wishes to the Government and the people of Guinea.

I am fortunate in having had the opportunity personally of meeting many high ranking Guinean officials during their recent visits to Washington, and I can vouch for the dedication and vigor of the leaders of that country. I particularly recall the visit of Foreign Minister Beavogui on March 9, 1967, at which time I had the honor, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa, to be his host at a luncheon.

I express the hope that the mutuality of interests already shared by our two countries and two peoples may not only continue to flourish but may grow stronger in the years to come.

American industry is assisting the Government in mining Guinea's rich bauxite deposits, which obviously will do much for the economy of that country. The good relations that continue to exist between the Government of Guinea and American industry is gratifying and stimulating to both Guineans and Americans.

I express my personal felicitations to the able President of Guinea, His Excellency Sekou Toure, and to my good friend the Guinean Ambassador to the United States, His Excellency Karim Bangoura.

REPUBLICANS PLAYING POLITICS IN VOTING TO RECOMMIT CONTINUING RESOLUTION

Mr. GIAIMO. 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 request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, I think the RECORD should show that our Republican colleagues in the House are trying to play politics with vital functionings of the Federal Government. By voting to recommit the continuing resolution, these Republicans have sought to paralyze the entire Federal establishment under the guise of alleged fiscal integrity.

Mr. Speaker, the Republicans say they want the budget cut, and many programs drastically trimmed. They claim that is why they have voted to recommit the continuing resolution.

But I think we may ask: Do you achieve fiscal integrity by paralyzing, in a dangerous and irresponsible way, the Federal Establishment? Do you save money by bringing the Government to its knees?

This is a foolish and irresponsible game the Republicans are playing. It is not the way to fiscal responsibility. It is the high road to political recklessness, and it will not succeed.

It will not succeed, Mr. Speaker, because the majority of House Members know that cutting back expenditures is not the job of the President; it is the function of Congress.

And I would say to these Republicans: Where do you want to start cutting? In which congressional district? If you are sincere, perhaps you will not mind if a few projects in your own districts are trimmed back?

These are the hard facts, Mr. Speaker. And the Republicans know them.

REPUBLICAN RULE OR RUIN POLITICS PARALYZES GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. 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 request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, I too would have preferred to line up this morning for World Series tickets. Unfortunately, however, the major action in the Nation this week will not all center in Boston and St. Louis. There will be considerable public attention on Washington, D.C. For the Republicans in this body, by a unanimous, partyline, rubberstamp vote have threatened to paralyze the Federal Government. They have refused it permission to pay its bills and fulfill its obligations.

In recommitting the continuing resolution last week, those who wish to embarrass the administration politically have worked their will in this House. Major departments of Government can now not function.

But this political sham will be uncovered.

Willful men cannot merely shout "cut the budget" to the administration without specifying where those cuts should be made.

Willful men cannot practice rule or ruin politics in this House, without inviting a negative reaction from the people.

It is the responsibility of the House of Representatives as a whole to approve or disapprove budgets submitted by the President. But it is also the duty of the House of Representatives to make certain that Government is not paralyzed, that essential services go on, and that the Government of the United States is not made a laughing stock before the world.

I urge that the continuing resolution be approved, and that the fiscal year 1968 budget be approved, and that we get on with the job of Government.

Political maneuvers cannot be allowed to play havoc with the U.S. Government.

ABSENTEES COMPLAIN OF ABSENTEEISM

Mr. HAYS. 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 request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I think some note should be made of a recent letter that was sent to the Speaker of the House by some 28 freshmen Congressmen.

The gist of it was to provide some tips to the Speaker about more efficient management of House business.

These young Members of our body told the Speaker that business is scheduled on a Tuesday to Thursday basis so that everybody can take off Mondays and Fridays.

I think we should take some note of the fact that 11 of these 28 watchdogs were absent on the day after they sent the letter, last Friday, when a quorum was called prior to the vote on the bill, H.R. 10673, which would have amended or which did amend the Packers and Stockyards Act.

It seems to me that some of these 28 know-it-alls are worrying too much about other people's business. Perhaps they should concentrate making these rollcalls themselves first—or maybe they were too busy drafting another letter about people taking off on Fridays for personal matters.

SENATOR CARL HAYDEN

Mr. KIRWAN. 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 request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to have an opportunity here today to pay my respects to a great American—and I mean a great American.

Senator CARL HAYDEN is 90 years old today. He has done for the protection and development of our great national resources what the late John Fogarty did for the health of mankind. The New York Times said recently that John Fogarty did more than any man for mankind, and he did. The same can be said for CARL HAYDEN for his great achievements for mankind in respect to our priceless national resources.

Without people like CARL HAYDEN and John Fogarty in this country, where would we be?

The late Senator Kerr often said:

> Prosperity does not really come from our automobile factories, steel plants, railroads, and other elements of our industrial processes. Prosperity comes instead from the land, the woods, and the waters of this land.

For the protection and development of these basic resources he has done more for mankind than any man who ever lived.

It is a privilege and an honor for me just to mention his name, and I hope that God who in His wisdom has let him be here for 90 years will let him stay around here for 100 years to come.

HOW SCRUPULOUS IS THE READER'S DIGEST?

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the Reader's Digest is up to its old tricks of slanted rightwing attacks on American institutions; this time it is the social security system. In the October issue of the magazine, a Charles Stevenson has done a clever hatchet job on social security, entitled "How Secure Is Your Social Security?"

In the RECORD of September 27, the distinguished and fairminded chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, Mr. WILBUR MILLS, stated:

> I have read the article very carefully and find that it contains a number of half-truths that lead to misleading conclusions.

He then had reprinted in the RECORD a factual and soundly reasoned refutation of the Reader's Digest article by Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Wilbur J. Cohen.

The Reader's Digest has consistently attacked progressive Federal programs for years, usually under the spurious rationale that they interfere with the free enterprise system. It is regrettable that the Digest does not provide a letters-to-the-editor section within its magazine in order that replies to its attacks can be offered to its readership.

Because replies are not allowed within the pages of the Digest, I believe it is doubly important that the Members of this body and readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD are informed of the fact that while the Reader's Digest is crusading against Federal social programs, it is constantly dipping into the public till to add to its own profits. Currently, publishers of magazines pay less than 30 percent of what it costs the Post Office Department to deliver them; in the case of the Digest this means the taxpayers are subsidizing it by $8.9 million a year. The Digest is also a heavy user of third-class mail and is receiving a subsidy within this class of mail to the tune of approximately $2.3 million a year. Therefore, the taxpayer is subsidizing the Reader's Digest to the tune of over $11 million a year in second and third class alone; another hefty subsidy is given the Digest when they mail the books they publish, which are delivered by the Post Office for a little over 40 percent of cost.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I believe it is important that the information that I have disclosed today be included in the RECORD and thereby be made known to the American public.

FEDERAL EXPENDITURES SHOULD BE REDUCED IN AN ORDERLY AND LOGICAL MANNER

Mr. KEE. 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 request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, it has been indeed unfortunate that our Republican colleagues have voted to recommit the continuing resolution that provides various agencies of the Federal Government with operating funds to meet financial obligations.

This action—presumably—is to embarrass the President and demonstrate a the voters that those opposed to providing the Federal Government with sufficient funds to meet current obligations are for budget cutting against an administration of wild spenders.

Mr. Speaker, this is political demagoguery. We all know that the authority to reduce expenditures belongs to the Congress, not to the White House. The President recommends—the Congress appropriates.

Apparently the Republicans want the President of the United States to be the one to take the political criticism by cutting back programs the people want. The President has said—time and again—that he will carefully review all appropriations which have been passed by the U.S. Congress.

I, for one, do not want to give up the congressional authority to control Federal expenditures.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that the responsibility for appropriating funds rests entirely with the U.S. Congress, and I firmly believe that the Appropriations Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives should have adequate time in order to reduce Federal expenditures in a logical manner which will not disrupt the essential services and the economy of the United States.

SUCCESS OF BOSTON RED SOX IN WINNING AMERICAN LEAGUE PENNANT

Mrs. SULLIVAN. 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 request of the gentlewoman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate you and the people you represent in the great city of Boston for the remarkable success of the Boston Red Sox in winning the American League pennant on the final day of the season. Every one in St. Louis looks forward to the appearance in our magnificent new Busch Stadium of the gallant Boston team in the World Series this coming Saturday.

I am sure the St. Louis Cardinals will do everything they can to prevent it, but it is my feeling that the Boston team should win one of the first four games of the series so that we will have the opportunity to have three World Series games in St. Louis.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that when your constituents go to St. Louis for the world's series, they will have the opportunity to visit many of the other attractions in my city, and particularly the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial and the spectacular Gateway Arch which, are part of the national park system and for which we, incidentally, still need a final Federal appropriation of $6 million for construction. Once your people see this breathtaking structure, I am sure they will want you to continue to do everything you can to assure completion of the work. In any event, all St. Louis joins me in welcoming Boston to the world's series.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I have been unable to get any tickets out of Boston so far. What about St. Louis?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, may I tell the gentleman he is very late. Three weeks ago I could have gotten the gentleman what he wanted.

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 11722 UNTIL MIDNIGHT TONIGHT

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill, H.R. 11722, to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, have until 12 o'clock tonight in which to file a conference report on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF MAX KAMPELMAN TO NEW WASHINGTON CITY COUNCIL

Mr. GROSS. 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 request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the appointment by President Johnson of one Max Kampelman, to be the chairman of the new Washington, D.C. City Council, is astonishing to the point of disbelief.

Kampelman was a conscientious objector in World War II, who, through some sort of manipulation, after the shooting stopped in the Korean war, obtained a Reserve commission as a captain in the Marine Corps. When the war in Vietnam began to expand, he resigned his commission.

Kampelman was a pal of the notorious Bobby Baker. He was one of the organizers of the District of Columbia National Bank, a former chairman of the executive committee and a member of the board of directors.

It was the District of Columbia National Bank that handed out to the fast-traveling Baker an unsecured loan of $125,000.

Mr. Speaker, this appointment calls for the most careful scrutiny and I urge that the proper committee of the House undertake an immediate investigation of this appointee.

GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES AND RESPONSIBILITY THEREFOR

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with interest today to the boilerplate speeches that have been made here on the question of the Bow amendment. I shall read them carefully, and we will meet them and reply to them in detail tomorrow.

I notice in the press reports that the President again has said, "Send all the appropriation bills down to me and I will then make the cuts in them."

Everyone seems to be complaining about the President and the vicious things he is going to do. I hope in 1969 I have more confidence in my President then than the majority seem to have in their President this year. Everyone complains of what he might do to him.

I say to you, I am more interested in what we are doing to the country. If we go forward with the spending on the basis we are now, the July and August expenditures of $24,232,000,000, this means they are going to spend this year $145 billion.

Now let us go back to last year. The limitation that I am suggesting is $131 billion. Last year total expenditures were $125 billion, and we did not do bad last year. It seems to me we might go back to last year and add for them a little $6 billion, and they would get along quite well, without all the trouble mentioned.

So far as shutting down the business of the Government is concerned, we were here, ready and willing to pass a continuing resolution, 2 days last week, but it was denied because of the majority. So if there is any shutting down of the Government, the majority must take responsibility for it.

Let me say, when there are complaints about the adoption of the motion to recommit, it was only done with the help of courageous and loyal Democrats. So when you say to us that we are upsetting the functions of Government by the adoption of the motion to recommit, the responsibility lies in the majority party, if there is anything to be said.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. Of course I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman will admit that——

Mr. BOW. Do not tell me what I am going to admit. The gentleman does not know what I am going to admit.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. This is in the form of a question.

Mr. BOW. Yes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I will put it a different way. Is it true that by the exclusion of the military, the interest on the national debt, and other fixed contract obligations that could not be canceled without great cost to the Government, the $5 billion cut would apply to a $21 billion pool, which includes $9 billion for salaries of Government employees?

Mr. BOW. No. I do not admit that.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. You do not admit it. Will you explain why not?

Mr. BOW. I will explain that tomorrow, when we have time in the House to do it, when the continuing resolution comes up.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I will be glad to have you do it.

Mr. BOW. We will be glad to do it.

ATTENDANCE AND ABSENCE

Mr. RIEGLE. 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 request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to comment briefly on the remarks of my distinguished colleague from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] a few moments ago, and his point that some 11 freshmen were not present for the quorum call last Friday. I was present last Friday, but as I go over the RECORD for last Friday, I find there were 186 Members absent, and 106 of those, or well over half, were from the Democrat side of the aisle.

This is not surprising, because I believe the reason so many Members were gone last week was touched on by my chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], with his request of Thursday that the continuing resolution be put over until Tuesday of this week, because of the fact that many Members of the House had made commitments to be away from Washington last Friday, on official business presumably.

I would now like to comment briefly on the letter sent to the Speaker last week by 28 freshmen Republicans. I want to say that I think the remarks I am about to make express the spirit of the Members who signed that letter, as well as my own. I think it in no way reflects on our esteem and our very deep respect for the Speaker. I know of no man in Government today that I have any higher personal respect for than the Speaker. Certainly our letter was not intended to reflect on him in any way. Our point is this: We have a congressional reorganization bill that has gone through the legislative mill for some months and is awaiting action on the House floor. We would like to see it come down here so that we can have a chance to look at it and discuss it and determine what reforms are needed. If we can win some bipartisan support on that, we all will be ahead and the country will be ahead.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIEGLE. I will if you are supporting my desire to get the Congressional Reorganization Act out of committee and down here on the floor.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I merely want to compliment the gentleman for the kind remarks that he made with respect to the Speaker, which I am sure all of us share.

DISCUSSION OF CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I join with the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW] in calling to the attention of the House the importance of the vote we will be having tomorrow here on the floor of the House. The important vote will be the vote on the previous question. That particular vote will be important because if the previous question carries, then Mr. Bow will be precluded from offering his amendment to establish an expenditure limitation for fiscal year 1968.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is extremely important that we all realize that the Congress can make substantial reductions in appropriations but that reductions in appropriations will not directly affect spending levels. Even if we make a $7 billion or $8 billion reduction in appropriations, this will only reduce the amount of new obligational authority in the hands of the executive branch from $192 billion to about $184 billion. The executive branch will still have in its hands $184 billion with an appropriation cut of $8 billion available for expenditure in fiscal year 1968. This is because of the large carryover in obligational authority, or appropriations, from prior years.

Mr. Speaker, I think we all realize that the Congress cannot control the expenditure rate, because the Congress deals with appropriations and only with appropriations. We feel, however, that the time has come, because of the serious crisis facing this country, for the Congress to

move into the expenditure field in fiscal year 1968. We are facing a tremendous crisis with a budget deficit of over $30 billion.

The Chief Executive seems to be trying to create confusion in this country by refusing to distinguish between appropriations and expenditures. In doing this, he is only widening the credibility gap. Yesterday in his press conference, the President talked about a $1.6 billion reduction in appropriations for the Defense Department. He tried to tie that $1.6 billion up with the war cost in Vietnam. The Committee on Appropriations in reducing new obligational authority did not reduce expenditure rates, but in reducing new obligational authority by $1.6 billion not a single bit of that authorization was involved with war costs in Southeast Asia. It is true that the war in Southeast Asia is going to cost more than the budget estimate of expenditures of $21.9 billion. The cost of the war will in fact be at least $29 billion in fiscal year 1968.

Mr. Speaker, I can only say I am shocked that the President of the United States would imply that there is any connection between the Congress cut in defense funds and the war in Vietnam.

I cannot remain silent when the word of the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee is thrown into serious question by the President of the United States. Yet, that is precisely the effect of the Chief Executive's attempt to relate the $1.6 billion reduction in the Defense Appropriation bill to the cost of the war in Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, Chairman MAHON and I may not see eye to eye on all things but he certainly made it crystal clear both in the Defense Committee report and on the floor during debate on the Defense bill that not a single penny of the $1.6 billion in defense cuts was in any way related to Vietnam war costs. The report clearly stated that—

> The reductions . . . are made in programs not directly related to the prosecution of the war.

For the President of the United States to cast public doubt on the word and the assurances of the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] and the unanimous committee report written under his direction cannot go unanswered.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that additional funds will be required for the war in Vietnam—we know that and said so when the original budget came up last year.

But the $1.6 billion has nothing to do with those additional requirements and it is time this administration stopped throwing up smokescreens in attempts to cloud the issue that faces us in tomorrow's action.

Tomorrow's issue has to do with expenditure controls, not with new obligational authority or appropriations. Let us deal with that issue with relevant facts.

This credibility gap in America is being widened, and I say it is being widened deliberately in view of the important debate which we will have upon tomorrow here on the floor of the House.

TO AUTHORIZE AND REQUEST THE PRESIDENT TO ISSUE A PROCLAMATION COMMEMORATING 50 YEARS OF SERVICE TO THE NATION BY THE LANGLEY RESEARCH CENTER

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 109) to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation commemorating 50 years of service to the Nation by the Langley Research Center.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I understand that this has been completely cleared on our side of the aisle with the members of the Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman from Illinois is eminently correct.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, may we have some assurance that this is not going to cost the taxpayers of the United States any money?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Illinois will yield further, the proclamation will not cost the taxpayers one dime.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Illinois will yield further, let us go beyond the proclamation. Will this celebration cost the taxpayers of the United States of America any money?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Illinois will yield further, it will not.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 109

Whereas this calendar year marks the fiftieth anniversary of the establishment in 1917 of the Langley Research Center at Hampton, Virginia; and

Whereas the Langley Research Center of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, of forty-one years a facility of the former National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, has provided a continuing technological basis for significant advances in military and commercial aviation; and

Whereas pioneering scientific investigations conducted by the Langley Research Center contributed to the development over the years of unique facilities, research techniques, and the technical competence required to establish and maintain this country's leadership in aeronautics; and

Whereas the Langley Research Center was the birthplace of Project Mercury—the first United States manned space flight project; and

Whereas the Langley Research Center is one of the major research facilities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration engaged in significant programs of advanced research and technology relating to aeronautics and the manned and unmanned exploration of space, including, among others, the development of the supersonic transport, vertical and short take off and landing aircraft, the Apollo lunar mission, and a variety of other projects designed to accelerate our flight progress and expand our knowledge of the universe: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is hereby authorized and requested to issue a proclamation commemorating the fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the Langley Research Center at Hampton, Virginia, and calling upon the people of the United States, during the first full calendar week in October 1967, to observe such anniversary with appropriate ceremonies and activities honoring such Center's fifty years of service to the Nation.

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, I arise in enthusiastic support of this legislation.

This resolution gives national recognition to the 50 years of scientific progress in the fields of space and aeronautics at Langley Research Center in Hampton, Va.

Langley was the first of the scientific facilities under the old National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics which was subsequently changed to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration when this Nation decided to unite and promote its efforts in this scientific field.

Today it is one of the foremost facilities in the huge NASA complex. Under the capable leadership of Dr. Floyd L. Thompson and a dedicated group of scientists, Langley can achieve the impossible if asked to do so.

This first week in October is Langley Research Center Week and it is open to the public to see and hear what has been accomplished in the last 50 years and what we can expect in the future.

I have just returned from Langley a few minutes ago where I had the privilege of seeing the morning's presentation. It was dramatic, impressive, and educational. I was extremely proud to see the magnificent scientific accomplishments which our own facility has produced. I invite all the Members to attend if they possibly can. If they will call me, I will be happy to make the necessary transportation arrangements.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD, I include a NASA press release which sets forth some of the achievements of the Langley Research Center:

[A National Aeronautics and Space Administration, news release, Oct. 1, 1967]

LANGLEY 50TH ANNIVERSARY

On Oct. 7, 1903, Charles M. Manley, chief assistant to Samuel Pierpont Langley, was launched from a houseboat on the Potomac in a heavier-than-air machine that was designed to fly. It sank.

Sixty-eight days later a similar wood and canvas contraption, designed by a pair of bicycle mechanics, Wilbur and Orville Wright, shot down the sands at Kitty Hawk, N.C., stayed in the air for 3.5 seconds and covered a distance of 105 feet.

A few weeks from now a sleek rocket, the Saturn V, 365 feet tall and with a thrust comparable to 160 million horsepower, will

take off from Cape Kennedy, Fla., on a test flight in preparation for this country's first trip to the Moon and back.

As unlikely as it seems, the Saturn V had its genesis in the Langley and Wright machines.

The journey from the first biplanes to supersonic aircraft and space vehicles was exciting, arduous and rewarding. Credit for the success of man's conquest of the air and space must go in large part to the work done at the research center, later named after Dr. Langley, located in Hampton, Va.

In recognition of Langley Research Center's contribution to the advancement of the United States in aeronautics and astronautics, the first week of October has been set aside by Presidential proclamation to commemorate 50 years of service to the Nation.

From 1917 to 1938, Langley, as the single laboratory of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, provided the facilities and scientific brainpower necessary to keep the nation in the vanguard of aviation progress. As other research centers were established across the country after 1938, Langley staff members provided the leadership to make them work. When the National Aeronautics and Space Administration was established in 1958, it was built largely around NACA and the experience gained at Langley.

Langley has assisted in increasing the speed of the airplane from less than 100 miles-per-hour to more than 4,000 miles-per-hour. It has helped man conquer the air and move toward mastery of the infinite space above the atmosphere.

Its milestones include:

The development in the 1920's of a cowling for aircooled engines, a streamlining effect credited with increasing the speeds of airplanes of that period from 12 to 15 per cent; an innovation that made possible the use of engines of much higher horsepower;

The accumulation of scientific data and technical competence that increased the performance and utility of aircraft used in World War II;

The conception in the 1940's of research planes leading to history-making advancements at supersonic and hypersonic speeds;

The design, development, and practical application in the '50's of the world's first transonic wind tunnels which bridged the technological gap in research facilities between subsonic and supersonic speeds;

The discovery and verification of the Area Rule, a revolutionary idea concerning the configuration of aircraft;

The development of much of the technology for a practical supersonic commercial air transport plane.

Langley continues in its aeronautical researches, working on current and future concepts of hypersonic flight, advanced supersonic aircraft, helicopters, vertical takeoff and landing and short takeoff and landing aircraft (VTOL/STOL), and support services for the exploration of space.

If Dr. Langley were alive today he would be gratified by the nation's space program. He would also have a part in it. He had from his earliest years been interested in astronomy. For many years he was interested in research as Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution. He and his brother John built from scratch a telescope with a five-foot focal length and a seven-inch mirror. They polished and discarded 20 mirrors before they fabricated one that met their standards.

Later, at the Allegheny Observatory, he made drawings that served for years as classic sunspot representations. Having realized early the limitations placed on astrophysics by the blanketing layer of Earth's atmosphere, he attempted to overcome them first by trying to find a constant that would represent the filtering atmosphere of the Earth, and later by moving instruments to the tops of mountains where this effect would be minimized.

In order to explore the physics of outer space further he invented the boloscope, a device that could measure temperature differences of 1/100,000 of one degree Centigrade. With this instrument he extended the spectrum to a point until then undreamed of.

It was not until he was 50 years old that he launched a new career in aerodynamics.

The credit for flying the first heavier-than-air machine was hotly disputed by followers of the Wright brothers and Langley for many years, but time eventually dulled the dispute and all of the figures involved were given due credit.

Disputes were not unusual in the history of aviation progress.

Attempts to end NACA's existence as an independent agency were made with regularity. It was proposed at varying intervals that NACA's facilities and functions be transferred to the Navy, the Army, the Bureau of Standards, the War Department and the Department of Commerce.

The Langley laboratory also suffered its share of natural disasters. Wooden buildings, hangars and wind tunnels were beset by fires, and storms and floods took their toll. Langley, however, pushed aviation progress ahead in the face of adversity in politics, natural disasters, and a shortage of funds during the Great Depression of the 30's.

A five-foot wind tunnel was opened in 1920. In many ways, the development of the airplane has been the development of the wind tunnel, and Langley consistently has pioneered in these devices, extending with each new one the range of aerodynamic testing that can be done on the ground.

Langley's first wind tunnel was not unusual. It was modeled after one in use at the British National Physical Laboratory. Similar models were in use by the Army, Navy and various engineering schools. Its operation was quite simple: it directed a stream of air across a model airplane, where gages measured the stresses.

By the following year it was decided that a new kind of wind tunnel was needed, one using compressed air. It was known for some time that a model's behavior differed from that of a full-scale airplane. By raising the air pressure in the wind tunnel this difference in the effects of scale was overcome. As a result of tests in this so-called "variable density" wind tunnel, NACA studied the feasibility of jet propulsion some 25 years before the first jet airplane flew.

In 1927, a tunnel known as the propeller research tunnel, large enough to test full-scale parts, was put into operation. It had a 20-foot test section through which air flowed at 110 miles-per-hour. This tunnel, the world's largest at that time, allowed aerodynamic tests on full-scale propellers, fuselages, landing gear and other aircraft parts.

The most dramatic breakthrough achieved by this equipment was what came to be known as the NACA cowling. A streamlined covering for radial air-cooled engines, the cowling reduced the drag created by exposed engine parts. Because it greatly improved cooling, it permitted much larger engines of greater power.

In its 1928 report, NACA stated, "by the application of the results of this study to this study to a Curtiss AT–5A Army pursuit training plane, the maximum speed was increased from 118 to 137 mph. This is equivalent to providing approximately 83 additional horsepower without additional weight or cost of engine, fuel consumption, or weight of structure." For this achievement, NACA was awarded the Collier Trophy for 1928.

Another benefit from the Propeller Research Tunnel was the location of engine nacelles on the leading edges of wings, rather than slung beneath them as had been the previous practice. This resulted in important speed gains. The amount of drag on fixed landing gear was also accurately determined.

Throughout the 1930's, aviation continued its advance. The shape of wings and airplane bodies all over the world were determined by the knowledge gained at Langley. And when World War II came, the information acquired over the years at this NACA facility contributed mightily to America's superior wartime air power.

Elaborately instrumented research rocket planes were carried above the atmosphere, where the density of the air was low, to explore transonic and supersonic speeds. Starting with the spectacular flight of the X–1 and progressing through the more and more advanced models, speed and altitude records were broken again and again. Langley shared the Collier Trophy with Bell Aircraft and the U.S. Air Force for this pioneering research in 1947. Today the X–15, latest in the series, has achieved speeds over 4,000 miles-per-hour and altitudes of more than 354,000 feet.

Langley was honored with the Collier Trophy again in 1951 for the development and practical application of the transonic wind tunnel, a facility that bridged the gap which once existed in wind tunnel research in the range from high subsonic speeds to those just above the speed of sound.

Langley's fourth Collier Trophy was won in 1954 for the discovery and experimental verification of the Area Rule.

Essentially, the Area Rule is a method to balance in a rational way the lengthwise distribution of volume of fuselage and wings in order to produce an airplane with minimum drag at transonic speeds.

Slight modifications of the shape of the airplane fuselage can result in highly-improved performance. For example, a fighter plane prototype was unable in tests to achieve supersonic speed. With slight modifications indicated by the Area Rule, a gain in speed as much as 25 per cent was attained.

Today, Langley continues to improve the speed and versatility of aircraft. Some of its objectives are improved helicopters for urban travel up to 100 miles, short takeoff and landing aircraft for interurban travel up to about 500 miles, and improvements in subsonic jet transports to allow short runway operation.

Work is going forward on the supersonic airplane, and in the more distant future for an airplane designed to go more than five times the speed of sound—the hypersonic airplane.

Langley was the birthplace of Project Mercury, the first United States manned space flight project. It was instrumental in some of the key research in support of the successful Gemini project and the Apollo program, now just getting under way.

Langley research contributed to the Echo passive communication satellites. Once launched into orbit, a large aluminum-covered mylar plastic balloon automatically inflated and was used to bounce electronic signals from one point on Earth down to another. Line-of-sight electronic transmission is generally restricted to about 150 miles; by means of Echo satellites, this range was extended to span oceans and continents. In addition, regularly published reports of the transit of the Echo balloon allowed people all over the world to see their first man-made satellite move across the night sky.

Langley also took part in the development of the versatile Scout rocket, first all-solid-fueled launch vehicle to put a satellite in orbit, and the management of Lunar Orbiter, a spacecraft which circled and helped map the Moon. Lunar Orbiter was successful in five launches on five attempts.

Mercury models were tested in Langley's wind tunnels. Tests varied from static stability studies on full-scale models to drag

and heat transfer investigations on models weighing less than a ping-pong ball.

The research center is supporting project Apollo through the use of unique simulators and specialized laboratories, designed to enable the country to gain on the ground experience of the rigors of outer space.

The experience and accomplishments gained at Langley, combined with the availability at one location of an array of specialized laboratory facilities and equipment at Hampton, is unique. Langley today constitutes a vital national resource for the future conduct of advanced research and technology programs in aeronautics and the manned and unmanned exploration of space.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 109) just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

ADDITIONAL LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. ALBERT. 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 request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I have requested this time for the purpose of making an announcement.

Mr. Speaker, I take this time to advise the Members of the House that we expect to call up the conference report on the military construction authorization bill tomorrow.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, in order to find out how many of the 28 advisory committee members to the Speaker are here, 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. 288]

Ashley	Celler	Fino
Aspinall	Cleveland	Flynt
Ayres	Conyers	Ford, Gerald R.
Barrett	Corbett	Ford,
Blatnik	Corman	William D.
Brademas	Culver	Fountain
Brock	de la Garza	Gallagher
Broomfield	Dent	Gettys
Brown, Mich.	Derwinski	Hagan
Bush	Diggs	Halleck
Cabell	Eckhardt	Hanna
Carey	Edwards, La.	Helstoski
Carter	Evans, Colo.	Kluczynski
Casey	Feighan	Kupferman
Kyl	Monagan	Stuckey
Landrum	Nichols	Teague, Calif.
Leggett	Nix	Tiernan
Lukens	O'Konski	Tuck
McCulloch	O'Neill, Mass.	Udall
McDonald, Mich.	Pettis	Utt
McEwen	Pool	Vander Jagt
Macdonald, Mass.	Pucinski	Waggonner
May	Rarick	Watkins
Michel	Reifel	Watts
Miller, Calif.	Resnick	Whitener
Mink	Ronan	Williams, Miss.
Minshall	Sandman	Willis
	St Germain	Wilson, Bob
	Smith, Iowa	Wright

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 348 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is the call of the Consent Calendar. The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

SAUGUS IRON WORKS NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE, MASS.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1308) to establish the Saugus Iron Works National Historic Site in the State of Massachusetts, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1308

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to preserve in public ownership the first sustained integrated ironworks in the Thirteen Colonies, the Secretary of the Interior may acquire by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, or otherwise, lands and interests in lands within boundaries of the area generally depicted on drawing numbered NHS SI 7100, entitled "Proposed Saugus Iron Works National Historic Site", dated May 28, 1964, which is on file in the Department of the Interior. If the Secretary determines that features historically associated with the Saugus Iron Works, including the charcoal pit and the collection basin, are outside the boundaries shown on the drawing he may revise the boundaries of the area by publication of a notice to that effect in the Federal Register. The property acquired pursuant to this section shall be known as the Saugus Iron Works National Historic Site.

SEC. 2. The Secretary shall administer the Saugus Iron Works National Historic Site in accordance with the Act approved August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), as amended and supplemented, and the Act approved August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666).

SEC. 3. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 3, through page 2, line 7, strike out all of section 1 and insert the following in lieu thereof:

"That in order to preserve in public ownership the first sustained integrated ironworks in the Thirteen Colonies, the Secretary of the Interior may acquire by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, or otherwise, lands and interests in lands within the boundaries of the area generally depicted on drawing numbered NHS-SI-7100B, entitled 'Proposed Saugus Iron Works National Historic Site', dated May, 1967, which is on file in the Department of the Interior. The property acquired pursuant to this section shall be known as the Saugus Iron Works National Historic Site."

On page 2, lines 13 and 14, strike out "such sums as may be necessary" and insert "$400,000".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. SAYLOR Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1308, a bill to establish the Saugus Iron Works National Historic Site in the State of Massachusetts, and for other purposes.

The purpose of H.R. 1308 is to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept the donation of the site of one of America's earliest industrial landmarks—the old Saugus Iron Works. The nucleus of this proposed national historic site consists of property now owned by the First Iron Works Association, Inc. This association has offered to donate all of its property, comprising some eight acres, to the United States for the proposed national historic site.

This colonial iron works dates back to 1648 and the site was first owned and established under an English partnership called the "Company of Undertakers for the Iron Works in New England," and was operational from 1648 to 1670. The site is on the Saugus River about ten miles north of historic Boston.

The old Saugus Iron Works, though not successful financially because of competitive imports and mismanagement, was a prototype of a modern iron and steel plant. It was an integrated mill producing directly malleable wrought iron in contrast to pig or cast iron. This colonial iron works supplied the tools and hardware very much needed in our colonial development. The old Saugus Iron Works was a symbolic forerunner of America's present-day industrial giants.

The historic values of this property were recognized and in 1943 the First Iron Works Association, Inc., a private, nonprofit organization interested in historic preservation, was formed to protect the site from being moved and publicize its historic importance. In 1949, the American Iron & Steel Institute became interested in the restoration of the Saugus Iron Works and for the next 13 years spent $2.4 million in support of the archeological investigation as the first step toward reconstruction of this site. By 1954, extensive archeological investigation and research had been completed, the works were created and opened to the public.

The restoration and reconstruction of this colonial iron works has been accomplished in a meticulous manner using the foundations of the original building. The work has been done and supervised by the same group that advised and assisted in the reconstruction of historic Williamsburg.

At the site of the first iron works in America one can see how iron was made in the early days of this Nation. It is truly an enlightening experience to see and particularly for those people who live in the cities and towns where modern steel methods are being used.

It is most interesting to note that this colonial iron works was probably the first

example of a large scale capitalistic enterprise in the American colonies. The company of undertakers starting this venture was organized in England and included not only people who lived in England but people from all walks of life who lived in the Massachusetts Bay Colony, including members of the clergy who invested their money in this original undertaking. The first iron works was started with a capital investment of a thousand pounds sterling and later investments brought the total investment to approximately 15,000 pounds.

Mr. Speaker, establishment of the proposed Saugus Iron Works National Historic Site would, in my opinion, become a valuable addition to our national park system. The Saugus Iron Works exemplifies an important era in the industrial and economic development of this Nation. I wish to commend the American Iron & Steel Institute for its spirit and generosity in financing the excavation and restoration of this colonial ironworks. And further, I wish to commend the First Iron Works Association, Inc., for its preservation of this historic site and offer to donate the Saugus Iron Works to the United States for administration as a national historic site.

The estimated capital cost for acquisition of additional lands and development of the site is $400,000. The Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings, and Monuments has endorsed the proposal to establish the Saugus Iron Works as a national historic site.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it will be a tremendous benefit to the American people to be authorized to accept the gift of the First Iron Works Association, Inc., and the American Iron & Steel Institute, who have done an excellent job in preserving our American heritage.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of H.R. 1308.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 1308 by our colleague, Congressman SAYLOR, is to set up the Saugus Iron Works National Historic Site.

Congressman SAYLOR, Congressman SKUBITZ, and I visited these ironworks about 2 months ago. These works were one of the most interesting attractions and historic spots we found in Boston.

The Saugus Iron Works as they exist today are a reconstruction on the original foundations of the first integrated ironworks in America. The works were in actual operation from 1648 to 1670. They consisted of a blast furnace, a forge, a rolling and slitting mill, and other works. In addition, there was an iron master's house which is still standing and is an interesting example of early 17th century American architecture. There are two large fireplaces you can almost walk in. Most of the reconstructed works are in operating condition today and are put through their paces twice a day when the big water wheels are set in motion, the fires of the forge flare up, and the machinery goes into operation.

Restoration of the Saugus Iron Works was accomplished through the interest and generosity of the American Iron & Steel Institute. The buildings and the 8 acres of land on which they stand are now owned by the First Iron Works Association, Inc. The association's income, however, is insufficient for it to maintain the works as they should be maintained and the American Iron & Steel Institute is unwilling to invest more money in the project. The association intends to donate these assets to the United States if H.R. 1308 becomes law.

There can be no question that the Saugus Iron Works represent an important chapter in our early industrial history and that, as such, they deserve a place in the national park system. I visualize on this spot a museum of great national value telling the story of development of iron processing in this country from the very beginning when it was in its primitive stage down to the present. There is a small museum there now that could well be enlarged to tell this whole story.

The Interior Department's report on the bill advised us that its cost estimates were $47,700 for acquisition of two parcels of land in addition to the 8 acres that are to be donated and $831,000 for rehabilitation and development expenses. The committee thought the estimated cost was too high and cut this figure to $400,000.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support this legislation and urge its enactment.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE SMALL RECLAMATION PROJECTS ACT OF 1956

The Clerk called the bill (S. 862) to amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956, as amended.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I object.

GRAZING RESERVES FOR INDIANS OF FORT McDERMITT, NEV.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11576) to amend the act of January 17, 1936 (49 Stat. 1094), reserving certain public domain lands in Nevada and Oregon as a grazing reserve for Indians of Fort McDermitt, Nev.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill, S. 2162, be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 2162

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act of January 17, 1936 (49 Stat. 1094), is amended by inserting a comma after "southwest quarter section 26; west half".

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 11576) was laid on the table.

REALLOCATING PART OF THE BANKRUPTCY FILING FEE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8632) to amend sections 40c(1) and 52a of the Bankruptcy Act so as to reallocate part of the filing fee from the clerk's earnings to the referees' salary and expense fund.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask someone who has had this bill under consideration how we are doing in this country with respect to bankruptcies. Are they increasing or decreasing?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The answer to the gentleman's question should not affect this proposal, but the information I have is that there are more bankruptcies being filed.

Mr. GROSS. There are more bankruptcies being filed in the Great Society than heretofore?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The answer is yes.

Mr. GROSS. I regret to hear that, but I guess it goes along with the welfare state that is being established.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 8632

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That paragraph c(1) of section 40 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 68c(1)) is amended by deleting "$32" and inserting in lieu thereof "$37".

SEC. 2. Paragraph a of section 52 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 80a) is amended by deleting "$8" and inserting in lieu thereof "$3".

SEC. 3. This amendatory Act shall take effect on the thirtieth day following the date of its approval.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALLOTMENTS TO UNIFORMED SAVINGS DEPOSIT PROGRAM

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4772) to authorize the Secretaries concerned to direct the initiation of allotments of the pay and allowances of certain members of the Armed Forces for the purpose of making deposits under section 1035 of title 10, United States Code.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 4772

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

the Secretary concerned considers it to be in the interest of a member of an Armed Force or his dependents, he may direct the initiation of an allotment of the unallotted pay and allowances of the members for the purpose of making deposits under section 1035 of title 10, United States Code, if the member entered a "missing status" (as defined in section 551(2) of title 37, United States Code) before having an opportunity to execute an allotment for that purpose. The Secretary may direct the initiation of an allotment under this act without the knowledge of the member, but the allotment shall be terminated upon the written request of the member.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following language:

"That section 1035 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding the following new subsection.

"'(e) The Secretary concerned, or his designee, may in the interest of a member who is in a missing status (as defined in section 551(2) of title 37) or his dependents, initiate, stop, modify, and change allotments, and authorize a withdrawal of deposits, made under this section, even though the member had an opportunity to deposit amounts under this section and elected not to do so. Interest may be computed from the day the member entered a missing status, or September 1, 1966, whichever is later.'

"SEC. 2. This act becomes effective as of September 1, 1966."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4772 is a bill that would give members of the military services who have been captured in Vietnam, or who are missing, certain rights which their more fortunate companions have today.

Last year the Congress enacted Public Law 538 which inaugurated a new savings deposit program for members of the armed forces. This new program replaced the soldiers', sailors', and airmen's savings deposit program which had virtually fallen into disuse.

The new savings deposit law became effective on September 1, 1966. Unfortunately, and through a mistaken interpretation of the law, the Department of Defense thought that 350 men who were captured or missing on that date could have deposits made in the savings fund on their behalf. However, the Comptroller General held that the law was not broad enough to cover these 350 persons in a missing status in Vietnam. This, of course, created a wholly unreasonable situation which this bill is designed to correct.

There is no one on the floor of this House but will agree that those unfortunate enough to be captured or missing should have the same rights as other military people in overseas areas.

H.R. 4772 as introduced would have taken care of these 350 missing persons. It did not, however, go quite far enough and the committee, therefore, broadened it to remove any doubt whatsoever that any person achieving the status of missing or captured after September 1, 1966, would have these same rights to have deposits made in the savings deposit program.

That is all this bill will do. It will give captured and missing people the same rights that our other military people in overseas areas have today.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in support of legislation I have sponsored. I believe that H.R. 4772 is a necessary addition to Public Law 89–538.

On August 14, 1966, the President signed into law a bill that both Houses of Congress thought necessary. Public Law 89–538 established a new savings deposit program for members of our armed services. This program provides competitive rates of interest and reasonable deposit and withdrawal terms; features which the old program lacked.

The purpose of H.R. 4772 is to extend the privilege of that program to members of the Armed Forces who are in a missing status, to prisoners of war, those people who do not have the option to act for themselves. There were 350 men in missing status on the enacting date of Public Law 89–583.

Existing legislation does not provide for those 350 missing men and their families. H.R. 4772 will correct that omission. This bill authorizes the Secretaries concerned to act in behalf of men missing or captured so that they might have the benefit of this program. It merely extends the privileges now enjoyed by all other men in the service.

These men cannot act for themselves. It is only right that we protect their interests and assist their families. I hope the Members of this body will follow the suggestion of the Armed Services Committee and give this legislation their full support.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CASEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, I commend my distinguished friend and colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts, Representative THOMAS P. O'NEILL, for authoring H.R. 4772, and the members of the Armed Services Committee for bringing it before the House.

I joined in cosponsoring this legislation when the inequity in the present law was brought to my attention by the parents of my first appointment to the U.S. Naval Academy, who is listed as missing in action in Vietnam. My bill, H.R. 4851, is a companion to that authored by my colleague.

The need for the authority contained in this bill—to permit the Secretary of the service branch to act in initiating or modifying allotments in the interest of missing or captured servicemen or their families—is obvious. These men cannot act for themselves, and certainly every effort should be made to assist them.

It is indeed gratifying to me that this legislation, which affects about 350 men and their families, has the full approval of the Department of Defense and Bureau of the Budget, and unanimous support of our colleagues on the Armed Services Committee. It certainly merits similar support by the House.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JURISDICTION AT U.S. NAVAL STATION, LONG BEACH, CALIF.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11767) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to adjust the legislation jurisdiction exercised by the United States over lands comprising the U.S. Naval Station, Long Beach, Calif.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 11767

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Navy may, at such times as he may deem desirable, retrocede to the State of California all, or such portion as he may deem desirable for retrocession, of the jurisdiction heretofore acquired by the United States over any lands comprising the United States Naval Station, Long Beach, California. Retrocession of jurisdiction under the authority of this Act may be made by filing a written notice of such retrocession with the Governor of the State of California, and shall take effect upon the acceptance thereof by the State of California in such manner as its laws may prescribe.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 11707 would permit the Secretary of the Navy to retrocede to the State of California all or such portion as he may deem desirable for retrocession of the jurisdiction heretofore acquired by the United States over lands comprising the U.S. Naval Station, Long Beach, Calif.

This authority is similar to many other bills that we have passed and specifically is sought to permit the State of California, acting through local civil authorities, to furnish regular police protection to the 391 families residing in two Navy housing projects constructed on separate parcels of land which now comprise parts of the Naval Station, Long Beach, Calif.

Retrocession would be accomplished by filing written notice thereof with the Governor of California to be effective upon its acceptance by the State in such a manner as its laws may prescribe.

The U.S. Naval Station, Long Beach, Calif., comprises a total of 1,503.63 acres

of land and submerged land. The main site of the naval station comprises 1,102.46 acres acquired by separate condemnation actions in 1940, 1942, and 1963. The remaining 401.17 acres of land acquired by condemnation and transfer are the sites of seven off-station Navy housing projects.

Over most of the naval station and the first five off-station housing projects, the Government jurisdiction is proprietorial only. However, over a 243.46-acre portion of the main site—including 219.58 acres in which the Government interest is only a leasehold until August 9, 1970—the Government presently has partial legislative jurisdiction, subject only to State reserved powers of taxation and service of civil and criminal process. Such jurisdiction is vested by article I, section 8, clause 17 of the Constitution; section 255 of title 40, United States Code; an act of the California Legislature of March 12, 1872, as amended by chapter 710 of the statutes of 1939—California Political Code, section 34—and Secretary of the Navy letter of April 5, 1943, accepting jurisdiction, acknowledged by California State Lands Commission letter of April 10, 1943.

The same Federal constitutional provision and statute, the same substantive California law, recodified as California Government Code, section 111 by chapter 134, California Statutes of 1943, Secretary of the Navy letter of November 12, 1943, accepting jurisdiction and California State Lands Commission acknowledgment letter of November 12, 1943, operated to vest the Government with similar jurisdiction over 485 acres acquired in 1942 for use in connection with the U.S. Naval Fuel Depot, San Pedro, Calif. Two portions of this 485-acre tract, measuring 58.86 and 88.77 acres, were subsequently transferred from the Naval Fuel Depot, San Pedro, to the Naval Station, Long Beach. Their development and use as Palos Verdes public quarters and the San Pedro fund housing project, respectively, has given rise to a significant problem in the furnishing of adequate police protection to the 391 families residing in the housing projects. The Government's existing legislative jurisdiction over the entire 485 acres leaves local police authorities with no jurisdiction over these projects for performance of their ordinary functions of law enforcement and protection of persons and property on behalf of the residents. The Navy shore patrol, the only Government police agency readily available, cannot effectively police these residential areas since it has no general authority over persons other than members of the Armed Forces. Under section 13 of title 18, United States Code, the criminal laws of the State would be enforceable in the project areas notwithstanding the lack of State jurisdiction, but only as Federal law and only by such other Government police officers as may be provided. The forum for enforcement of such laws would be the U.S. district court.

The law enforcement agencies of the city of Los Angeles and of the county of Los Angeles, presently rendering police services in the general localities of Palos Verdes public quarters and the San Pedro fund housing project, have both indicated willingness to furnish these housing projects with their regular services if the impediment of lack of jurisdiction is removed. Government retrocession of legislative jurisdiction over these projects as soon as possible is considered highly desirable to relieve the existing unhappy situation. This will make regular police services of the city of Los Angeles and the county of Los Angeles available to occupants of portions of the housing project under their respective jurisdictions. Advising that State acceptance of retrocession of Government jurisdiction will require an act of the California Legislature, the California State Lands Commission has prepared proposed general legislation to effect State consent to Government retrocession of jurisdiction under certain conditions of procedure.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTABLISHING A JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S CORPS IN THE NAVY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 12910) to establish a Judge Advocate General's Corps in the Navy, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I simply want to commend the committee for bringing forth this bill.

Mr. Speaker, for many years I have advocated the creation in the Department of the Navy of a Judge Advocate General's Corps. I have never been able to understand why the other branches of the Service have had a Judge Advocate General's Corps and not the Department of the Navy.

Mr. Speaker, I simply wish to compliment the committee for proposing this legislation.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the distinguished gentleman from Iowa for his comments and to also thank the gentleman for his support of this legislation throughout the years.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 12910

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That chapter 47 of title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Section 801(11) is amended to read as follows:

"(11) 'Law specialist' means a commissioned officer of the Coast Guard designated for special duty (law)."

(2) The following new clause is added at the end of section 801:

"(13) 'Judge advocate' means an officer of the Judge Advocate General's Corps of the Army or the Navy or an officer of the Air Force or the Marine Corps who is designated as a judge advocate."

(3) Section 806(a) is amended by deleting the first sentence and inserting the following sentences in place thereof:

"The assignment for duty of judge advocates of the Army, Navy, and Air Force and law specialists of the Coast Guard shall be made upon the recommendation of the Judge Advocate General of the armed force of which they are members. The assignment for duty of judge advocates of the Marine Corps shall be made by direction of the Commandant of the Marine Corps."

(4) Section 815(e) is amended by striking out the words "Army or Air Force, a law specialist of the Navy" in the last sentence and substituting in place thereof the words "Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps".

(5) Section 827(b)(1) is amended by striking out the words "or the Air Force or a law specialist of the Navy or" and inserting in place thereof the words ", Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps or a law specialist of the".

(6) Section 865(c) is amended by striking out the words "or the Air Force, a law specialist of the Navy" and inserting in place thereof the words ", Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps".

(7) Section 936(a)(1) is amended by deleting the words "and the Air Force" and inserting in place thereof the words ", Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps".

SEC. 2. Chapter 513 of title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Section 5148 is amended—

(A) by amending the catchline to read:

"§ 5148. Judge Advocate General's Corps: Office of the Judge Advocate General; Judge Advocate General; appointment, term, emoluments, duties";

(B) by redesignating subsections (a), (b), and (c) as subsections (b), (c), and (d), respectively, and inserting the following new subsection:

"(a) The Judge Advocate General's Corps is a Staff Corps of the Navy, and shall be organized in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy."; and

(C) by striking out, in subsection (b) as redesignated, in the third sentence, the word "officers" and inserting in place thereof the words "judge advocates".

(2) Section 5149 is amended to read as follows:

"§ 5149. Office of the Judge Advocate General: Deputy Judge Advocate General; Assistant Judge Advocate General

"(a) A judge advocate of the Navy or Marine Corps who has the qualifications prescribed for the Judge Advocate General in section 5148(b) of this title shall be detailed as Deputy Judge Advocate General of the Navy. While so serving he is entitled to the rank and grade of rear admiral (upper half) or major general, as appropriate, unless entitled to a higher rank or grade under another provision of law. The Deputy Judge Advocate General is entitled to the same privileges of retirement as provided for chiefs of bureaus in section 5133 of this title.

"(b) A judge advocate of the Navy or Marine Corps who has the qualifications prescribed for the Judge Advocate General in section 5148(b) of this title shall be detailed as Assistant Judge Advocate General of the Navy.

"(c) When there is a vacancy in the Office of the Judge Advocate General, or during the absence or disability of the Judge Advocate General, the Deputy Judge Advocate General shall perform the duties of the Judge Advocate General until a successor is appointed or the absence or disability ceases.

"(d) When subsection (c) cannot be complied with because of the absence or disability of the Deputy Judge Advocate General, the Assistant Judge Advocate General

shall perform the duties of the Judge Advocate General."

(3) The analysis is amended by amending the items relating to sections 5148 and 5149 to read as follows:

"5148. Judge Advocate General's Corps: Office of the Judge Advocate General; Judge Advocate General; appointment, term, emoluments, duties.

"5149. Office of the Judge Advocate General: Deputy Judge Advocate General; Assistant Judge Advocate General."

SEC. 3. Section 5404 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(c) The Secretary of the Navy, as of January 1 of each year, shall establish the authorized strength of the active list of the Navy in officers in the Judge Advocate General's Corps."

SEC. 4. Section 5508(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting the following new clause after clause (5): "(6) Officers in the Judge Advocate General's Corps,"; and

(2) by renumbering clauses (6), (7), and (8) as clauses "(7)", "(8)", and "(9)", respectively.

SEC. 5. Chapter 539 of title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) The following new section is added after section 5578:

"§ 5578a. Regular Navy; Judge Advocate General's Corps

"(a) Original appointments to the active list of the Navy in the Judge Advocate General's Corps may be made from persons who—

"(1) are at least twenty-one and under thirty-five years of age;

"(2) are graduates of an accredited law school or are members of the bar of a Federal court or the highest court of a State; and

"(3) have physical, mental, and moral qualifications satisfactory to the Secretary of the Navy.

For the purposes of determining lineal position, permanent grade, seniority in permanent grade, and eligibility for promotion, an officer appointed in the Judge Advocate General's Corps shall be credited with the amount of service prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy, but not less than three years.

"(b) Under such regulations as the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe, appointments to the active list of the Navy in the Judge Advocate General's Corps may be made from officers of the Navy, including the Naval Reserve, in the line or in another staff corps. Notwithstanding any other law, an officer appointed under this subsection shall have a running mate assigned to him under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy."

(2) Section 5587(c) is amended by striking out "law,".

(3) The following new section is added after section 5587:

"§ 5587a. Regular Marine Corps: judge advocates.

"(a) With the approval of the Secretary of the Navy, any officer on the active list of the Marine Corps who is qualified under section 827(b) of this title may, upon his application, be designated as a judge advocate.

"(b) For the purposes of determining lineal position, permanent grade, seniority in permanent grade, and eligibility for promotion, a person appointed to the active list of the Marine Corps with a view to designation as a judge advocate may be credited with the amount of service prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy, but not more than three years."

(4) Section 5600(b) is amended—

(A) by adding at the end of clause (1) the words

"(D) Judge Advocate General's Corps—3 years;";

(B) by striking out clause (2); and

(C) by renumbering clause (3) as clause (2).

(5) The following new items are inserted in the analysis:

"5578a. Regular Navy: Judge Advocate General's Corps."

"5587a. Regular Marine Corps: judge advocates."

SEC. 6. Section 5762 of title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Section 5762(d) is amended by inserting the words "Judge Advocate General's Corps," after the words "Medical Corps,".

(2) The following new subsection is added at the end:

"(f) The Secretary shall furnish the appropriate selection board convened under chapter 543 of this title with the number of officers that may be recommended for promotion to the grade of captain or commander in the Judge Advocate General's Corps. This number, determined by the Secretary as of the date the selection board is convened—

"(1) may not exceed the total number of officers of the Judge Advocate General's Corps in the promotion zone for the grade concerned; and

"(2) may not be less than the product of the number of officers of the Judge Advocate General's Corps in the promotion zone and a fraction, of which the numerator is the number of male line officers, not restricted in the performance of duty, placed upon the promotion list pursuant to the report of the comparable board for the selection of line officers convened in the same fiscal year, and the denominator is the number of male line officers, not restricted in the performance of duty, in the promotion zone considered by that board."

SEC. 7. Section 202 of title 37, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (g) is amended by inserting the words "or as Deputy Judge Advocate General of the Navy," after the word "Navy".

(2) Subsection (h) is amended—

(A) by striking out "or" at the end of clause (6);

(B) by redesignating clause (7) as clause (8); and

(C) by adding immediately after clause (6) a new clause as follows:

"(7) Deputy Judge Advocate General of the Navy; or".

(3) Subsection (i) is amended by striking out clause (3) thereof and by renumbering clauses (4) and (5) as clauses (3) and (4), respectively.

SEC. 8. (a) In this section "law specialist" means a line officer on the active or retired list of the Regular Navy or of the Naval Reserve designated for special duty (law) or a line officer of the Naval Reserve assigned a numerical designator indicating a special duty officer (law).

(b) All law specialists in the Navy are redesignated as judge advocates in the Judge Advocate General's Corps of the Navy. Each law specialist of the Navy who is on a promotion list on the day before the effective date of this Act shall be placed on the appropriate promotion list for the Judge Advocate General's Corps and shall be eligible for promotion when the officer who is to be his running mate in the next higher grade becomes eligible for promotion in that grade. All provisions of title 10, United States Code, not inconsistent with this Act, relating to officers of the Medical Corps of the Navy shall apply to officers of the Judge Advocate General's Corps of the Navy.

SEC. 9. Nothing in this Act shall operate to terminate or reduce the term of an officer who was serving as Deputy and Assistant Judge Advocate General of the Navy on the day before the effective date of this Act or to deprive him of the rank, pay, allowances, or retirement privileges to which he was then entitled. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an officer who was so serving on the day before the effective date of this Act shall be deemed to be detailed as Deputy Judge Advocate General, pursuant to section 5149 of title 10, United States Code, as amended by this Act, and, in addition to rights and benefits then accrued, to be entitled to the rank and retirement benefits authorized by that section. For the purposes of determining his eligibility for the retirement benefits authorized by section 5149 of title 10, United States Code, as amended by this Act, an officer who is serving as Deputy Judge Advocate General on the effective date of this Act shall be credited with all service performed under appointment or detail as Deputy and Assistant Judge Advocate General before the effective date of this Act.

SEC. 10. This Act does not affect rights accrued, duties matured, or proceedings commenced before its effective date.

SEC. 11. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, all provisions of law applicable to a male officer in the Judge Advocate General's Corps of the Navy, including the Naval Reserve, are applicable to a woman officer in that corps.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 3, lines 20 through 25, and page 4, lines 1 through 21, strike entire section and substitute in lieu thereof the following:

"§ 5149. Office of the Judge Advocate General: Deputy Judge Advocate General; Assistant Judge Advocates General

"(a) A judge advocate of the Navy or Marine Corps who has the qualifications prescribed for the Judge Advocate General in section 5148(b) of this title shall be detailed as Deputy Judge Advocate General of the Navy. While so serving he is entitled to the rank and grade of rear admiral (upper half) or major general, as appropriate, unless entitled to a higher rank or grade under another provision of law. The Deputy Judge Advocate General is entitled to the same privileges of retirement as provided for chiefs of bureaus in section 5133 of this title.

"(b) An officer of the Judge Advocate General's Corps who has the qualifications prescribed for the Judge Advocate General in section 5148(b) of this title shall be detailed as Assistant Judge Advocate General of the Navy. While so serving he is entitled to the rank and grade to rear admiral (lower half), unless entitled to a higher rank or grade under another provision of law. An officer who is retired while serving as Assistant Judge Advocate General of the Navy under this subsection or who, after serving at least twelve months as Assistant Judge Advocate General of the Navy, is retired after completion of that service while serving in a lower rank or grade, may, in the discretion of the President, be retired with the rank and grade of rear admiral (lower half). If he is retired as a rear admiral, he is entitled to retired pay in the lower half of that grade, unless entitled to higher pay under another provision of law.

"(c) A judge advocate of the Marine Corps who has the qualifications prescribed for the Judge Advocate General in section 4158(b) of this title shall be detailed as Assistant Judge Advocate General of the Navy. While so serving he is entitled to the rank and grade of brigadier general, unless entitled to a higher rank or grade under another provision of law. An officer who is retired while serving as Assistant Judge Advocate General of the Navy under this subsection or who, after serving at least twelve months as Assistant Judge Advocate General of the Navy, is retired after completion of that service while serving in a lower rank or grade, may, in the discretion of the President, be retired with the rank and grade of brigadier general. If he is retired as a brigadier general, he is entitled to the retired pay of that grade, unless entitled to higher pay under another provision of law.

"(d) When there is a vacancy in the Office of the Judge Advocate General, or during the absence or disability of the Judge Advocate General, the Deputy Judge Advocate General shall perform the duties of the Judge Advocate General until a successor is appointed or the absence or disability ceases.

"(e) When subsection (d) cannot be complied with because of the absence or disability of the Deputy Judge Advocate General, the Assistant Judge Advocates General in the order directed by the Secretary of the Navy, shall perform the duties of the Judge Advocate General."

On page 7, on the last line before line 6, add an "s" to the word "Advocate".

On page 9, after line 4, add the following:

"(4) The following new subsection is added at the end:

"'(k) Unless appointed to a higher grade under another provision of law, an officer of the Navy or Marine Corps serving as Assistant Judge Advocate General of the Navy is entitled to the basic pay of a rear admiral (lower half) or brigadier general, as appropriate.'"

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 12910 would provide for a Judge Advocate General's Corps in the Navy. At the outset, I should say that this bill stems from legislation which had been carefully studied and drafted by our able and conscientious colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT].

The responsibilities of the uniformed lawyer in the Navy—now law specialists—have been increasing over the years. It was not until after World War II that the Navy began to use full-time lawyers in place of line officers with legal training who spent part time on legal matters. Now the problems have become even more complex—with the Uniform Code of Military Justice, with the increased necessity of providing legal guidance to service personnel and with the Navy's increased responsibilities around the world.

The Navy has had to rely recently more and more on young students right out of law school to provide the major portion of its officers. There has been a real dearth of officers continuing in the Navy making it a lifetime career. Young men who have been interviewed when leaving the service have said that one of the two main reasons for their departure was the lack of a professional organization within the Navy. This bill is designed to supply that lack. It is hoped that with a full organization within the Navy more young men will decide that there is a place in the Navy for a legal career and will stay with it for their professional lives. Then the lawyers will have the same kind of an organization within which they can have professional recognition as the doctors, the dentists, and the civil engineers. The bill has many sections because it was necessary to amend many parts of title 10 in order to provide for the Judge Advocate General's Corps.

The bill was unanimously approved in subcommittee and in the full committee. I move its passage.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 12910.

I support this for the following reasons: First, each other branch of the armed services already has such a corps and has found this to be efficient and helpful; second, if the Navy secures the establishment of such a corps it will be consistent with and carry out the internal Navy organization in other staff corps such as supply, civil engineering, medical, dental, nurse, and medical services; third, the present Navy strength of persons doing this legal work is now at the level of 555 and the demand for the type of work which they do is increasing. Recently enacted legislation to require the Navy to recover certain funds under the Medical Care Recovery Act of 1962 and the Federal Tort Claims Act of 1966 have increased the responsibilities of Navy lawyers. Further, decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States with regard to furnishing free legal counsel to the accused must eventually be consistently carried out in the armed services, and this would require a substantial number of lawyers. So it is clear from these and other things that the responsibilities of the Navy lawyers have increased substantially through recent years, and it seems clear for this reason alone that the Navy should be allowed the same organizational structure in this field as is enjoyed by other branches of the services. Fourth, and finally, the legislation will assist in obtaining and retaining adequate Navy lawyers. The experience level of the Navy lawyer has been steadily declining since 1957. Although the numbers available for the Navy have been adequate, if their lack of experience is not considered, the numbers reflect very largely the present draft situation. This means that we are obtaining inexperienced lawyers and that when the draft situation eases even they will not be available. Even at the present time the question of retention of an adequate number of lawyers with experience is very much a problem. This legislation would help to correct this situation.

It is my belief that the creation of a Navy Judge Advocate General's Corps would be a great help in the retention problems of the Navy in the field of maintaining adequate lawyers for the responsibilities that are placed upon them by statute. I sincerely hope that the House will pass the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FACILITATING COMPUTATION OF TOBACCO ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1564) to amend the marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 1564

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first sentence of section 313(g) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the Secretary may convert the national marketing quota into a national acreage allotment by dividing the national marketing quota by the national average yield for the five years immediately preceding the year in which the national marketing quota is proclaimed, and may apportion the national acreage allotment, less a reserve of not to exceed 1 per centum thereof for new farms, for making corrections in old farm acreage allotments, and for adjusting inequities in old farm acreage allotments, through the local committees among farms on the basis of the factors set forth in subsection (b), using past farm acreage and past farm acreage allotments for tobacco in lieu of past marketing of tobacco; and the Secretary on the basis of the factors set forth in subsection (c) and the past tobacco experience of the farm operator, shall through the local committees allot that portion of the national acreage allotment reserved for new farms among farms on which no tobacco was produced or considered produced during the last five years."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of the Consent Calendar.

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT IN THE RYUKYU ISLANDS

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4903) to amend the act providing for the economic and social development in the Ryukyu Islands.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4903

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 4 of the Act of July 12, 1960, Public Law 86-629, as amended (76 Stat. 742), is amended by striking out the figure "$12,000,000" and inserting the figure "$25,000,000" in place thereof.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4903 would raise our assistance to the Ryukyu Islands from the sum of $12 million to $25 million.

The bill, however, is very much more important than the amount of money would indicate, and I shall attempt to make this statement abundantly clear during my discussion of what the bill, if adopted, would do.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, this is the third time that legislation of this kind has been considered by the House of Representatives. Only last year, in March, we considered a bill, identical in its language to the one which is pending

before us today. That bill was reported out of the Committee on Armed Services unanimously and passed the House. However, it failed of passage in the other body.

Further, by reason of your approval of this same legislation—and I do not intend to go into great detail, since great detail as has been gone into on previous occasions, we do have a real high priority and practical obligation to the people of Okinawa. Legislation of this kind is in the last analysis serving our own best interests. There can be no doubt that Okinawa is our most important military installation in the Far East.

Mr. Speaker, our investment to date in structures alone on Okinawa is in excess of one-half billion dollars. Of course, what this bill will do, if enacted, is very simply stated as follows: It will permit the raising of teachers' salaries, for example in the area of public health, it will provide for disease control and for health and medical facilities and equipment.

It will permit the building of roads, bridges, and a sewer system, and many other things of this same general nature.

Mr. Speaker, I will not go into further detail on this unless of course there are some questions on the part of the Members. But, Mr. Speaker, this is an essential bill in support of our military installations in Okinawa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. This bill, as I believe the gentleman has stated, would increase the authorization for the support of the Ryukyu Islands from $12 million to $25 million a year?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Why, having taken the islands at a terrific price in blood and lives, must we now, in addition to the economic support that our huge base there gives to these people, more than double the direct authorization each year?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I will say to the gentleman that emphasis has been placed in the past that since we took Okinawa by conquest our use of the islands is merely the result of the defeat of the Japanese.

The gentleman will grant this is the emphasis that sometimes has been placed in these matters, that is true. But it fails to recognize that Okinawa is far separated from Japan, and has in many ways its own, ancient culture. The Okinawans were never really our enemies; they were rather the unhappy victims of the war that had little or no presence there. They do, however, consider themselves a part of Japan. They compare their situation as against the situation in the other prefectures of Japan. They compare their progress with the progress being made in the other prefectures of Japan. Unfortunately, they find themselves a little bit below that progress.

I believe we have some responsibility to assist them in at least maintaining the same rate of progress as the people in the other areas of Japan enjoy.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Yes; I yield further to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I know of no one who wants to surrender this bastion we have in the Pacific. That is not the issue at all. What I am concerned about is this continual increasing of the spending of our taxpayers' money on the Ryukyus, with the Japanese continuing to insist that they again take over the rule of the Ryukyus and Matsuoko, chief of the local government, insisting on a return to Japanese jurisdiction.

What are we proposing to do; spend more hundreds of millions of dollars putting capital improvements on Okinawa and then one day turning the huge investment over to the Japanese?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I will say to the gentleman that we went into this quite thoroughly during our hearings, and we have held extensive hearings on this matter. The Okinawa situation is a continuing situation. The increase in the cost of operation is like in any other part of the world. The economics have improved, naturally, and we want them to continue to improve.

But I do want to comment on the gentleman's concern about the reversion of the islands to Japan. There has been a great deal said in the past about the possibility of returning Okinawa to Japan. That is the reason we were careful in our hearings to give much attention to this matter. We went into it in detail, and I might say we went into it in depth, both with the Army representative and Ambassador Berger of the State Department, and I want to state frankly—and I believe the other members of the subcommittee will agree with me—that there is not any thought on this side, at least, in our Government being given to the return of Okinawa to Japan. There was no division of opinion on this in any of the testimony received by the subcommittee.

Mr. GROSS. Do I understand there are about a million natives on the Ryukyu Islands?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. There are something less than a million. It is in the neighborhood of 940,000.

Mr. GROSS. And about 700,000 of them are on Okinawa?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. That is true—yes.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman have any figures as to the Japanese contribution to the economy of the islands?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Yes, we do. The Japanese have contributed about $26 million in 1967 to the same type of program. Over $67 million since 1951.

Mr. GROSS. What is their annual share of the contribution? I know what it is for 1966, but what was it for 1967? or what is it estimated to be?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. They are increasing it to about $25 million in 1967 and it has been a steady increase each year since 1951.

Mr. GROSS. In other words, the Japanese in fiscal year 1966 put in about $16 million into Okinawa; is that not correct?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. That is right. They are increasing it this year.

I might say to the gentleman that this is one reason for the necessity of increasing our authorization because we have a partnership program with the Japanese for sharing the costs of certain specific items that are of great importance to the economy of Okinawa.

Mr. GROSS. Is it not true that the bulk of Ryukyus exports are to Japan, and the bulk of their imports are from Japan?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. That may be true. But the Okinawans for a long time have attempted to increase their trade with other parts of the world and they have attempted to increase their business with us.

Mr. GROSS. In other words, we are about to vote here to double the take from the United States—from $12 to $25 million—and yet we do not have the slightest assurance that this is going to provide us with any larger share of the trade with the Ryukyus, and principally Okinawa? The Japanese are living high on the hog so far as trade with the Ryukyus is concerned, and we are putting in more money than the Japanese.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. No, no—we are not.

Mr. GROSS. Oh, yes, we are when it is all totaled.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. In the whole picture—in the operation of our base—yes. But in the particular program for which these funds are being provided, we are not. We have to face the practical situation we are in in Okinawa. We have our main military installation in Asia in Okinawa. We are going to have to stay there a long time and the gentleman, I think, wants us to stay there. If we are going to stay there, we have to meet our responsibilities to the area and we have to assist the people of Okinawa to promote and build up their economy and to do the essential things that are necessary and this money will help them.

This is for educational programs. It is for public health and medical programs, and public safety and cultural facilities. It is for public works and economic development. It is for the construction of a sewer system and of a water system and for transportation. It is for all the essential things that go to make up the economy of a country. These are just as essential for our troops over there because without an adequate water supply and without an adequate sewer system, we are adversely affected.

Mr. GROSS. I again say to the gentleman that we obtained the island of Okinawa at a staggering price in lives and blood of Americans. I know of no reason why we should today expend the kind of money that we are, over and above the contribution that the stationing of our troops at this base contributes to their economy. I know of no reason why we should continue to pay right through the nose to the Ryukyus who are demonstrating at times and insisting that they be returned to Japanese rule.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I do not follow the logic of the gentleman because if he thinks that we should stay there, and if he thinks we are there by conquest, and if he thinks we have a right to be there, then we have the obligation to maintain

the island and support its economy. We have $1.5 billion in a military operation there to maintain and protect. I think it is in our own self-interest that we do this.

Mr. GROSS. There are any number of the natives employed by the U.S. Government at good pay by Asian standards and that is where their economy gets its biggest boost.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Of course, they are. There is no argument about that.

Mr. GROSS. Then why double the amount of the authorization in this bill?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Because the sewer systems are essential. The water system is essential. Because the educational system is essential. Because these funds are required to bolster the economy of the country and at least to try to bring them up to a level equal to that of the people in other prefectures of Japan.

I think it would be a sad reflection on America if we are not able to do that.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Did the recent visit of the Prime Minister of Japan to this country have anything to do with a commitment to pass this bill? Is the effort to pass this bill a result of his visit here?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. That has nothing to do with it. This bill was passed by the House in the 89th Congress before his visit here. This will be the third time it has been passed. It has been passed twice by the House.

I would like the gentleman to bear in mind the preamble to the basic law related to those islands. Here is what it says:

> In the exercise by the President of the authority over the Ryukyu Islands granted to the United States, Article III of the Treaty of Peace with Japan, every effort shall be made to improve the welfare and well being of the inhabitants of the Ryukyu Islands and to promote their economic and cultural development.

That is what we seek to do with this bill, but without these funds we will not be in a very good position to fulfill this commitment in the preamble to the treaty entered into with Japan.

Mr. GROSS. With the Japanese putting in $16 million and with an increase in our contribution to $25 million, that would be $41 million going into that country, in addition to the other money to which I have referred.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. We must contribute $25 million even to match what the Japanese may be expected to put in. The Japanese put up $16 million in 1966. We were not able to do that in this particular program. The Japanese were able to put $25 million in for fiscal 1967, which we are not able to match because we do not have sufficient authorization to do it.

Mr. GROSS. Does not the gentleman appreciate that the U.S. Treasury is "busted," and that we are borrowing money every hour of every day to run this Government? And this is an increase of more than 100 percent in our authorization for the Ryukyu Islands. I just do not go along with it, and I want the record to show that I am opposed to it.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. To protect an investment of $1,500,000,000 that we have in military operations in the Ryukyus and which we hope to maintain.

Mr. GROSS. If the channeling of more and more millions of dollars into the Ryukyu Islands is necessary for our retention of the Ryukyus, then we had better prepare to get out of there now, because we cannot continue this endlessly and forever. We cannot always buy our way around the world. In this case there is no justification for buying our right to stay on Okinawa or any other island of that chain.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. RUMSFELD. The report indicates that the Government of the United States recognizes a residual sovereignty of Japan with respect to the Ryukyu Islands. We all know that Japan has been increasing their economic aid and technical assistance throughout Southeast Asia in recent years. In view of the fact that the United States Government, and the taxpayers of the United States, are providing a nuclear as well as conventional umbrella over Japan, and in view of the fact that the security treaty and their Constitution require that Japan not have a Military Establishment and therefore she does not bear the costs of defense, would it not seem reasonable for the U.S. Government to encourage Japan to undertake a greater role with respect to economic assistance in the Ryukyu Islands.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I am glad the gentleman brought that up, because at this point I would like to read into the RECORD how the Japanese contribution has been increasing year by year.

In 1960 the Japanese Government contributed about $172,000. Then in 1961, $570,000; in 1965, to $8 million; in 1966, $16 million; in 1967, $25 million.

So those figures indicate that the contributions of Japan have grown year by year.

So Japan has been increasing its contribution.

I might say to the gentleman—I think he will agree with me—that it is in our interest to maintain our bases on Okinawa. I do not know where we would go in the Asian area, and I do not know what the cost of replacement of the facilities would be in some other place.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further. I certainly am not debating the question as to whether or not the United States should retain bases on Okinawa—at least until such time as the world situation is such that those bases are no longer required.

My point is this. On the economic side, and it assumes continuation of U.S. involvement there and the base there, and a continued attitude on the part of Japan that they recognize, as we do, a residual sovereignty. In view of the fact that Japan is spending less than 5 percent of her national budget per year on defense and on their foreign aid programs—and my guess is that it would be something closer to 2 or 3 percent—and in view of the fact that the U.S. Government is spending approximately 60 percent on defense, military assistance, and foreign aid, it seems to me it would not be unreasonable for the United States to attempt to make an arrangement with Japan whereby Japan would undertake a proportionally greater portion of the assistance in the Ryukyu Islands.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, my time is almost up, so I will reply to the gentleman very rapidly. First of all, the Japanese Government is precluded in the Treaty of Peace from operation of military defense there.

Mr. RUMSFELD. The gentleman is not answering my question. I know that.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Secondly, I do not think there would be any difficulty in the world in having the Japanese put more funds into the existing joint program, but it would then strengthen their case for early reversion and would cause considerable problems.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I am interested to hear the gentleman say that that is what is behind his position.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I think we should bear that in mind.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill, H.R. 4903, being full well aware of the argument that has gone before. In noting that, I will advise our colleagues to review the committee report, pages 5, 6, 7, and 8 in particular. These pertain to the authority of the United States in the Ryukyus. It pertains to something that has been very close to the heart of those of us who have been in the military (and perhaps are still in the Reserves), those of us who have served in Okinawa and in the Ryukyu Islands in World War II, or who have visited there officially as architects for the Congress since that time, or indeed even on active duty as Reserves. I refer to the fact that control of the Ryukyus is in their assembly, elected in a representative fashion, in their elected head of State, in the High Commissioner of the Ryukyus, and the civilian adviser to the High Commissioner.

The High Commissioner of the Ryukyus has three different hats to wear: First of all, he is the commander in chief of the 9th Corps of the Army; secondly, he is the High Commissioner and is appointed by the State Department and has State Department functions; and also, indeed his civilian adviser is for the most part from and nominated by the Department of State. I for one am adamant in my belief that the High Commissioner should remain an armed service representative and designee.

This is a very complex situation. Suffice it to say that under the de facto sovereignty which we exercise there, although Executive Order No. 10713, and indeed the peace treaty with Japan, sections 2 and 3, do not clearly establish this as a total sovereign right or a ceding of territory to the United States of America, it is beyond any peradventure of doubt important that we maintain this

as a crossroads of the military in the Western Pacific, as far as our ability to maintain freedom around the world is concerned.

I, for one, do feel that it is important that we maintain this bastion in the far western Pacific forever. If we do so, I think we do have some obligation to see that, on a private enterprise basis and on a government basis, if necessary, "we fly our flag," in this area.

Toward this end I have indeed gone so far as to solicit private enterprise from time to time, and some medical care in particular, and the Sears, Roebuck Foundation specifically, for the establishment of clinics needed there, and also to see that some American-trained physicians practice there. We were partially successful in this effort for the area.

There has been a need for and an opportunity to fly the flag there with fertilizer plants, increased farming techniques with land restoration objectives, paints, certainly private power, and many other areas.

So long as we are going to maintain this as a base, and maintain control, including the health factors and the required sanitation in this faraway place, much of it for military purposes, our obligation is worthwhile; and albeit, as stated, we can never retract or take from them the installations of private enterprise, there planted in an effort to fly our flag, or any public installation, we need do this for the weal of all concerned.

Personally, after careful consideration of this bill, after having visited both with past and present high commissioners and representatives from the Ryukyus, after having been assured by our Department of State—which I am not always so positive can and will maintain our sovereignty there, other than residual sovereignty, as indeed they are now attempting to do in the Panama Canal—I have come to the considered opinion, Mr. Speaker, it is better for us to so manipulate and to so contribute and to so constitute our control, and the high commissioner's veto power, along with the ascendancy of the GRI (the governing body of the Ryukus), that they will, in the open market place on a fair enterprise basis, put out bids for the electric power company, which certainly we have subsidized in the past, even by putting barges alongside, and ships to generate power in times of need from low power peaks so that they themselves will be able to build the powerplant on a competitive basis, rather than let the Corps of Engineers do it, which would be wholly subsidized. I believe there is some evidence that perhaps the Corps wanted to do this construction and perhaps along with the Department of the Army has been instrumental, in an indirect way, in not allowing the bids for the consortium for the development of power on the Ryukyus base, for too long a time.

Therefore, I would rise—with some reservation—in support of this bill, especially in view of the fact that on two past occasions it passed this House. We should work the will of the House vis-a-vis the other body, where the bill has languished in idleness and failed to come before the body, as needed law.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] 3 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I have listened to quite a discourse from both sides of the aisle on the fact that we are there and apparently we are going to stay. I hope we do stay in the Ryukyus.

If we fail to increase this expenditure by more than 100 percent, from $12 million to $25 million, does it mean the United States is going to be forced off the Ryukyus, that we are going to be forced out of Okinawa? Is this what the gentlemen on the committee are saying, that unless we more than double this authorization we are going to be forced off the Ryukyus, including Okinawa? If this is the situation we are in today then we are militarily bankrupt.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman looked over this way, so I assume he wants me to answer.

No. I would say this is a reflection of our responsibility. If we are going to remain there and maintain our installation, we have this responsibility and it should be met.

I would say that the fact the authorization is for $25 million does not indicate there is $25 million in the budget this year. As a matter of fact, it would be considerably less than that for this year.

Mr. GROSS. What the gentleman should admit is that with the passage of this bill it can go to $25 million at any time in the future.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. No. It puts us in a position, on a program we have there in conjunction with the Japanese, where we can match offers of contributions with the Japanese.

Mr. GROSS. Why should we match anything with the Japanese?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Because——

Mr. GROSS. Just a minute now. Why should we match anything with the Japanese? The Japanese, if I remember the figures correctly, for 1966, at least, are getting more than 70 percent of the import business into the Ryukyus and particularly into Okinawa and more than 70 percent of the exports from the Ryukyus are going into Japan. We are way down the list. We are in second or third place as far as trade with the Ryukyus is concerned despite the fact that we have been putting up the lion's share of the money for them. The reason why I do not know. When we consider the millions of dollars that we have spent for the support of this base, for the military forces there and for hiring of native employees and so on, I just do not understand why we should spend $12 million, much less increase it to $25 million as is proposed. Some place along the line you on the Committee on Armed Services ought to put a stop to this business. We are there by right of conquest at a staggering price in terms of Americans killed and wounded. We should stay there by right of conquest until the Ryukyus are no longer valuable to use as a base in the Pacific. There is no reason why we should ask the taxpayers of this country to pay through the nose for this right.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I simply want to say that I believe every member of the Committee on Armed Services full well realizes how Okinawa was obtained. I am sure we all realize the success and vagaries of the peace treaty with Japan. I want to emphasize to this House that this is the most important military base currently in existence in all of our armed defenses of the United States of America, and freedom around the world.

Second. I want to make the didactic statement that insofar as this member of the Committee on Armed Services is concerned, so long as he or any influence he might wield is concerned, these islands will never be returned or receded, with residuary rights or otherwise, to any foreign sovereign power because of their inherent value, considering our military defense needs.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is not saying that if we should refuse to add $13 million a year to the take by the Ryukyuan Government, that we are going to lose this base in the Pacific, is he?

Mr. HALL. No, I am certainly not, nor have I ever countenanced such a thought. Personally I do not believe this is on a matching-fund race basis with any other government, but I am sincerely anxious that we keep this as a going concern for the military. I just do not consider it on that basis or that we are matching pennies or playing games with any other sovereign power.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4903, a bill to provide for the economic and social development in the Ryukyu Islands, and to commend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] for the great leadership and foresight he has demonstrated in the matter under consideration. Much of the good relationship which we now enjoy with the Ryukyuans is the result of the work of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE]. From personal knowledge, I know that he is one of the most highly regarded Americans in the Ryukyu Islands, as well as in Japan.

Mr. Speaker, the bill under debate will authorize the increase from $13 million to $25 million in appropriations to maintain our position in the Ryukyu Islands. As it is well known, the islands are under the complete control of the United States, and will continue to be so, so long as it is our wish. It is an undeniable fact too that the Ryukyu Islands play a highly important role in our efforts in Vietnam. Were it not for the free use of the military bases there our operations in Vietnam would be sorely handicapped.

Both the Japanese and the Okinawans recognize this, and being in support of our policy in Vietnam, they are not exerting undue pressure for the return of

the islands to Japan, under its recognized rights of residual sovereignty.

Despite the fact that the United States exercises complete jurisdiction and control over the Ryukyu Islands, the Japanese Government has, upon the urging of our Government, agreed to increase its economic assistance to the Ryukyuans and will be boosting its annual contribution from its present $16 million to $25 million.

Because there are thousands of Americans, civilian and military, now resident in the Ryukyu Islands, and because it is not known how long they will be there, whatever improvements we make there will be to the benefit of Americans, as well as to the Ryukyuans. If we fail to provide the necessary improvements, agitation for reversion will no doubt increase, and our operations in connection with Vietnam can become truly complicated. Passage of this bill will assure continued good relations and cooperation from the people of the Ryukyus, and will be in our own best interest. I therefore urge my colleagues to support and vote for the measure under consideration.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I urge favorable action on the legislation before this body today, H.R. 4903, which provides for the promotion of economic and social development in the Ryukyu Islands.

As chairman of the House Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I have long been concerned about American policies and position in the Ryukyu Islands.

Less than 2 years ago as chairman of a study mission to Asia I visited both Japan and Okinawa in an attempt to gain firsthand information and opinions on the "reversion" issue.

The mission, which included our colleagues, Representatives MURPHY of Illinois, BROOMFIELD, WHALLEY, THOMSON of Wisconsin, and JAMES FULTON and Representative MATSUNAGA, representative of the House Agriculture Committee, discussed relevant matters with Japanese, Ryukyuan, and American officials.

Our observations confirmed that the requirement of free world security are intimately connected with the effective and unified control of the military facilities which dominate the life of the islands. At the same time, the study mission expressed support for any measures which would aid in improving American-Ryukyuan relations and in eliminating sources of friction.

The legislation before the House today fulfills those criteria. It seeks to help eliminate an economic source of unrest by providing additional funds for further development of the islands' wealth and resources.

Certainly progress has been made during the past few years. At the same time, however, the standard of living for the people of the islands lags behind that of the Japanese. The Ryukyuans, who are ethnically Japanese, need only look to the East to see a reason for pressing for the reversion of their island to Japan.

Through this legislation we hope to demonstrate to the people of the island that the United States is not only interested in their island as a military bastion, but as a real interest in the progress and welfare of the inhabitants.

Such a concern unfortunately, has not been too evident at times in the past.

It we are to keep this important base in the Pacific for as long as the security of our country and the countries of this area demand without constant friction and troubles, the future must be different.

That is the purpose of this legislation: to insure a better and more harmonious future for the Ryukyuan people and for American military presence on the islands.

At the same time, we continue to hope that the international and regional tensions which require a U.S. presence in the eastern Pacific will soon subside, allowing the reversion of the Ryukyus to Japan.

When that day comes, let us be sure that the Ryukyuan people do not look back on their "American period" as one of stagnation and unrest, but rather as a time of growth and development for themselves while their island home served as an indispensable arsenal of strength in the defense of the free world.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 4903.

The question was taken.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 284, nays 80, not voting 68, as follows:

[Roll No. 289]

YEAS—284

Adair	Brasco	Davis, Ga.
Adams	Bray	Davis, Wis.
Addabbo	Brinkley	Dawson
Albert	Brooks	Delaney
Anderson, Ill.	Brotzman	Dellenback
Anderson, Tenn.	Broyhill, N.C.	Denney
Andrews, N. Dak.	Broyhill, Va.	Dent
Annunzio	Buchanan	Devine
Arends	Burke, Mass.	Dickinson
Baring	Burton, Calif.	Dingell
Bates	Burton, Utah	Dole
Battin	Button	Donohue
Belcher	Byrne, Pa.	Dow
Bell	Cahill	Dowdy
Bennett	Carey	Downing
Berry	Celler	Dulski
Betts	Chamberlain	Dwyer
Biester	Clancy	Edmondson
Bingham	Clark	Edwards, Ala.
Blackburn	Cohelan	Eilberg
Blatnik	Collier	Erlenborn
Boggs	Colmer	Esch
Boland	Cramer	Fallon
Bolling	Culver	Farbstein
Bolton	Curtis	Fascell
	Daddario	Findley
	Daniels	Fisher
	Davis, Wis.	Flood
	Dawson	Foley
	Delaney	Fraser
	Dellenback	Frelinghuysen
	Denney	Friedel
	Dent	Fulton, Pa.
	Devine	Fulton, Tenn.
	Dickinson	Fuqua
	Dingell	Galifianakis
	Dole	Garmatz
	Donohue	Giaimo
	Dow	Gibbons
	Dowdy	Gilbert
	Downing	Gonzalez
	Dulski	Goodell
	Dwyer	Gray
	Edmondson	Green, Oreg.
	Edwards, Ala.	Green, Pa.
	Eilberg	Griffiths
	Erlenborn	Gubser
	Esch	Haley
	Fallon	Hall
	Farbstein	Halpern
	Fascell	Hamilton
	Findley	Hanley
	Fisher	Hansen, Idaho
		Hansen, Wash.
		Hardy
		Harrison
		Harsha
		Harvey
		Hathaway
		Hawkins
		Hays
		Hébert
		Hechler, W. Va.
		Heckler, Mass.
		Henderson
		Herlong
		Hicks
		Holifield
		Holland
		Horton
		Hosmer
		Howard
		Hull
		Hungate
		Hunt
		Ichord
		Irwin
		Jacobs
		Jarman
		Joelson
		Johnson, Calif.
		Jones, Ala.
		Jones, N.C.
		Karsten
		Karth
		Kazen
		Kee
		Keith
		Kelly
		King, Calif.
		King, N.Y.
		Kirwan
		Kornegay
		Kuykendall
		Kyros
		Laird
		Lennon
		Lloyd
		Long, La.
		Long, Md.
		McCarthy
		McClory
		McClure
		McDade
		McDonald, Mich.
		McFall
		McMillan
		MacGregor
		Machen
		Madden
		Mailliard
		Marsh
		Martin
		Mathias, Calif.
		Mathias, Md.
		Matsunaga
		May
		Meeds
		Meskill
		Mills
		Minish
		Mize
		Monagan
		Moore
		Moorhead
		Morgan
		Morris, N. Mex.
		Morse, Mass.
		Morton
		Mosher
		Moss
		Multer
		Murphy, Ill.
		Murphy, N.Y.
		Myers
		Nedzi
		Nelsen
		Nix
		O'Hara, Ill.
		O'Hara, Mich.
		Olsen
		O'Neill, Mass.
		Ottinger
		Patman
		Patten
		Pelly
		Pepper
		Perkins
		Philbin
		Pickle
		Pike
		Pirnie
		Poff
		Pollock
		Price, Ill.
		Price, Tex.
		Purcell
		Quie
		Railsback
		Randall
		Reid, N.Y.
		Reinecke
		Reuss
		Rhodes, Ariz.
		Rhodes, Pa.
		Rivers
		Roberts
		Rodino
		Rogers, Colo.
		Rogers, Fla.
		Rooney, N.Y.
		Rooney, Pa.
		Rosenthal
		Rostenkowski
		Roudebush
		Roush
		Rumsfeld
		Ryan
		St Germain
		St. Onge
		Saylor
		Schadeberg
		Scheuer
		Schweiker
		Schwengel
		Scott
		Selden
		Shipley
		Sisk
		Slack
		Smith, Calif.
		Smith, Iowa
		Smith, N.Y.
		Smith, Okla.
		Springer
		Stafford
		Staggers
		Stanton
		Steed
		Steiger, Ariz.
		Steiger, Wis.
		Stephens
		Stratton
		Sullivan
		Taft
		Taylor
		Teague, Tex.
		Tenzer
		Thompson, Ga.
		Thomson, Wis.
		Tunney
		Udall
		Ullman
		Van Deerlin
		Vanik
		Vigorito
		Waldie
		Walker
		Whalen
		White
		Whitener
		Widnall
		Wiggins
		Winn
		Wyatt
		Wydler
		Wylie
		Yates
		Young
		Zablocki
		Zion
		Zwach

NAYS—80

Abbitt	Gathings	Rees
Abernethy	Goodling	Reid, Ill.
Andrews, Ala.	Gross	Riegle
Ashmore	Grover	Robison
Bevill	Gude	Roth
Blanton	Gurney	Roybal
Bow	Hammer-schmidt	Ruppe
Brown, Calif.	Hutchinson	Sandman
Brown, Mich.	Johnson, Pa.	Satterfield
Brown, Ohio	Jonas	Scherle
Burke, Fla.	Jones, Mo.	Schneebeli
Burleson	Kastenmeier	Shriver
Byrnes, Wis.	Kleppe	Sikes
Cederberg	Langen	Skubitz
Clausen, Don H.	Latta	Snyder
Clawson, Del	Lipscomb	Stubblefield
Conable	Mahon	Talcott
Conte	Mayne	Thompson, N.J.
Cowger	Michel	Tuck
Cunningham	Miller, Ohio	Wampler
Dorn	Montgomery	Watson
Duncan	Natcher	Whalley
Edwards, Calif.	O'Neal, Ga.	Whitten
Eshleman	Passman	Williams, Pa.
Everett	Poage	Wolff
Evins, Tenn.	Pryor	Wyman
Gardner	Quillen	

NOT VOTING—68

Ashbrook	Brademas	Carter
Ashley	Brock	Casey
Aspinall	Broomfield	Cleveland
Ayres	Bush	Conyers
Barrett	Cabell	Corbett

Corman	Helstoski	Rarick
de la Garza	Kluczynski	Reifel
Derwinski	Kupferman	Resnick
Diggs	Kyl	Ronan
Eckhardt	Landrum	Stuckey
Edwards, La.	Leggett	Teague, Calif.
Evans, Colo.	Lukens	Tiernan
Feighan	McCulloch	Utt
Fino	McEwen	Vander Jagt
Flynt	Macdonald, Mass.	Waggonner
Ford, Gerald R.	Miller, Calif.	Watkins
Ford, William D.	Mink	Watts
Fountain	Minshall	Williams, Miss.
Gallagher	Nichols	Willis
Gettys	O'Konski	Wilson, Bob
Hagan	Pettis	Wilson, Charles H.
Halleck	Pool	Wright
Hanna	Pucinski	

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Barrett with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Minshall.
Mr. Williams of Mississippi with Mr. Utt.
Mr. Willis with Mr. McCulloch.
Mr. Feighan with Mr. Corbett.
Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Ayres.
Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Gerald R. Ford.
Mr. Brademas with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Ashley with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. Cabell with Mr. Derwinski.
Mr. Casey with Mr. Cramer.
Mr. Evans of Colorado with Mr. Cleveland.
Mr. Fountain with Mr. Reifel.
Mr. Gettys with Mr. Teague of California.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Fino.
Mr. Stuckey with Mr. Watkins.
Mr. Tiernan with Mr. Ashbrook.
Mr. Waggonner with Mr. Brock.
Mr. Leggett with Mr. Kupferman.
Mr. Watts with Mr. Carter.
Mr. Corman with Mr. McEwen.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Kyl.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Lukens.
Mr. Ronan with Mr. Bush.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Vander Jagt.
Mrs. Mink with Mr. Pettis.
Mr. Wright with Mr. Edwards of Louisiana.
Mr. Hanna with Mr. Hagan.
Mr. Pucinski with Mr. Pool.
Mr. Helstoski with Mr. Conyers.
Mr. Resnick with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. William D. Ford with Mr. Rarick.
Mr. Nichols with Mr. Eckhardt.

Mr. FUQUA changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Messrs. HAMMERSCHMIDT, DUNCAN, CUNNINGHAM, BROWN of Michigan, GARDNER, LATTA, and BURKE of Florida changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT TONIGHT TO FILE CERTAIN PRIVILEGED REPORTS

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

DISPOSAL OF THE ALASKA COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 223) to authorize the disposal of the Government-owned long-lines communication facilities in the State of Alaska, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 223

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 "Alaska Communications Disposal Act".

TITLE I—DEFINITIONS

SEC. 101. In this Act—

(1) "Transfer" means the conveyance by the United States of any element of ownership, including but not restricted to any estate or interest in property, and franchise rights, by sale, exchange, lease, easement, or permit, for cash, credit, or other property, with or without warranty.

(2) "Long-lines communication facilities" means the transmission systems connecting points inside the State with each other and with points outside the State by radio or wire, and includes all kinds of property and rights-of-way necessary to accomplish this interconnection.

(3) "Agency concerned" means any department, agency, wholly owned corporation, or instrumentality of the United States.

TITLE II—TRANSFER OF UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT - OWNED LONG - LINES COMMUNICATION FACILITIES IN AND TO ALASKA

SEC. 201. (1) Subject to the provisions of section 202, and notwithstanding provisions of any other law, the Secretary of Defense or his designee, with the advice, assistance, and, in the case of any agency not under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Defense, the consent of the agency concerned, and after approval of the President, is authorized to and shall transfer for adequate consideration any or all long-lines communication facilities in or to Alaska under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government to any person qualifying under the provisions of section 202, and may take such action and exercise such powers as may be necessary or appropriate to effectuate the purposes of this Act.

(2) Transfers under this title shall be made in accordance with the procedures and methods required by sections 203(e), (1), (2), and (3) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 484(e)), except that "the Secretary of Defense or his designee" shall be substituted for all references therein to "the Administrator".

(3) The requirements of section 207 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 488), shall apply to transfers under this title.

(4) The head of the agency concerned or his designee shall execute such documents for the transfer of title or other interest in property, except any mineral rights therein, and take such other action as the Secretary of Defense deems necessary or proper to transfer such property under the provisions of this title. A copy of any deed, lease, or other instrument executed by or on behalf of the head of the agency concerned purporting to transfer title or any other interest in public land shall be furnished to the Secretary of the Interior.

(5) No interest in public lands, withdrawn or otherwise appropriated, may be transferred under this title, without the prior consent of the Secretary of the Interior, or, with respect to lands within a national forest, of the Secretary of Agriculture.

(6) In connection with soliciting offers to purchase such long-lines facilities of the Alaska Communication System the Secretary of Defense or his designee shall:

(a) Provide any prospective purchaser who requests it data on (i) the facilities available for purchase, (ii) the amounts deemed to be the current fair and reasonable value of those facilities, and (iii) the initial rates which will be charged to the purchaser for capacity in facilities retained by the Government and available for commercial use;

(b) Provide, in the request for offers to purchase, that offerors must specify the rates they propose to charge for service and the improvements in service which they propose to initiate;

(c) Provide an opportunity for prospective purchasers to meet as a group with Department of Defense representatives to assure that the data and the public interest requirements described in (a) and (b), above, are fully understood; and

(d) Seek the advice and assistance of the Federal Communications Commission, the Federal Field Committee for Development Planning in Alaska, and the Governor of Alaska or his designees, to assure consideration of all public interest factors associated with the transfer.

SEC. 202. No transfer under this title may be made unless the Secretary of Defense or his designee determines that—

(1) the United States does not need to retain the property involved in the transfer for national defense purposes;

(2) the transfer is in the public interest;

(3) the person to whom the transfer is made is prepared and qualified to provide, without interruption, the communication service involved in the transfer; and

(4) the long-lines communication facilities will not directly or indirectly be owned, operated, or controlled by a person who would legally be disqualified by subsection 310(a) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, from holding a radio station license.

SEC. 203. The agreements by which a transfer is made under this title shall include a provision that—

(1) the person to whom the transfer is made shall, subject to the rules and regulations of any body or commission established by the State of Alaska to govern and regulate communication services to the public and of the Federal Communications Commission and all applicable statutes, treaties, and conventions, provide without interruption, the communication services involved in the transfer, except those services reserved by the United States in the transfer;

(2) the rates and charges for such services applicable at the time of transfer shall not be changed for a period of one year from the date of such transfer unless approved by a governmental body or commission having jurisdiction; and

(3) the transfer will not be final unless and until the transferee shall receive any requisite licenses and certificates of convenience and necessity to operate interstate and intrastate commercial communications in Alaska from the appropriate governmental regulatory bodies.

SEC. 204. Transfers under this title do not require the approval of the Federal Communications Commission except to the extent that the approval of the Federal Communications Commission is necessary under section 203(3) above.

SEC. 205. Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the gross proceeds of each transfer shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 206. The Secretary of Defense or his designee shall report to the Congress and the President—

(1) in January of each year, the actions taken under this title during the preceding twelve months; and

(2) not later than ninety days after completion of each transfer under this title, a full account of that transfer.

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. This Act does not modify in any manner the provisions of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended.

SEC. 302. There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Defense such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is a second demanded?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, S. 223 is a bill to authorize the Department of Defense to dispose of the Alaska Communications System. It has been unanimously approved in both subcommittee and full committee.

In 1900 Congress authorized the Army to provide commercial communications to the then territory of Alaska. The Army has continued to do this until 1962 when the Air Force took over the responsibility since most of the defense communications in Alaska involved that Department. The Alaska Communications System has been a special organization formed to be the link between the local communications companies and the long-lines facilities of the Air Force. On the major links between Fairbanks and the lower 48 and between Anchorage and the lower 48, the Alaska Communications System utilizes one-fourth of the channels available. While the overall communications system in Alaska had an initial cost of about $200 million, the present fair market value of that portion relating to commercial messages is in the neighborhood of $20 million.

There are believed to be several advantages in turning the commercial communications business over to a private firm. First of all, since the Department of Defense decided that it should no longer be in the business of providing commercial communications in Alaska, it has not put in the new equipment which is needed to keep the system up to date. There is no commercial long-distance direct dialing. Second, the rates for long-distance calls are much higher than the rates for comparable distances in the lower 48.

Because the rates are so high, the subcommittee followed the Department of Defense and the Senate in providing essentially that the facilities to be sold should go for their fair market value, and that the competition among the bidders should be for enforceable improvement in service and rates. The successful bidder is not only going to have to spend about $20 million for the facilities at the outset, but it is also going to have to spend a roughly equal sum to modernize the facilities that are sold.

The disposal is not going to be able to be accomplished quickly. It is going to take between 1 and 2 years before the details can be straightened out. During this period, the Department of Defense is going to consult with both the Federal Communications Commission and the government of the State of Alaska to be sure that the disposal planned is in the best interests of that State.

There are committee amendments which merely clarify the role of the Federal Communications Commission—there might have been some conflict between its advisory capacity in connection with the sale of its later responsibility of licensing the successful bidder. By the technical amendments offered, it is believed that these two roles can be successfully handled without having them conflict.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois used a figure of $200 million. In what relation?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. That is the overall cost of the original installation of the long-line facilities and all other facilities that the Government owned and operated in Alaska.

Mr. GROSS. Over what period of time, if the gentleman will yield further?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I would like to say that this is a communications system and its initial construction commenced in 1900. Of course, there have been other stages of added construction which, of course, have added to the original cost of the construction of these lines.

I might say further to the gentleman from Iowa that this $200 million is not to be compared with the $20 million, because the Government is only selling the commercial long-line facilities. It is not selling any of its other facilities.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, over what period of time was it depreciated?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Well, I do not know the period of depreciation, but this is the investment of the Government in its communications system up to this time. However, the commercial aspects of the operation——

Mr. GROSS. Now, let us see if we have this straight: $200 million invested in this communications system. Is that over the total period of time?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. In the overall system, yes.

Mr. GROSS. And it has now depreciated down to the sum of $20 million?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. No, no. The $20 million represents that part of the facilities which are used for commercial purposes that the Government seeks to dispose of.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 additional minute in order to further respond to the gentleman from Iowa.

The Government does not dispose of its own communication lines, only those that are used for commercial communications in the State of Alaska.

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to know if the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] could give us a little further explanation of the $500,000 which has been estimated as the cost, administrative cost, in order to dispose of the communications system?

It seems to me that this is a rather large sum of money to be used for the disposal of this system.

Could the gentleman from Illinois comment on that?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. It is for preparing the accounts, and preparing the specifications and the normal work that goes into setting up sales specifications for any commercial disposal, that is the amount which has been arrived at.

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, as I look at this, it seems to me that we might be better off to retain the system rather than paying the sum of $500,000 in order to get rid of it. I am just wondering if the gentleman would care to comment upon that situation? In other words, it might cost us more to get rid of it than to retain it.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Of course, we would not be paying $500,000 to get rid of it, because $20 million would come into the Treasury of the United States and that sum would certainly offset the $500,000 for setting up the investigation of its disposal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. POLLOCK. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Illinois for yielding to me at this time.

I would like to reiterate the point that was just made by the gentleman from Illinois to the effect that this is a unique situation wherein the U.S. Government is going to profit because this communications system will be sold, and the income will come into the Treasury of the United States. That is point No. 1.

Point No. 2, to more specifically answer the question which has been propounded by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. KLEPPE] as to sales costs involved in the disposition of this property. Higher than normal costs are involved due to the fact that over the years of the operation of this system by the military there was never any industrial fund accounting system implemented so that we would know what the actual cost of the operations have been. Therefore, in order to determine the realistic and accurate current sales price, and in order to determine the current maintenance and modernization condition of the operating system, a lot of research and detailed FCC accounting work is entailed which has not been previously done.

Mr. KLEPPE. I thank the gentleman from Illinois for this information and I thank the gentleman from Alaska for responding.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 223 and concur generally in the statement of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE], the chairman of the subcommittee handling this bill, and advise the House that it came out of the subcommittee and the full committee unanimously.

In addition to that which has been said I might amplify on the fact that it was necessary within this $500,000 allowance to convert to the FCC type of bookkeeping from that which had been used since 1900 by the Army, and since it was turned over to the Air Force in later years.

I would also like to emphasize that this is the sale of only the commercial long lines aspects of the overall Alaskan communication system to private enterprise at a fair market value yet to be determined in detail.

The subcommittee had before it from the new and prideful State of Alaska the Public Service Commission, representatives and statements from the Governor, and all others who were interested in this and, indeed, the aims of the government of Alaska and it is the committee's feelings that they should not have the right of veto perhaps on any arrangement that can be made under this authority to sell, but should at least be up to date and appraised concerning this matter.

I want to emphasize that our BMEWS defense line and others, using all of the means of communications including forward troposphere scatter, and all other lines of communications from this vital defense area, are involved in such an Alaskan communication system as, indeed, are the communications of the Alaskan railway system, and many different departments, all coordinating in this effort to divest the Defense Department as controlling agency of another enterprise which certainly should be in the open marketplace, and on the basis of competitive price handling.

In addition to all of this, Mr. Speaker, there are two main reasons that I support this bill. First, we are relinquishing from the Department of Defense to private industry one of its burdens that now properly belongs in the open marketplace, and industrial side of our country. One of the reasons for the value and the depreciation is the fact that there has been no upkeep, no modernization or extension of the long-lines communications on the commercial side of this because the military side has been using other means of communications for some time.

To me it is most encouraging that even this portion of some 720-odd operations of the DOD, which should be, in my opinion, in the open marketplace, can now be turned over for what has generally been the goal that we on the Committee on Armed Services have sought for that Department for a long time.

Second, Mr. Speaker, by turning this group of facilities over to private industry there is started in the State of Alaska a new commercial enterprise which will help that State in many different ways. Not only will it help it to improve the present system of long-lines communications and give more equity and justice to toll rates, but it will allow bidding by many fine, capable, telephonic communications industries. And that is the basic reason for the legislation.

In addition it will also help to attract new business into Alaska. In my opinion, both the purchaser and the other new industries, the satellites of the long-lines communications, so to speak; will be brought into the State and will provide additional tax bases for the further development of Alaska, and hasten the time when it is not so largely dependent upon the Federal Government.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, S. 223 has my endorsement.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman why, if an appraisal has been made of the fair market price for this property, it is necessary to expend half a million dollars for the disposal of it?

Mr. HALL. As was explained, the appraisal is in process of being made, and a lot of this is in the conversion to the FCC type of bookkeeping, so that a universal applicable appraisal can be made in the next 2-year period.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I notice on page 7 of the report:

> It does not obligate or authorize the FCC or the State authorities to evaluate or choose between competing offerors, but only to act on applications from the successful offerors, as selected by the Secretary of Defense or his designee.

I have two questions. One—was there competitive bidding, and if so by whom?

Mr. HALL. Let me hasten to tell my colleague, the gentleman from California, the appraisal, as I just told the gentleman from Iowa, has not yet been completed and, secondly, this bill does make in order such competitive bidding for the future, and that the call or prospectus for bids has not yet been offered.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I yield to my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from California.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to compliment the gentleman from Missouri and also to associate myself with his remarks.

Just recently the Flood Control Subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works went to Alaska, and specifically to the Fairbanks area, to view some of the flood damage. During that time we had an opportunity to discuss this particular piece of legislation with a number of people there and they wholeheartedly endorsed this. So, Mr. Speaker, I want to add my support to what the gentleman has said.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentleman's comments. I could not accept any credit for this legislation because it belongs, indeed, to the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. POLLOCK], to the Department of Defense, and to the committee that has worked wholeheartedly on this and has held extensive hearings.

In that respect, Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to yield 2 minutes or such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Alaska, our colleague [Mr. POLLOCK].

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 223 a bill which will lead to improved long-distance communications between the State of Alaska and the continental United States.

The purpose of this bill is to dispose of certain of the long-line communications facilities in Alaska now owned by the Air Force and operated for commercial, not military purposes.

A separate military organization was organized to run the system, first by the Army, then from 1962 by the Air Force. Now the Air Force wishes to sell the system, and to my knowledge there is no opposition to this authorization.

The Government will benefit as a result of reduced expenditures, plus the income from sale.

The State will benefit from an improved system and increased tax revenues.

The American people will benefit by private enterprise taking over this commercial business from the U.S. Government.

It is a vital bill from the standpoint of Alaskans who now pay exorbitant rates for service that is not up to present-day standards anywhere else under the American flag.

The act of May 26, 1900—48 U.W.C. 310—authorized the Army to transmit commercial business over military lines in the then territory of Alaska. Under this authority, the Army and from 1962 the Air Force has had a separate military organization, the Alaska Communications System, responsible for commercial communications within Alaska and between Alaska and the other 48 States in continental United States. The Government-owned facilities tie in directly with commercial operations at several points—at Ketchikan with an American Telephone & Telegraph cable and with a General Telephone tropospheric scatter route to Seattle; and at the Canadian border point on the Alcan Highway with the Canadian National Telecommunications and British Columbia Telephone Co. In Alaska the Alaska Communications System ties in with local and municipal telephone companies.

As presently established, the Alaska Communications System utilizes available channels on the Air Force communications routes to carry commercial messages long distance within Alaska and between Alaska and the lower 48. There are four main toll centers in Alaska—Anchorage, Fairbanks, Juneau, and Ketchikan. It is presently contemplated that these four centers, together with some additional equipment which would also cover the bush and marine operations, would be sold to a private company. The original cost of this equipment

was around $36 million, but it is estimated that the present fair market value would be about $20 million.

As Alaska begins to grow as a new State, good communications across her vast areas will be essential. Since about 1959, when it was first determined that the U.S. Government should withdraw from the commercial communications operation in Alaska, there has been little money gone into new equipment for the ACS. Consequently, the service is not up to present-day standards, including direct distance dialing. The rates are high. There is no effort made to get new business in the spirit that a regular telephone company would seek it. Hence the Air Force desires to sell the Alaska Communications System, a commercial enterprise for which it is not fitted, and the State of Alaska hopes to have a commercial communications operator vitalize this central element in its development.

This legislation has been sought by the Air Force ever since the operation of the Alaska communication system was transferred to it from the Army, 5 years ago. The system, popularly known as ACS, is the civilian long-distance communications network in Alaska. With the growth of the nonmilitary economy in Alaska, civilian users have accounted for about 90 percent of the traffic using the system. It has been a longstanding Government policy not to operate such a business where private enterprise can do the job. The Air Force has been particularly uneasy in its role as an operator of a civilian communications company. Feeling such an operation to be outside of its assigned mission, the Air Force has been eager to divest itself of ACS.

Because of this attitude, the long-distance communications facilities in Alaska have suffered greatly. As noted in the committee report, little improvement has been made in ACS since 1959. Air Force policy has been to "operate and maintain." "Improvement" definitely has not been part of this policy. As a result, the entire system is woefully obsolete and rates are astronomical.

From the standpoint of the Federal Government, it would be a distinct advantage to be rid of this unwanted business. The Senate Committee on Armed Services has estimated that a sale will probably result in a dollar benefit to the Government. From every angle, it is quite clear that the Government will benefit.

The parties most concerned, however, are the people of Alaska who are served by ACS, and their elected representatives. For several years the State and the Alaska Congressional delegation were unenthusiastic about such a sale. Last year, however, the delegation backed the measure and this year the State administration strongly endorsed S. 223. No opposition was expressed at the hearings. The reason for the change from this wariness to wholehearted support was the realization that Alaska would never have a modern communication's system unless ACS were sold. Only private industry is willing to make the multimillion dollar investment necessary to bring the facilities up to date. Several large companies have expressed interest in a purchase. It is thus expected that sufficient competition will exist to insure a fair price and a qualified buyer.

The Air Force has pledged to work closely with the Governor of Alaska and the Alaska Public Service Commission to insure that all public interest factors are considered.

It should be noted that S. 223 contains several safeguards for the Government and the public. No property can be transferred if its retention is needed for national defense. The Secretary of Defense must make a determination that the transfer is in the public interest and that the transfer is in the public interest and that the transferee is qualified to provide the service.

Mr. Speaker, S. 223 is a good bill from every angle. From Alaska's standpoint, however, it is a vital bill. Indeed, it is the only way open for the 49th State to obtain the type of communications system that is absolutely necessary in this modern age. I urge the passage of S. 223.

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman and appreciate his yielding to me at this time.

I have a question. Is there a possibility of this communications system being sold to a co-op and then the co-op coming back to ask for a part of the 2-percent money that the House has already appropriated?

We have many co-op telephone companies in this country, that are competing for 2-percent dollars to build up their own systems.

The question is, Could this system be sold to a co-op and then it in turn, ask for additional dollars to build up the system, thus causing an existing co-op with a pending loan application to have its application deferred?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman that the subcommittee took this under advisement and detailed consideration, and that specific question was posed to both the author of the bill in the other body and certainly to our distinguished colleague.

I will say then that it could be possible under section 202 wherein the Secretary of Defense is required to work out plans for disposal to the best interests of the Government. But this is not a point of issue in this particular sale or in the disposition of the long lines communications.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE], that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill S. 223, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 358, nays 1, not voting 63, as follows:

[Roll No. 290]

YEAS—358

Abbitt	Dingell	Johnson, Calif.
Abernethy	Dole	Johnson, Pa.
Adair	Donohue	Jonas
Adams	Dorn	Jones, Ala.
Addabbo	Dow	Jones, Mo.
Albert	Dowdy	Jones, N.C.
Anderson, Ill.	Downing	Karsten
Anderson, Tenn.	Dulski	Karth
Andrews, Ala.	Duncan	Kastenmeier
Andrews, N. Dak.	Dwyer	Kazen
Annunzio	Edmondson	Kee
Arends	Edwards, Ala.	Kelly
Ashbrook	Edwards, Calif.	King, Calif.
Ashmore	Eilberg	King, N.Y.
Baring	Erlenborn	Kleppe
Bates	Esch	Kornegay
Battin	Eshleman	Kuykendall
Belcher	Everett	Kyros
Bell	Evins, Tenn.	Laird
Bennett	Fallon	Langen
Berry	Farbstein	Latta
Betts	Fascell	Lennon
Bevill	Findley	Lipscomb
Biester	Fisher	Lloyd
Bingham	Flood	Long, Md.
Blackburn	Fraser	McCarthy
Blanton	Friedel	McClory
Blatnik	Fulton, Pa.	McClure
Boggs	Fulton, Tenn.	McDade
Boland	Fuqua	McDonald, Mich.
Bolling	Galifianakis	McFall
Bolton	Gardner	McMillan
Bow	Garmatz	MacGregor
Brasco	Gathings	Machen
Bray	Giaimo	Madden
Brinkley	Gibbons	Mahon
Brooks	Gilbert	Mailliard
Brotzman	Gonzalez	Marsh
Brown, Calif.	Goodell	Martin
Brown, Mich.	Goodling	Mathias, Calif.
Brown, Ohio	Gray	Mathias, Md.
Broyhill, N.C.	Green, Oreg.	Matsunaga
Broyhill, Va.	Green, Pa.	May
Buchanan	Griffiths	Mayne
Burke, Fla.	Gross	Meeds
Burke, Mass.	Grover	Meskill
Burleson	Gubser	Michel
Burton, Utah	Gude	Miller, Ohio
Button	Gurney	Mills
Byrne, Pa.	Haley	Minish
Byrnes, Wis.	Hall	Mize
Cahill	Halpern	Monagan
Carey	Hamilton	Montgomery
Cederberg	Hammer-schmidt	Moore
Celler	Hanley	Moorhead
Chamberlain	Hansen, Idaho	Morgan
Clancy	Hardy	Morris, N. Mex.
Clark	Harrison	Morse, Mass.
Clausen, Don H.	Harsha	Morton
Clawson, Del	Harvey	Mosher
Cohelan	Hathaway	Moss
Collier	Hawkins	Multer
Colmer	Hays	Murphy, Ill.
Conable	Hébert	Murphy, N.Y.
Conte	Hechler, W. Va.	Myers
Corbett	Heckler, Mass.	Natcher
Cowger	Henderson	Nedzi
Cramer	Herlong	Nelsen
Cunningham	Hicks	Nix
Curtis	Holifield	O'Hara, Ill.
Daddario	Holland	O'Hara, Mich.
Daniels	Horton	Olsen
Davis, Ga.	Hosmer	O'Neal, Ga.
Davis, Wis.	Howard	O'Neill, Mass.
Dawson	Hull	Ottinger
Delaney	Hungate	Passman
Dellenback	Hunt	Patman
Denney	Hutchinson	Patten
Dent	Ichord	Pelly
Devine	Irwin	Pepper
Dickinson	Jacobs	Perkins
	Jarman	Philbin
	Joelson	Pickle

Pike	Ryan	Tenzer
Pirnie	Sandman	Thompson, Ga.
Poage	Satterfield	Thompson, N.J.
Poff	St Germain	Thomson, Wis.
Pollock	St. Onge	Tuck
Price, Ill.	Saylor	Tunney
Price, Tex.	Schadeberg	Udall
Pryor	Scherle	Ullman
Purcell	Schneebeli	Van Deerlin
Quie	Schweiker	Vanik
Quillen	Schwengel	Vigorito
Railsback	Scott	Waldie
Randall	Selden	Walker
Rees	Shipley	Wampler
Reid, Ill.	Shriver	Watson
Reid, N.Y.	Sikes	Watts
Reinecke	Sisk	Whalen
Reuss	Slack	Whalley
Rhodes, Ariz.	Smith, Calif.	White
Rhodes, Pa.	Smith, Iowa	Whitener
Riegle	Smith, N.Y.	Whitten
Rivers	Smith, Okla.	Widnall
Roberts	Snyder	Wiggins
Robison	Springer	Williams, Pa.
Rodino	Stafford	Wilson, Charles H.
Rogers, Colo.	Staggers	
Rogers, Fla.	Stanton	Winn
Rooney, N.Y.	Steed	Wolff
Rooney, Pa.	Steiger, Ariz.	Wyatt
Rosenthal	Stephens	Wydler
Rostenkowski	Stratton	Wylie
Roth	Stubblefield	Wyman
Roudebush	Sullivan	Yates
Roush	Taft	Young
Roybal	Talcott	Zablocki
Rumsfeld	Taylor	Zion
Ruppe	Teague, Tex.	Zwach

NAYS—1

Burton, Calif.

NOT VOTING—63

Ashley	Ford, William D.	Minshall
Aspinall	Fountain	Nichols
Ayres	Frelinghuysen	O'Konski
Barrett	Gallagher	Pettis
Brademas	Gettys	Pool
Brock	Hagan	Pucinski
Broomfield	Halleck	Rarick
Bush	Hanna	Reifel
Cabell	Hansen, Wash.	Resnick
Carter	Helstoski	Ronan
Casey	Keith	Scheuer
Cleveland	Kirwan	Skubitz
Conyers	Kluczynski	Steiger, Wis.
Corman	Kupferman	Stuckey
Culver	Kyl	Teague, Calif.
de la Garza	Landrum	Tiernan
Derwinski	Leggett	Utt
Diggs	Long, La.	Vander Jagt
Eckhardt	Lukens	Waggonner
Edwards, La.	McCulloch	Watkins
Evans, Colo.	McEwen	Williams, Miss.
Feighan	Macdonald, Mass.	Willis
Fino	Miller, Calif.	Wilson, Bob
Flynt	Mink	Wright
Foley		
Ford, Gerald R.		

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Barrett with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. Williams of Mississippi with Mr. Teague of California.
Mr. Willis with Mr. Utt.
Mr. Feighan with Mr. Fino.
Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Derwinski.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Brock.
Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Brademas with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
Mr. Ashley with Mr. Minshall.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Gerald R. Ford.
Mr. Evans of Colorado with Mr. Reifel.
Mr. Fountain with Mr. Cleveland.
Mr. Gettys with Mr. Ayres.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. Tiernan with Mr. McEwen.
Mr. Waggonner with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Leggett with Mr. Kupferman.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Skubitz.
Mr. Ronan with Mr. Watkins.
Mr. Foley with Mr. Conyers.
Mr. Scheuer with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Lukens.
Mr. Nichols with Mr. McCulloch.
Mr. Culver with Mr. Kyl.
Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Hunt.
Mr. Hagan with Mr. Carter.
Mr. Resnick with Mr. Bush.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Pettis.
Mrs. Mink with Mr. Steiger of Wisconsin.
Mr. Wright with Mr. Vander Jagt.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Cabell.
Mr. Casey with Mr. Corman.
Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Eckhardt.
Mr. Helstoski with Mr. Hanna.
Mr. Pucinski with Mr. Pool.
Mr. William D. Ford with Mr. Stuckey.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, TO CHANGE THE METHOD OF COMPUTING RETIRED PAY OF CERTAIN ENLISTED MEMBERS OF THE ARMY, NAVY, AIR FORCE, OR MARINE CORPS

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5943) to amend title 10, United States Code, to change the method of computing retired pay of certain enlisted members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 5943

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3925(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) For the purpose of determining whether a regular enlisted member of the Army may be retired under section 3914 or 3917 of this title, his years of service are computed by adding all active service in the armed forces and service computed under section 3683 of this title. For the purpose of computing his retired pay under section 3991 of this title, his years of service are computed by adding—

"(1) his years of active service in the armed forces;

"(2) his years of service computed under section 3683 of this title; and

"(3) the years of service, not included in clause (1) or (2), with which he would be entitled to be credited under section 1333 of this title, if he were entitled to retired pay under section 1331 of this title."

SEC. 2. Section 6330 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out the words "the number of years of active service in the armed forces" in the first sentence of subsection (c) and inserting the following in place thereof:

"the total of—

"(1) his years of active service in the armed forces; and

"(2) the years of service, not included in clause (1), with which he would be entitled to be credited under section 1333 of this title, if he were entitled to retired pay under section 1331 of this title";

(2) by striking out the words "purposes of subsections (b) and (c)" in subsection (d) and inserting the words "purpose of subsection (b)" in place thereof; and

(3) by inserting the following new sentence after the first sentence of subsection (d):

"For the purpose of computing total years of service under subsection (c), after years creditable under clauses (1) and (2) have been added together, a part of a year that is six months or more is counted as a whole year and a part of a year that is less than six months is disregarded."

SEC. 3. Section 8925(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) For the purpose of determining whether a regular enlisted member of the Air Force may be retired under section 8914 or 8917 of this title, his years of service are computed by adding all active service in the armed forces and service computed under section 8683 of this title. For the purpose of computing his retired pay under section 8991 of this title, his years of service are computed by adding—

"(1) his years of active service in the armed forces;

"(2) his years of service computed under section 8683 of this title; and

"(3) the years of service, not included in clause (1) or (2), with which he would be entitled to be credited under section 1333 of this title, if he were entitled to retired pay under section 1331 of this title."

SEC. 4. This Act is applicable to enlisted members heretofore or hereafter retired or granted retainer pay. However, no person retired or granted retainer pay before the effective date of this Act is entitled to a retroactive increase in retired pay or retainer pay because of this Act.

SEC. 5. To accrue rights under this Act, a person who is entitled to retired or retainer pay on the effective date of this Act must file an application with the Secretary of the military department concerned.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, this bill, I believe, is noncontroversial. An identical bill passed the House on two prior occasions but no action was taken on those bills in the other body.

H.R. 5943 would allow career enlisted men who have completed 20 years' active duty to receive credit in computing their retired pay for time they might have spent in nonactive Reserve duty status. That is all it does. It affects only career enlisted men.

The bill was unanimously approved by our committee. I know of no opposition to it.

Enlisted men now receive no credit in their retirement multiplier for inactive Reserve service. Officers do receive credit for such service and this has created a morale problem with enlisted personnel.

Officers who have completed 20 years receive full credit in their retirement multiplier for pre-1958 Reserve service. That is, they receive 2½ percent per year for each year active or reserve. In 1958, Congress changed this to say such officers could only receive credit according to the point system normally used for those citizen-soldiers who achieve Reserve retirement at age 60.

H.R. 5943 would give to enlisted men credit according to this point system for any nonactive Reserve duty time, regardless of when accrued.

The Department of Defense supports the bill.

The Department of Defense has estimated that the maximum additional annual budgetary requirements as a result

of the bill would be $2,630,532. This is the maximum. The estimate was arrived at by taking a sampling to determine the percentage of men who had prior Reserve service and the average number of years of such Reserve time and then assuming the maximum number of Reserve points were earned for each year. The committee believes that many enlisted men would have years in which they earned fewer points or, perhaps, none at all, thus reducing their creditable service and reducing the cost of the bill. However, there is no precise way to determine what the average number of points earned would be without screening the records of all enlisted personnel. The Committee on Armed Services is satisfied that $2,630,532 is the upper limit of possible cost for the bill.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCHWEIKER].

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, this bill was reported out by the subcommittee unanimously as well as the full committee.

The present situation is such that the law discriminates against our enlisted men in terms of retirement credit.

This bill, H.R. 5943, will remove this inequity and will handle retirement credit for inactive service and compute it in the same way as is now done for commissioned officers.

This bill has already passed the House on two occasions and is legislation that is very much needed to take care of the great disadvantage to our enlisted men at the present time.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the immediate adoption of this bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 5943.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZE LOAN OF CERTAIN NAVAL VESSELS

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 9796) to authorize the extension of certain naval vessel loans now in existence, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 9796

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding section 7307 of title 10, United States Code, or any other law, the President may extend on such terms and under such conditions as he deems appropriate the loan of ships, previously authorized as indicated, as follows: (1) Brazil, two submarines (Act of July 18, 1958 (72 Stat. 376)); (2) Chile, one submarine (Act of July 18, 1958 (72 Stat. 376)), two destroyers (Act of July 18, 1958 (72 Stat. 376)); (3) Federal Republic of Germany, one destroyer (Act of August 5, 1953 (67 Stat. 363), as amended by Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 967)); (4) Greece, one submarine (Act of August 5, 1953 (67 Stat. 363), as amended by Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 967)), two destroyers (Act of October 4, 1961 (75 Stat. 815)); (5) Korea, one destroyer (Act of October 4, 1961 (75 Stat. 815)), one destroyer escort (Act of October 4, 1961 (75 Stat. 815)); (6) Portugal, two destroyer escorts (Act of August 5, 1953 (67 Stat. 363), as amended by Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 967)); (7) Spain, two destroyers (Act of August 5, 1953 (67 Stat. 363), as amended by Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 967)).

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding section 7307 of title 10, United States Code, or any other law, the President may lend to friendly foreign nations, on such terms and conditions as he deems appropriate, ships as follows: (1) Republic of Korea, one destroyer, and (2) the Republic of China, one destroyer. All expenses involved in the activation, rehabilitation, and outfitting (including repairs, alterations, and logistic support) of ships transferred under this section shall be charged to funds programed for the recipient government as grant military assistance, or as reimbursable, under the provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, or successor legislation.

SEC. 3. All new loans and loan extensions executed under this Act shall be for periods not exceeding five years, but the President may in his discretion extend such loans for an additional period of not more than five years. They shall be made on the condition that they may be terminated at an earlier date if necessitated by the defense requirements of the United States.

SEC. 4. No loan may be made or extended under this Act unless the Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Joint Chiefs of Staff, determines that such loan or extension is in the best interest of the United States. The Secretary of Defense shall keep the Congress currently advised of all loans made under authority of this Act.

SEC. 5. The President may promulgate such rules and regulations as he deems necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 6. The authority of the President to lend naval vessels under this Act terminates on December 31, 1969.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, this bill, H.R. 9796, would authorize the extension of certain naval vessel loans now in existence and also authorize two new loans.

This kind of legislation has been passed on by the Congress on numerous occasions in the past. This bill is exactly the same as all of the previous ones.

Let me describe what this bill will do. It will authorize the extension of the loan of 15 vessels now in the possession of certain foreign countries. The countries are Brazil, Chile, Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Korea, Portugal, and Spain. It should be understood that all of these ships are now in the possession of and are being used by the countries I have named.

The committee amended the bill to add two new loans. The countries involved are Korea and the Republic of China. The ship to be the subject of the new loan in each instance is a destroyer. I would like to point out that the Armed Services Committee was unanimous in its belief that these new loans should be granted.

Korea has a very special problem with respect to protecting its shoreline. Frequent forays are made along its shores by the Communist North Koreans. The North Koreans have in their possession very fast patrol boats which are extremely difficult to intercept. It is very clearly in not only their interests but in our own interests that our friends in South Korea have a capability of maintaining constant vigilance in order to repulse these intrusions along their coasts.

Let us remember, not so incidentally, that there are over 50,000 Korean troops fighting side by side with Americans in Vietnam today.

Little need be said about the loan of a destroyer to the Republic of China. This country has no firmer friend or greater ally in the Far East than the Government of the Republic of China. The trained and ready force which Chiang Kai-shek maintains on Formosa is a powerful, stabilizing force in that part of the world. The Chinese Navy needs improvement and enlargement. The loan of one destroyer to this great ally will constitute an important step toward this end and cannot help but redound to our own benefit.

The bill refers to "friendly foreign nations." We have no better friends than the Koreans and the Chinese. They are indeed "friendly foreign nations."

The basic theory of lending ships to friendly foreign nations is simple. The program of lending ships from our Naval Reserve Fleet to selected friendly countries—as approved by Congress—has, over the past 15 years, proven to be one of the most effective and economical ways to assist our friends and allies. With our assistance, these allies can accomplish tasks such as antisubmarine escort, patrol, mine warfare, and coastal and harbor protection in their local waters. Also, the potential help of these navies is valuable in our wartime role of controlling the deep seas. Our loaned ships provide the major assets for accomplishing these tasks. To deny our friends and allies the use of these vessels would create vacuums in many areas of the world which could be filled only by us and only with difficulty and at the expense of other commitments. By combining our idle ships and their competent manpower and strategic locations, we contribute substantially to mutual defense—and at a minimum cost.

Many of the ships involved in this proposed legislation are loaned to navies which have responsibilities under bilateral or multilateral defense agreements. Greece requests that the loan of two destroyers and one submarine be extended. Portugal desires the same for two destroyer escorts. Germany seeks to extend the agreement for a destroyer now on loan. These countries are, of course, NATO allies, and the ships involved are important units which help fulfill mutual security commitments as well as perform national tasks. These ships participate in combined naval exercises which have attested to the effectiveness of these navies in carrying out their responsibilities.

Spain requests that the loan of two

destroyers be extended. The efforts of the free world in the European area have been assisted significantly by the privileges granted U.S. forces by this friendly nation. Spain's strategic position makes her extremely important to free world defense. In recent years, Spanish Navy ships have a fine record of performance in combined exercises with U.S. 6th Fleet units. And this is something concerning which I have extensive personal knowledge.

The two South American countries included in this bill—that is, Brazil and Chile—have played an active role in the annual combined fleet exercises—called Unitas—conducted in Latin American waters. Brazil requests that the loan of two submarines be extended. Chile desires the same for two destroyers and a submarine. These ships compose very significant parts of the active fleets of these two friendly maritime nations. The submarines in both countries provide essential target services for antisubmarine warfare training.

Mr. Speaker, I want to stress that these 17 ships—15 loan extensions and two new loans—are not now required for the defense of the United States.

I would also like to make specific note of the fact that the bill includes the language:

> No loan may be made or extended under this Act unless the Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Joint Chiefs of Staff, determines that such loan or extension is in the best interest of the United States. The Secretary of Defense shall keep the Congress currently advised of all loans made under authority of this Act.

You should understand that these ships are not ships that we would be using ourselves were they not on loan to our friends since they are old and were in the mothball fleet.

In addition to the prime purpose of antisubmarine patrol there are collateral benefits that accrue to the United States. The officers and men who run these ships come to the United States for training at our naval installations and become oriented to the manner in which our Navy does its work. In effect, these foreign crews become an arm of our own naval forces and it is easy to see that this, on a longrun basis, cannot help but benefit us.

As I have said, someone has to do the job and this is an inexpensive and efficient way to do it.

There is no cost involved in this bill for the 15 ships already on loan. The only cost is about $15 million to place the two destroyers for Korea and China in operational shape. This money will be spent in our own shipyards here in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, that is the bill—it is no different from many previous ones that the House has passed on favorably over the years and I strongly recommend the favorable consideration of the House.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I do not believe the gentleman needs to convince the House of the propriety of loaning certain warships to Korea and Nationalist China. The pertinent question here is why are we lending ships to Chile and what assurance do we have that they and others are not going to continue stopping our fishing boats on the high seas or chasing them onto the beaches?

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from South Carolina yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman from Washington. Does the gentleman want to answer the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. PELLY. Yes. As the gentleman from South Carolina will remember—and I am sure also the gentleman from Iowa—in the past I have strongly objected to legislation to authorize the President to lend naval vessels to certain Latin American countries who are illegally seizing American fishing boats on the high seas. However, I have scrutinized this bill and report, and I am delighted to assure the gentleman from Iowa that the two South American countries included in this bill, Brazil and Chile, are not guilty of seizing our fishing boats. Others in South America are.

I only want to say I will join with the gentleman from Iowa in opposing legislation where there is a case of a nation seizing our fishing boats, but these two nations are not guilty as far as I know.

Mr. RIVERS. Does that answer the gentleman's question?

Mr. GROSS. No, not quite, because the disease seems to be contagious.

Mr. RIVERS. To what is the gentleman referring?

Mr. GROSS. I am referring to the various Latin American countries and the disease they have of seizing our fishing boats or chasing them onto the beaches.

Mr. RIVERS. Let me answer the gentleman. Not one ship which we authorized for loan is engaged in the activity to which the gentleman refers. Not one single ship.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask the gentleman how the gentleman knows some of these naval vessels we have given them have not been used to intercept our vessels?

Mr. RIVERS. I guess we can rely on the Navy, can we not? The Navy says they have not been so used. They are our authority on the high seas. Not a single ship which has been the subject of a loan has engaged in these activities.

Mr. GROSS. The Mexican Government did not use any of our naval vessels to chase our shrimp boats onto the beach?

Mr. RIVERS. The gentleman now refers to Mexico. I can investigate that also. Mexico is not in this bill.

Mr. GROSS. I just say this disease seems to be catching. I think we ought to have assurance in every case that we loan any kind of an American combat vessel.

Mr. RIVERS. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from South Carolina and the gentleman from Iowa suggested that to the State Department and the military several years ago in the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. I want to be assured that when we lend vessels, that is warships, combat ships to these countries, under no circumstances will they be used to go after our fishing fleets.

Mr. RIVERS. Of course. I agree with the gentleman. I insist on that also.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, in regard to what the gentleman has said, I think actually—according at least to a letter I received from the State Department—our naval vessels have been used by certain Latin American countries to seize our fishing boats.

Mr. GROSS. That is correct.

Mr. PELLY. And I certainly know that one nation, Ecuador, has used our cutters.

Mr. RIVERS. But not naval combatant ships loaned under this type of legislation.

Mr. PELLY. That is correct. But I will say this, that I have introduced legislation which will ask our Coast Guard to lend protection to our fishing ships when they are congregated there. The State Department says it is against our policy to protect our American vessels flying American flags.

Mr. RIVERS. To what committee will those bills go? Will they go to the gentleman's committee or to our committee?

Mr. PELLY. I believe they will go to the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee.

Mr. RIVERS. If they should come to our committee, they will be reported out.

Mr. PELLY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, there is also a question of their gratitude. When they go 200 miles offshore to intercept our fishing vessels and cargoes, confiscating them along with the crews. There is a question of gratitude, in addition to that.

Mr. RIVERS. I agree with the gentleman. The gentleman mentioned that I did not have to sell him on the idea of furnishing ships to Korea and Nationalist China.

I had to sell the State Department and the Defense Department, because they did not include additional destroyers for these two countries. The committee added them, because they are our great allies. We added these two destroyers in committee.

This is not a ship loan bill. This is a bill to authorize the President to loan them if he sees fit. We do not loan anything by this bill. We extend the authority to the President; that is all.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, that raises another question. Are we here delegating more power to the President? We have been hearing a lot about that in the past few days. I wonder if we should do this.

Mr. RIVERS. Every other President has had this same authority.

I am glad to see the gentleman, as usual, is trying to help. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to the rest of this legislation and the ships that are involved but I would like to question the advisability of extending the loan of one submarine and

two destroyers to the Government of Greece which is today charged with denying the democratic process to many of its citizens.

It seems to me that under the circumstances we should carefully consider what we do and defer action on the Greek loan until the facts can be ascertained.

Mr. RIVERS. This would only authorize the President to make the loans, not require that the loans be made.

I have here, handed to me by Mr. Kelleher, the Greek policy statement issued in April. It states:

The Government will endeavor to carry out the following: to abide firmly by the idea of peace and freedom according to the principles of the U.N. Charter. In this sense, Greece, as a free and proud nation, intends to abide firmly by its obligations to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and its Western Allies.

The bill would not extend existing loans, but only authorize the President to extend the loans. In other words, the bill if approved would merely authorize the State Department to negotiate an extension of these loans. Negotiations will not commence until the bill becomes law.

The State Department advises that loan extension agreements customarily stipulate that the extensions are pursuant to the provisions of the basic agreement, and subject to all terms and conditions stated therein. This provision will be included in any ship loan extension, as authorized by Congress, negotiated with the respective countries.

As I said to the gentleman from Iowa, and I repeat, this bill would not extend any loan. It merely authorizes the President to do so. He may extend all of these, or hold back on one or more.

Mr. VANIK. What is the date of that?

Mr. RIVERS. April 21.

Mr. VANIK. However, the conditions I talk about have developed since that date.

Mr. RIVERS. What Mr. Kelleher has pointed out is that the memorandum conveying this policy statement to the committee is dated September 29, 1967, and refers back to the April 21 statement of policy.

Mr. VANIK. The letter is dated September 29?

Mr. RIVERS. Yes. The memorandum to the committee is dated September 29, 1967; and I will put this in the RECORD:

The use of loan ships is restricted by—

a. *Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended,* Sec. 305, which states that "Military Assistance to any country shall be furnished solely for internal security, for legitimate self-defense, to permit the recipient country to participate in regional or collective arrangements or measures consistent with the Charter of the United Nations, or otherwise to permit the recipient country to participate in collective measures requested by the United Nations for the purpose of maintaining or restoring international peace and security. . . ."

b. *Military Assistance bilateral agreements* which state that respective countries will not permit the use of articles provided thereunder for "any purpose other than that for which the article . . . is furnished."

c. *The Ship Loan Agreements.* For example, the Ship Loan Agreement with Greece states that Greece will "retain possession of and use the vessels . . . for the purpose of promoting an integrated defense of the North Atlantic area in accordance with defense plans formulated by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization."

Mr. Speaker, this only authorizes the President to take action. He can extend them all or none of them, as he sees fit.

Mr. VANIK. He has full discretion?

Mr. RIVERS. Yes. I would also like to point out the language of section 4 of the bill which reads:

SEC. 4. No loan may be made or extended under this Act unless the Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Joint Chiefs of Staff, determines that such loan or extension is in the best interest of the United States. The Secretary of Defense shall keep the Congress currently advised of all loans made under authority of this Act.

Mr. VANIK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requirement for time.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to reaffirm what the chairman of the committee has said.

Of the 17 ships involved, 15 are merely a continuation of the use of the vessels which has already been accorded these particular countries. The other two involve destroyers to Korea and the Republic of China.

Our committee this time, as it has on all other occasions, unanimously reported the bill to the House.

It seems to me this is an economical way of getting defense. These ships, except for Korea and China, are already an active part of the navies of the requesting countries and the continued loan is at no cost to the United States.

I am in full agreement with the bill and ask that the House pass it.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BATES. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. I refer back to the remarks made by the gentleman from Ohio. I am not quite satisfied with the answers given by the distinguished chairman of the committee.

What this bill provides is military aid to a totalitarian junta in Greece that has been locking up friends of democracy—that has just recently, within the past few days, put in jail and is going to try in a military court Mrs. Helen Vlachos, who has two Athens newspapers. Do Members know what the charges are? The charges were that she insulted the Government in an interview with an Italian newspaper.

Does the gentleman not believe it is about time that the House have a debate on our relationship with Greece?

I think it is possible that the whole world and certainly the Greek people are awaiting the expression of an attitude by us on this. Perhaps these items should be aired and perhaps it would be better to defeat this bill and then bring that portion on Greece out with a rule so that there could be full debate.

Mr. BATES. Is the gentleman asking me this question?

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Yes.

Mr. BATES. Certainly at all times we should have full debate on these issues. I am glad that the gentleman brought this point up. I do not think every time someone is arrested in some country that we can stop the flow of legislation on this floor. I would suggest that the gentleman contact the Department of State and the Committee on Foreign Affairs on the matter.

When this bill came before us there was no inkling of such an episode. Certainly Greece has been our friend. In the realm of foreign aid I do not think there has been any example given that has been more indicative of success than there has been in the case of Greece and Turkey. I feel that when the foreign aid bill comes before this House every year the advocates of the bill always point with great pride to what happened in the late 1940's when we first gave aid to Greece and Turkey and thus saved them from communism. For that reason and for other reasons as well, Mr. Speaker, I advocate the passage of this bill today, including the ships to Greece.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. Greece is still a member of NATO and these are NATO allies of ours. I do not know what the intricacies are of the situation in Greece, but we have a member of NATO in good standing. We are committed to the security of Greece in our NATO commitments. We are carrying out the things that we have been doing all this time. I do not know how we can change the course of things at this time.

Mr. BATES. Circumstances change in the development of a country, but it is not right to try to fashion every country in the world in our image here in the United States. Other countries have their laws which they respect, and we have ours. As the chairman said, in the postwar period Greece has indeed been our ally and has been a good one. I think she should be the beneficiary of this legislation.

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DENNEY. I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of the committee, Mr. RIVERS, one or two questions.

I have one boy who just came back from Vietnam and another boy aboard the U.S.S. *Dupont.* His ship was hit 2 weeks ago off the coast of North Vietnam. My question is do you have any knowledge as to whether or not any of these countries that we are authorizing ships to, have any trade directly or indirectly with North Vietnam?

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RIVERS. I do not know of any having any trade with them. None of these ships.

Mr. DENNEY. None of the ships listed here?

Mr. RIVERS. I am not aware of any. I do not know of any.

Mr. DENNEY. In other words, what I am concerned about is we in America proceed to make ships and money and

material available to foreign countries. That encourages their economy, and then they are able to trade with other countries and carry munitions of war to North Vietnam.

Mr. RIVERS. I can almost positively say I do not think there is any such thing as this happening in Greece or any that I know of.

Mr. DENNEY. I appreciate that statement.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SCHERLE. I appreciate the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services yielding to me at this time. I have only one brief question. Can you tell me who will pay for the activation and modernization and overhaul of these two new ships being loaned?

In other words, we are taking these two ships out of the fleet?

Mr. BATES. The gentleman refers to the ships going to the country of Korea and the Republic of China?

Mr. SCHERLE. Yes, I do.

Mr. BATES. The renovation of these two ships is estimated to cost $15 million and will be paid for by the United States.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, to pursue this a little further, why is it necessary, if we are to loan these ships to these countries, do we have to furnish and overhaul them, rather than to have the recipient countries do this job?

Mr. BATES. Because they are our allies and, presently, under the foreign aid bill we are spending a lot more money than this. This is just another effective way in which we believe the job can be done.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman means this is another means of extending foreign aid to these countries to which we are presently providing such aid?

Mr. BATES. I beg the pardon of the gentleman?

Mr. SCHERLE. This is another means of providing additional foreign aid to these countries?

Mr. BATES. As the gentleman is aware, the foreign aid bill does not come under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. SCHERLE. But I am saying, this is in addition to the foreign aid program?

Mr. BATES. We do provide foreign aid to both of these countries.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER].

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of pursuing this question about Greece. I am a little surprised to hear the remarks on the other side of the aisle, suggesting that Greece at the present time is the loyal and stanch ally of this country. Other members of NATO have taken a different view indicating very clearly the disapproval which they attach to the present military junta in Greece. I refer specifically to a report which appeared in the press recently to the effect that the European Common Market had voted, by a vote of 9 to 5, to deny a $10 million loan to Greece on the grounds that this was a Fascist government and on the ground that it was denying its people the fundamental liberties expected of a democratic form of government. This was buttressed by another article which appeared in the press—I think by the former Premier who headed a rightist cabinet, who in defiance of the laws of the military junta spoke out against the military junta and asked the military junta to get out and leave Greece. This was no leftist political leader of Greece. This was a leader who formerly had headed a rightist cabinet of Greece but who was deposed by the members of the military junta.

Mr. Speaker, the point I want to make is that our allies in NATO are very reluctant to give more economic assistance to Greece. This is particularly true with reference to the Scandinavian countries. These countries have spoken out very sharply against the present regime in Greece.

I have in my hand a copy of a telegram which was sent from Denmark to the other NATO countries, a telegram from one of the great members of the Atlantic community, which is a strong indictment of the present regime in Greece.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that for the United States to put any stamp of approval or to furnish or indicate any support of that regime would represent a flat denial or repudiation of our concern as has been expressed by our efforts in Vietnam and in the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that this bill ought to be sent back to the committee and brought out again without the Greek ship loans in order that we may have a separate discussion of this particular matter. We ought to make clear to the rest of the world that the United States believes in what it says it believes in. We ought to demonstrate that we believe certain things are wrong and that we believe in freedom.

I would ask the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services if the chairman does not think that this question requires further discussion? I would also ask why should we stand alone among our NATO allies in defense of a Fascist regime, when our closest allies say, "Let us cut off aid to the present Greek regime."

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRASER. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. The gentleman from Minnesota is talking about the Common Market. NATO has done nothing about Greece. We have extended loans to the military—to our allies—in the Scandinavian countries. Some of the Scandinavian countries represent some of the best members of the alliance which we have and have proven that they are fighting the same type of situation which we are fighting.

I do not know what is going on in Greece. I hope they do get a representative government. However, that has nothing to do with these loans. If the President decides he does not want to make these loans, this is not mandatory. This is only permissive. One could debate it 10 times or for 10 days. We do not make anything mandatory under the provisions of this bill.

We only authorize the President to do this as we have been doing for 15 years. If he sees fit to do it he can, and he can attach any strings he wants to keep up with our commitments to our allies, and in keeping with whatever treaties we are signatory to. So I do not know what good any debate would do on this. The gentleman can make such representations to the President as he desires to.

Mr. FRASER. I will say to the gentleman that it is the Common Market that has spoken, and the Common Market members happen to be, for the most part, members of NATO.

Mr. RIVERS. I do not know anything about the Common Market. The gentleman knows more about that than I do.

Mr. FRASER. We ought to learn something about it, maybe this should be done.

Mr. RIVERS. I have nothing to do with the Common Market, this is something else again.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SCHEUER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would like to emphasize the statement that my colleague from Minnesota made in connection with the arrest of a reputable Greek publisher and point out that this one particular arrest is not an isolated incident. I had occasion to be in Greece for a week in July of this year, and had many conversations with our own Embassy people there; from the Ambassador on down, and spoke also with many Greek professionals—doctors, lawyers, economists, bankers, and the like. There is no question of the fact that the intelligentsia of Greece feel they are suffering under a reactionary and repressive regime. Somewhere between 3,000 and 5,000 Greek intellectuals and politicians are languishing in confinement on an isolated island off the coast of Greece, under the most primitive conditions, without charges being brought, without arraignments, without trials. So I believe this Congress should have very serious doubts and misgivings about giving further aid at this time to the present Greek regime.

Mr. RIVERS. Let me answer the gentleman on that point before he continues with his statement.

I would say to the gentleman that we are lending these ships in our own interest in connection with our NATO and other responsibilities. If someone else does not patrol the Aegean Sea and the other waters in that part of the world then we must do so ourselves. Already NATO has been cut in half by one De Gaulle.

If the gentleman wishes to take all these ships away from them and send our own ships and men to do it, then go ahead, I just do not want to do this. These loans are in our own interest, and I want the gentleman to keep that in mind always. That is why we are authorizing the President to do this, and the

President can do it if he sees fit. If the President does not want the Greeks to patrol for us, then the President can send our own ships down there. That is all this bill does—is to authorize the President to continue on with that policy of letting the Greeks patrol the Aegean Sea, the Adriatic Sea and the Ionian Sea.

Mr. SCHEUER. I am afraid of voting for a policy that is not in our interest.

Mr. RIVERS. That is very simply what this is: to continue our current policy.

Mr. SCHEUER. It is not that simple.

Mr. RIVERS. That policy to me is quite simple.

Mr. SCHEUER. I believe it is in our interests to have peace and stability in the Middle East and the Aegean; to have governments that have popular support. I believe that is in our long-range interest.

Mr. RIVERS. I do not believe we can impose pax Americana on every people and nation on earth. Somewhere down the line we are going to have to let somebody else run his own country instead of us dipping our nose into it.

Mr. SCHEUER. This present administration in Greece was by no means popularly elected.

Mr. RIVERS. That may well be so.

Mr. SCHEUER. In the next 30 to 60 days the present junta is supposed to put into effect a constitution under which they would give some power back to the people. Our own State Department people are involved and are having some quiet conversations. Does the gentleman know what that means? This will be a turning point in Greek history if it is done, and it seems to me that, until the Greek junta gives evidence of its bona fides in returning to a system of constitutional democracy, we ought to tread very warily in giving them additional military aid. The time is only 30 to 60 days off. We can defer action that long.

Mr. RIVERS. The gentleman is not saying on the floor of the House that our Government is going over there telling them how to run Greece?

Mr. SCHEUER. I said I believe some quiet conversation is going on between our State Department people and the members of the ruling junta.

Mr. RIVERS. If they are doing anything about what happened in Greece I believe this is highly improper. I hope we let them run their own country.

Mr. SCHEUER. I would say that this junta took over by force, and imposed itself by force of arms, and that we have every right to encourage them to return to constitutional democracy—just as we have been doing for several years with some limited success in South Vietnam.

Mr. RIVERS. I do not know how our State Department could think of such a thing.

Mr. SCHEUER. I will say our State Department has been carrying on quiet discussions, and quite properly so.

Mr. RIVERS. I hope they are very quiet.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE of Illinois). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it always has seemed to me that legislative emotion on an unrelated matter did not furnish the most promising background for the development of sound foreign policy.

Most respectfully would I disagree with my good friends who see in a negative vote on H.R. 9796 a means of strengthening and advancing their concept of foreign policy as regards the present Government of Greece. I agree with them that affairs in Greece at the moment are disquieting to many good Americans and certainly I am of that number. I doubt, however, that the present situation will be long continuing. It is even possible that the enactment of H.R. 9796, with the broad powers it gives the President of the United States, could hasten the return of democratic government to Greece.

It should be made perfectly clear that H.R. 9796 does not turn over to Greece or any other country a single naval vessel of any size, age, or condition—not one ship to Greece or any other country. If it did this I might admit some germaneness to the present contention. If, upon the enactment of H.R. 9796, its passage by the House and the other body, and its signature by the President, and without any further ado the United States was giving Greece the continued and unrestricted use of a destroyer I well could join with my colleagues in advocating a halt at least until we had come to a better understanding.

But what H.R. 9796 does—and all that it does—is to give the President authority to "extend on such terms and under such conditions as he deems appropriate" the continued loan of ships to Brazil, Chile, the Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Korea, Portugal, and Spain and the new loan of destroyers to Korea and free China.

Mr. Speaker, that is not all. Let me read section 4 in its complete verbiage:

> No loan may be made or extended under this Act unless the Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Joint Chiefs of Staff, determines that such loan or extension is in the best interest of the United States. The Scretary of Defense shall keep the Congress currently advised of all loans made under authority of this Act.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, under H.R. 9796 the old naval loan to Greece, as well as those to Brazil, Chile, the Federal Republic of Germany, Korea, Portugal, and Spain, and the new naval loans to Korea and Free China would not start until, first, the Secretary of Defense had consulted with the Joint Chiefs of Staff; second, the Secretary of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff had agreed that the loans or extensions were in the best interest of the United States; and third, the President of the United States had reached the determination that the loan or renewal in each instance was in the national interest, and on what terms and under what conditions.

Not to be overlooked is the power vested in the President of the United States to outline to Greece, as well as the other recipient nations, the terms and conditions.

Mr. Speaker, I have served in the Congress under four Presidents, three of my party and one of the opposition. With all the faith in me I have believed in the loyalty of all four Presidents to the United States and the American people. If ever the unhappy day should come that the loyalty and patriotism of our President was in question, historians could write finis.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from South Carolina that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 9796, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 321, nays 42, not voting 69, as follows:

[Roll No. 291]

YEAS—321

Abbitt	Clawson, Del	Goodling
Abernethy	Colmer	Gray
Adair	Conable	Green, Pa.
Adams	Conte	Gross
Addabbo	Corbett	Grover
Albert	Cowger	Gubser
Anderson, Ill.	Cramer	Gude
Anderson, Tenn.	Culver	Gurney
	Cunningham	Haley
Andrews, Ala.	Curtis	Hall
Andrews, N. Dak.	Daddario	Halpern
	Daniels	Hamilton
Annunzio	Davis, Ga.	Hammer-schmidt
Arends	Davis, Wis.	
Ashbrook	Dawson	Hanley
Ashmore	Delaney	Hansen, Idaho
Baring	Dellenback	Hardy
Bates	Denney	Harrison
Battin	Dent	Harsha
Belcher	Devine	Harvey
Bell	Dickinson	Hathaway
Bennett	Dingell	Hays
Berry	Dole	Hébert
Betts	Donohue	Heckler, Mass.
Bevill	Dorn	Henderson
Biester	Dowdy	Herlong
Blackburn	Downing	Hicks
Blanton	Dulski	Holifield
Boggs	Duncan	Horton
Boland	Dwyer	Hosmer
Bolton	Edmondson	Howard
Bow	Edwards, Ala.	Hull
Bray	Eilberg	Hungate
Brinkley	Erlenborn	Hunt
Brooks	Esch	Hutchinson
Brotzman	Eshleman	Ichord
Brown, Mich.	Everett	Irwin
Brown, Ohio	Evins, Tenn.	Jarman
Broyhill, N.C.	Fallon	Johnson, Calif.
Broyhill, Va.	Farbstein	Johnson, Pa.
Buchanan	Fascell	Jonas
Burke, Fla.	Findley	Jones, Ala.
Burke, Mass.	Fisher	Jones, Mo.
Burleson	Flood	Jones, N.C.
Burton, Utah	Ford, Gerald R.	Karsten
Byrne, Pa.	Friedel	Karth
Byrnes, Wis.	Fulton, Pa.	Kazen
Cahill	Fulton, Tenn.	Kee
Carey	Fuqua	Keith
Carter	Galifianakis	Kelly
Cederberg	Gardner	King, Calif.
Celler	Garmatz	King, N.Y.
Chamberlain	Gathings	Kirwan
Clancy	Giaimo	Kleppe
Clark	Gibbons	Kornegay
Clausen, Don H.	Gonzalez	Kyros
	Goodell	Laird

Langen	Passman	Shriver
Latta	Patman	Sikes
Lennon	Patten	Skubitz
Lipscomb	Pelly	Slack
Lloyd	Pepper	Smith, Calif.
Long, La.	Perkins	Smith, Iowa
McClory	Philbin	Smith, N.Y.
McClure	Pickle	Smith, Okla.
McDade	Pike	Snyder
McDonald, Mich.	Pirnie	Springer
McEwen	Poage	Stafford
McFall	Poff	Staggers
McMillan	Pollock	Stanton
MacGregor	Price, Ill.	Steed
Machen	Price, Tex.	Steiger, Ariz.
Madden	Pryor	Stephens
Mahon	Purcell	Stratton
Mailliard	Quie	Stubblefield
Marsh	Quillen	Sullivan
Martin	Railsback	Taft
Mathias, Calif.	Randall	Talcott
Mathias, Md.	Reid, Ill.	Taylor
Matsunaga	Reid, N.Y.	Teague, Tex.
May	Reinecke	Tenzer
Mayne	Rhodes, Ariz.	Thompson, Ga.
Meeds	Rhodes, Pa.	Thomson, Wis.
Meskill	Rivers	Tuck
Miller, Ohio	Roberts	Vigorito
Mills	Robison	Waldie
Minish	Rodino	Walker
Mize	Rogers, Colo.	Wampler
Monagan	Rogers, Fla.	Watson
Montgomery	Rooney, N.Y.	Watts
Moore	Rooney, Pa.	Whalen
Moorhead	Rostenkowski	Whalley
Morgan	Roth	White
Morris, N. Mex.	Roudebush	Whitener
Morse, Mass.	Roush	Whitten
Morton	Ruppe	Widnall
Mosher	St Germain	Wiggins
Multer	St. Onge	Williams, Pa.
Murphy, Ill.	Sandman	Winn
Murphy, N.Y.	Satterfield	Wolff
Myers	Saylor	Wyatt
Natcher	Schadeberg	Wydler
Nedzi	Scherle	Wylie
Nelsen	Schneebeli	Wyman
O'Hara, Ill.	Schweiker	Young
O'Hara, Mich.	Schwengel	Zablocki
O'Neal, Ga.	Scott	Zion
O'Neill, Mass.	Selden	Zwach
	Shipley	

NAYS—42

Bingham	Green, Oreg.	Reuss
Blatnik	Griffiths	Rosenthal
Bolling	Hechler, W. Va.	Roybal
Brasco	Jacobs	Rumsfeld
Brown, Calif.	Joelson	Ryan
Burton, Calif.	Kastenmeier	Scheuer
Button	Long, Md.	Sisk
Cohelan	McCarthy	Thompson, N.J.
Collier	Michel	Tunney
Dow	Moss	Udall
Edwards, Calif.	Nix	Ullman
Foley	Olsen	Van Deerlin
Fraser	Ottinger	Vanik
Gilbert	Rees	Yates

NOT VOTING—69

Ashley	Fountain	Nichols
Aspinall	Frelinghuysen	O'Konski
Ayres	Gallagher	Pettis
Barrett	Gettys	Pool
Brademas	Hagan	Pucinski
Brock	Halleck	Rarick
Broomfield	Hanna	Reifel
Bush	Hansen, Wash.	Resnick
Cabell	Hawkins	Riegle
Casey	Helstoski	Ronan
Cleveland	Holland	Steiger, Wis.
Conyers	Kluczynski	Stuckey
Corman	Kupferman	Teague, Calif.
de la Garza	Kuykendall	Tiernan
Derwinski	Kyl	Utt
Diggs	Landrum	Vander Jagt
Eckhardt	Leggett	Waggonner
Edwards, La.	Lukens	Watkins
Evans, Colo.	McCulloch	Williams, Miss.
Feighan	Macdonald, Mass.	Willis
Fino	Miller, Calif.	Wilson, Bob
Flynt	Mink	Wilson, Charles H.
Ford, William D.	Minshall	Wright

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Frelinghuysen and Mr. Broomfield for, with Mr. Riegle against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Barrett with Mr. Ayres.
Mr. Aspinall with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Cleveland.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Utt.
Mr. Waggonner with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Hawkins.
Mr. Brademas with Mr. Fino.
Mr. Nichols with Mr. Watkins.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Derwinski.
Mr. Feighan with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. Ronan with Mr. Reifel.
Mr. Resnick with Mr. Conyers.
Mr. Corman with Mr. Kupferman.
Mr. Casey with Mr. McCulloch.
Mr. Leggett with Mr. Brock.
Mr. Tiernan with Mr. Willis.
Mr. Wright with Mr. Kyl.
Mr. Gettys with Mr. Teague of California.
Mr. Fountain with Mr. Minshall.
Mr. Evans of Colorado with Mr. Lukens.
Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Bush.
Mr. Ashley with Mr. Diggs.
Mrs. Mink with Mr. Steiger of Wisconsin.
Mr. Pucinski with Mr. Pettis.
Mr. Hanna with Mr. Kuykendall.
Mr. Helstoski with Mr. Vander Jagt.
Mr. Williams of Mississippi with Mr. Rarick.
Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts with Mr. Pool.
Mr. Cabell with Mr. Stuckey.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Holland.
Mr. Hagan with Mrs. Hansen of Washington.
Mr. Eckhardt with Mr. William D. Ford.

Messrs. LONG of Maryland and OLSEN changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. WALDIE changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the extension of certain naval vessel loans now in existence and new loans, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HURRICANE BEULAH

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I have recently returned from a tour of the areas in my district which suffered from floods, the winds of Hurricane Beulah and tornadoes spawned by the hurricane.

It is impossible to watch the struggles of those made homeless, the destruction of citizens' most prized possessions, the crumbling of roads and buildings, without feeling heartsore.

The 23d Congressional District received a large amount of flood and wind damage. Two counties—Jim Wells and Duval—were struck by the hurricane itself. In addition to direct damage, many areas will continue to feel the effect of loss of topsoil and pasture for some time to come.

I was fortunate, however, in being able to watch cities and counties, as well as the State of Texas, and the U.S. Government, put emergency procedures into operation. In every instance, cooperation was magnificent.

This spirit of helping others was pointed out in a September 21 editorial in the San Antonio Light newspaper which states:

There can be no taming of a shrew such as Beulah turned out to be, but her vindictiveness can be blunted by the skill and courage and generosity of thousands of South Texans.

And even though the article refers to work done in only one county, it could very well speak for all of the other counties affected, since this wonderful spirit was very much in evidence in every single part of the disaster area.

Mr. Speaker, it would be impossible to name all of the organizations and the many hundreds of individuals who did such a tremendous job in helping victims of the hurricane, flooding, and the tornadoes. I am proud to report to you and the membership of this Congress that every single Federal agency, every State agency, and all local agencies worked as one in helping those affected. I am also happy to report to you that every single person who was in need of food, shelter, or medicine was taken care of.

On behalf of the people whom I am privileged to represent, I offer my sincere thanks for a job well done. Over and beyond this, I want to commend the people themselves, who in the midst of suffering and heartache, exhibited a tremendous spirit of cooperation and concern for the less fortunate. This attitude of concern for others in time of great duress prompts me to reaffirm how very proud I am to be an American.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to include with these remarks in the RECORD a copy of the San Antonio Light editorial of September 21 entitled "Hurricane Heroes."

HURRICANE HEROES

There can be no taming of a shrew such as Beulah turned out to be, but her vindictiveness can be blunted by the skill and courage and generosity of thousands of South Texans.

Hurricanes may not make heroes of us all, but they create an astonishing number. Some become widely known. Many more are known only to those in their immediate vicinity. The identity of others is known only to themselves.

Who can measure the contribution of all the law enforcement officers, the National Guardsmen, and the Red Cross, Civil Defense and Salvation Army workers?

We think also of the telephone and electricity linemen, working at all hours and in appalling conditions to restore the means of communication and the source of power that are needed all the more when disaster strikes.

It is good to know that San Antonio also has been in a position to help the victims of Nature's rampage.

Auditorium Circle became the site of an unusual kind of convention. The delegates were fugitives from the hurricane, housed in the basement of Municipal Auditorium and at the city's Civil Defense headquarters.

Other refugees were cared for at Lackland AFB, Agudas Achim auditorium, Trinity Baptist Church, Alamo Stadium gym, and elsewhere. The Mexican Chamber of Commerce supplied interpreters for the Spanish-speaking.

We salute all those, professional or amateur, who responded to the emergency, including (may we add?) this newspaper's reporters and photographers who have kept you informed.

THE SEVENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE GOVERNMENT OF NIGERIA

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Government of Nigeria marked its seventh anniversary. To that troubled nation and all its people I express the fervent wish that future anniversaries will find the country united and in peace.

Nigeria has the resources, ability, and strength to become one of the strongest nations in the world and certainly a leader on the continent of Africa.

I pray that a way will shortly be found for all Nigerians to work together once more making their country a great and united nation.

HINDSIGHT IS BETTER THAN FORESIGHT

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, you will recall that, when the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 was before the House on September 21, I offered an amendment which would have provided the necessary funds for financing the program, through a schedule of license fees, to be set by the FCC, approved by the appropriate committees of Congress, and which would have saved the taxpayers of this Nation an initial $10 to $15 million a year, and which eventually are estimated to run possibly a half billion a year or more.

Since the defeat of my proposed amendment by approximately 4 to 1 on a division vote in the Committee of the Whole, a number of Members have told me that, while they did not vote for the amendment, because they did not understand how it would operate, that after having had an opportunity to read and study it, they were of the opinion that it was unfortunate the House did not adopt the amendment, especially in view of the fact that it will probably be a long time before such legislation will be approved by the committee, particularly when one realizes that the proposition which I have proposed is opposed by the FCC, the networks, and larger stations who also control the NAB, which exercises a great influence in the broadcasting industry, but in my opinion does not represent the views of the smaller broadcasters.

In the current issue of Broadcasting magazine, I read where the National Citizens Committee for Public Television had advocated that the television advertisers ought to contribute a "proper percentage" of their total advertising budget to noncommercial TV. I do not agree with that recommendation but feel that those who enjoy the exclusive and monopolistic use of the airwaves should contribute in proportion to the income they receive through the use of these channels, based on a very small percentage of their gross income—says, in proportion to the fees they pay ASCAP, Sesac, and BMI. Following is the editorial referred to above which appeared in the October 2, 1967, issue of Broadcasting:

WRONG PLACES TO LOOK

Now that the House has passed a bill to create a Corp. for Public Broadcasting (Broadcasting, Sept. 25) and that compromise seems probable between that bill and one that the Senate passed earlier, it may be assumed that the corporation will indeed come into being.

That brings us to the next question of how public broadcasting is to be financed in the long range.

Thomas P. F. Hoving, chairman of the National Citizens' Committee for Public Television, proposed, in the same week the House passed the CPB bill, that television advertisers ought to contribute "a proper percentage" of their total advertising budgets to noncommercial TV. During House debate 25 congressmen voted for an amendment that would have assessed commercial broadcasters to pay for noncommercial broadcasting.

More of the same will be heard—and, no doubt, louder.

BIG SPENDING CUT BACKERS DISREGARD PAINFUL LESSONS

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am including with my remarks an article from the Sunday, October 1, 1967, Washington Post by Joseph R. Slevin, entitled "Big Spending Cut Backers Disregard Painful Lessons."

Mr. Speaker, this article analyzes the true meaning of the Bow amendment to direct the President to cut $5 billion in expenditures from the fiscal 1968 budget. The figures given in the article have been checked by my staff and verified by the Bureau of the Budget with one correction of a technical nature. The 3.1 billion listed for the National Health Institute also embraced the Health, Education, and Welfare Department.

The gist of the article is to show that the $5 billion cut must be made from a pool of $21 billion and not from the overall pool of the total budget of $141 billion.

The cut of $5 billion must be found in appropriated funds from the following programs:

First. Government payroll, $9 billion.

Second and third. Health, Education and Welfare programs and educational grants and aids totaling $3.1 billion.

Fourth. Surplus food to underdeveloped countries, $1.8 billion.

Fifth. School lunches, food stamps, housing, urban development, and veterans programs, $1.9 billion.

Sixth. Transportation, $500 million.

Seventh. Foreign aid, $500 million.

Mr. Speaker, the $5 billion cut, because of fixed charges such as interest on the national debt and excluded military appropriations and contract obligations, will, if carried out, destroy many of the Nation's most vital domestic programs.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 1, 1967]

BIG SPENDING CUT BACKERS DISREGARD PAINFUL LESSONS

(By Joseph R. Slevin)

Congressional backers of big Federal spending cuts are disregarding painful lessons in budget arithmetic.

The burden of the lessons is that President Johnson can satisfy Congressional demands for a spending slash of $5 billion or more only by ordering deep cuts in a large number of popular programs. The candidates for the presidential axe include everything from the school lunch program and the agricultural extension service to small business loans and new Bureau of Reclamation dams.

Congressional Republicans and a big clutch of Democrats have been pushing the spending cuts as their price for supporting the President's Vietnam War surtax. Mr. Johnson agrees that spending has to be reduced. He pledged a cut of more than $2 billion when he sent his tax request to Congress in early August. But the White House insists that there cannot be an additional $5 billion of reductions without drastic cutbacks in programs that command powerful support in Congress and in the country at large.

Slashing Federal outlays by over $5 billion looks manageable when the cut is measured against a Federal spending budget that currently totals more than $141 billion.

The trouble is that most of the $141 billion is beyond Mr. Johnson's control. The startling fact is that any savings will have to come out of a relatively small $21 billion slice of the total budget, including $9 billion that is earmarked to meet the Government's payroll.

A quick look at the rest of the $21 billion shows that it covers $3.2 billion for space, $3.1 billion for the sacrosanct National Institutes of Health and school aid, $1.8 billion to provide surplus food to needy, underdeveloped countries, $1.9 billion for school lunches, food stamps, housing, urban development, and a variety of veterans programs, $500 million for transportation, and $500 million for foreign aid.

The biggest, untouchable chunk of Government spending is more than $75 billion that is budgeted for Viet Nam and other defense programs this year. The question is not whether the $75 billion can be reduced but whether it can be kept from going even higher.

Another $45 billion of civilian spending is beyond Mr. Johnson's control because it either is fixed by law or is tied to contracts that the Government cannot breech without huge losses. Major items include $14 billion for interest on the public debt, $5 billion for veterans benefits, $4.4 billion for public assistance grants to the states, $1.9 billion for the jealously guarded farm price supports, and $1 billion to cover the post office deficit.

The President, as this is written, has been steadfastly refusing to give Congress a list of potential spending cuts but high officials privately have been showing lawmakers a teeth-rattling rundown of the kind of slashes that would have to be ordered to chop the $21 billion of relatively controllable civilian programs by $5 billion.

At the top of their list, the Administration officials have a one-third slash in grants to states and local communities for aid to education, school lunches, maternal and child welfare, antipoverty programs, urban transportation, waste disposal, agricultural extension activities, and a broad range of other programs.

New construction of dams and Federal buildings is prohibited. All recently started projects of the Army Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation are to be halted immediately.

The confidential Administration list includes a 50 per cent slash in new loans including loans to farmers for electricity and telephones, in Federal emergency loans to disaster areas, and in housing, small business, and foreign aid loans.

The closing of some VA hospitals is proposed along with the discharge of a number of doctors and nurses.

The Administration officials even have included a cut in the FBI. They don't think the number of FBI agents is likely to be reduced under any circumstances but they stress that other programs would have to be chopped more severely if the FBI did not bear its share of the $5 billion spending reduction.

THE PRESIDENT COURAGEOUSLY FIRM: "WE SHALL PRESS FORWARD"

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, 100 years from today historians will perhaps search fruitlessly for what mania possessed a nation when people in high places and even Members of the Congress of the United States, in effect, ask for the death of their own flesh and blood, now fighting in South Vietnam, by asking for a cessation of bombing even while our men are under fire in South Vietnam.

Perhaps the answer is, we all tend to specialize. In this body we are very busy people, and perhaps those people calling for a halt do not really know what would happen during a bombing cessation—and what happened during the last bombing cessation.

Without further comment, Mr. Speaker, I will include an editorial by the St. Louis Globe-Democrat entitled "The President Courageously Firm, 'We Shall Press Forward' ":

THE PRESIDENT COURAGEOUSLY FIRM: "WE SHALL PRESS FORWARD"

Replying to the most recent freshet of emotional, vituperative criticism, coming from Senate foes of the Vietnam policy, President Lyndon B. Johnson has restated with clarity and logic the United States policy in Southeast Asia.

He refused to be cowed by the new bombast of tongue-lashing doves. He rejected the diatribes of appeasement that would have the nation retreat from the Vietnam cauldron—no matter what the cost to American integrity, no matter what the fate of South Vietnam, no matter what the profit to Communist aggression throughout Asia, indeed over the whole world.

Mr. Johnson's talk was calm, reasoned, at times eloquent. He stood staunchly behind conduct of the Viet war. If only he had gone further and set a victory goal, he would have had the nation behind his policy as the people have never been before.

The country is deeply worried and confused by the ugly conflict 10,000 miles distant, when the President has no clear goal.

In war there is only one goal: Victory. Americans cannot understand a war of attrition, that saps our strength, treasure and the lives of our troops with no clear design to win.

* * *

The President declared we "shall press forward." We shall fulfill our commitment under the SEATO Treaty, hard and sacrificial as it has become—not only to protect South Vietnam freedom under assault by combined Red power, but because American safety and our national existence as a democratic free people are threatened.

This took political courage on the threshold of a campaign in which he will seek reelection. An intensely political man, he has a compulsive desire for consensus approval of all his acts. No other President has sought to be all things to all people so assiduously. Yet in the Vietnam policy, he repudiates a cut-and-run compromise, which might achieve censensus if sugared over with a thick veneer of Washington propaganda.

In his week-end talk at San Antonio, Mr. Johnson once again showed his willingness to meet with Ho Chi Minh for peace talks. Time after futile time he has made the same plea. But it takes two to talk. Ho coldly, flatly turns down every suggestion. So have other, more powerful Communist nations, backing the Red Viet aggression with increasing supplies of rockets, planes, artillery, munitions and all needed materiel to kill our troops.

Again was the proffer made in cease bombing, if it could lead to "productive discussion." This cannot be done—and Mr. Johnson made this amply clear—unless the Viet Cong and North Vietnamese give similar concession. Repeatedly, when we have halted bombing, Red forces have used the lull to fortify, regroup and rush in new supplies for stepped-up aggression.

It would be a proved stupidity to halt bombing unilaterally in the north, or anywhere in Vietnam, in the fuzzy hope this insane strategy would do anything but prolong the war and slay more of our youth.

The key to all we have done, as the President declared, is our own basic security. He said he could not forecast with certainty that a Southeast Asia dominated by Communists would bring a third world war. None can read the future. But we can know the past. He was grimly right in warning "all we have learned in this tragic century" strongly argues that a Communist sweep of Southeast Asia would follow in the wake of a Vietnam capitulation.

The domino theory is still the only viable conclusion that can be read into a South Viet defeat. North Vietnamese are already in Thailand and Burma. These states would drop into the Red China maw. So, most certainly, would Hong Kong. Then Formosa, the Philippines, Indonesia, even Japan would be under a rapacious Red threat which would soon be open and violent.

Mr. Johnson emphasized he would "not risk the security, indeed the survival of (the United States) on mere hope and wishful thinking." Nor has he any right to do so.

Vietnam Reds believe that, despite their steady, slow setbacks in Vietnam, they are going to win out in Southeast Asia. They are banking on America getting weary, discouraged, disgusted with an inconclusive war that has already killed 13,500 of our sons and wounded 85,000 more. That's why they obdurately refuse to consider any talk of peace.

Such bilious blasts as Senator Thruston Morton's charge that the President of the United States has been "brainwashed" to defend South Vietnam, and the politically scurrilous speech of Senator Clifford Case calling the Johnson policy "perversion" of the Tonkin Gulf resolution by Congress, are music in the ears of Ho Chi Minh and his Hanoi warmongers.

Rational dissent is always justified, usually healthy. Divisive contumacy and harangue, such as we have recently suffered, simply give aid and comfort to the enemy, hardening their design to continue the war and kill more Americans.

Until we declare a victory purpose in Vietnam, and pursue that end, Hanoi will cling to a conviction of Communist triumph. The most humane, intelligent way to end the grueling Vietnam issue is to use whatever power is necessary to win the bloody conflagration—fast and decisively.

AN EVER-PRESENT DANGER

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, with the superabundance of fictional spy stories on the market in the past few years one might perhaps be tempted to view the field of espionage with undue levity. One need only recall the many cases in country after country where citizens have betrayed the country of their birth for various reasons to realize that the danger of espionage is forever with us. Especially so, when the Soviet Union over the years has enticed persons from foreign lands to switch their allegiance and service to the U.S.S.R.

One such case is that of Harold A. R. Philby, a former British diplomat, whose service to a dangerous foreign power makes Benedict Arnold look like a piker.

I request that the article, "Philby Admits Spying for Reds," from the New York Daily News of October 2 be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

PHILBY ADMITS SPYING FOR REDS

(By Henry Maule)

LONDON, October 1.—Twelve years after British diplomat Harold A. R. (Kim) Philby was exposed in the News as the "third man" in a spy case, he has admitted being a Soviet agent for more than 30 years.

An exclusive dispatch from this correspondent to The News in 1955 named Philby for the first time as the man who had tipped off British turncoats Guy Burgess and Donald MacLean, enabling them to flee to Russia.

The question was raised in Parliament and Harold Macmillan, then foreign secretary, cleared Philby, former first secretary of the British Embassy in Washington, declaring there was "no reason to conclude that Mr. Philby has at any time betrayed the interests of this country or to identify him with a so-called third man."

"I HAVE COME HOME," HE TELLS SON

Philby, 55, has admitted to his oldest son, John, 24, who recently visited him in Moscow, that his allegiance has been to the Soviet Union most of his adult life.

"I have come home," he told the son, declaring himself completely happy in Moscow, where he ostensibly works for a Soviet publishing house.

Two London newspapers, the Observer and Sunday Times, carried today what the Observer called his "unmatched success story in espionage."

They reported that Philby was now known to be the most important spy the Russians ever had in the West, and that for more than a decade, while serving as a Soviet agent, he was a trusted senior officer at the heart of British intelligence.

Philby reportedly was assigned by the Russians in 1934 to infiltrate British intelligence. By 1944 he was appointed head of British anti-Soviet intelligence.

IN ON BRITISH AND U.S. SECRETS

He was named to diplomatic posts from which he was able to disclose to Moscow the inner secrets of M–16, Britain's counter-

intelligence service, and of American Central Intelligence Agency, the newspapers said. He was being groomed to head M–16 and be Britain's link with the CIA.

In 1951, Philby risked exposing his position by warning MacLean that he had just been unmasked as a major atomic spy, permitting MacLean to flee with his friend Burgess, who since has died.

Apparently Philby did so because he suspected MacLean and Burgess might break down under interrogation and betray him.

Philby was later exposed by a Soviet intelligence officer who defected to the West in 1961 and told London about him. Philby fled to Moscow in 1963 from Beirut, Lebanon, where he was working for the Observer and, that paper said, for British intelligence.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S ELOQUENT ADDRESS PLACES VIETNAM IN ITS TRUE PERSPECTIVE

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, Friday night in San Antonio, the President of the United States reiterated our Nation's determination to stand fast against Communist aggression in Vietnam.

In this memorable speech, President Johnson explained to the American people the reason why Vietnam is so important to the vital interests of the United States. He emphasized that if aggression is allowed to go unchecked in Vietnam, its flaming violence would soon spread across the great land mass of Southeast Asia.

The President declared:

I cannot tell you—with certainty—that a Southeast Asia dominated by Communist power would bring a third world war much closer to terrible reality. One could hope that it would not be so. But all we have learned in this tragic century strongly suggests it would be so. As President of the United States I am not prepared to gamble on the chance it is not so.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is time for those so vocally opposed to the President's policy in Vietnam to ask themselves whether they are prepared to take such a gamble.

For as the President said:

I would rather stand in Vietnam, in our time, and by meeting this danger now, reduce the danger for our children and our grandchildren.

I support this view, Mr. Speaker. I support it not only because I have confidence in the wisdom and judgment of the President, but because I believe we have learned our lesson about appeasement. We learned in the 1930's that appeasing an aggressor only whets his appetite for more violence and territorial expansion at the expense of freedom and liberty.

Mr. Speaker, our cause in Vietnam must—and will—prevail. Our goal, as the President noted, is peace. But, he reminded us:

Peace cannot be secured by wishes; peace cannot be preserved by noble words and pure intentions.

And he added:

Peace cannot be bought at the cost of other people's freedom.

Under unanimous consent I insert in the RECORD President Johnson's address to the American people, as it was delivered at the National Legislative Conference in San Antonio:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT BEFORE THE NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE CONFERENCE, VILLITA ASSEMBLY HALL, SAN ANTONIO, TEX.

Speaker Barnes, Governor Hughes, Governor Smith, Congressman Kazen, Representative Graham, most distinguished legislators, ladies and gentlemen, I deeply appreciate this opportunity to appear before an organization whose members contribute every day such important work to the public affairs of our State and of our country.

This evening I came here to speak to you about Vietnam.

I do not have to tell you that our people are profoundly concerned about that struggle.

There are passionate convictions about the wisest course for our nation to follow. There are many sincere and patriotic Americans who harbor doubts about sustaining the commitment that three Presidents and a half a million of our young men have made.

Doubt and debate are enlarged because the problems of Vietnam are quite complex. They are a mixture of political turmoil—of poverty—of religious and factional strife—of ancient servitude and modern longing for freedom. Vietnam is all of these things.

Vietnam is also the scene of a powerful aggression that is spurred by an appetite for conquest.

It is the arena where Communist expansionism is most aggressively at work in the world today—where it is crossing international frontiers in violation of international agreement; where it is killing and kidnapping; where it is ruthlessly attempting to bend free people to its will.

Into this mixture of subversion and war, of terror and hope, America has entered—with its material power and with its moral commitment.

Why?

Why should three Presidents and the elected representatives of our people have chosen to defend this Asian nation more than ten thousand miles from American shores?

We cherish freedom—yes. We cherish self-determination for all people—yes. We abhor the political murder of any state by another, and the bodily murder of any people by gangsters of whatever ideology. And for 27 years—since the days of Lend-Lease—we have sought to strengthen free people against domination by aggressive foreign powers.

But the key to all we have done is really our own security. At times of crisis—before asking Americans to fight and die to resist aggression in a foreign land—every American President has finally had to answer this question:

Is the aggression a threat—not only to the immediate victim—but to the United States of America and to the peace and security of the entire world of which we in America are a very vital part?

That is the question which Dwight Eisenhower and John Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson had to answer in facing the issue in Vietnam.

That is the question that the Senate of the United States answered by a vote of 82 to 1 when it ratified and approved the SEATO treaty in 1955, and to which the members of the United States Congress responded in a resolution that it passed in 1964 by a vote of 504 to 2, "The United States is, therefore, prepared, as the President determines, to take all necessary steps, including the use of armed forces, to assist any member or protocol state of the Southeast Asia collective defense treaty requesting assistance in defense of its freedom."

Those who tell us now that we should abandon our commitment—that securing South Vietnam from armed domination is not worth the price we are paying—must also answer this question. And the test they must meet is this: What would be the consequence of letting armed aggression against South Vietnam succeed? What would follow in the time ahead? What kind of world are they prepared to live in five months or five years from tonight?

For those who have borne the responsibility for decision during these past 10 years, the stakes to us have seemed clear—and have seemed high.

President Dwight Eisenhower said in 1959: "Strategically, South Vietnam's capture by the Communists would bring their power several hundred miles into a hitherto free region. The remaining countries in Southeast Asia would be menaced by a great flanking movement. The freedom of 12 million people would be lost immediately, and that of 150 million in adjacent lands would be seriously endangered. The loss of South Vietnam would set in motion a crumbling process that could, as it progressed, have grave consequences for us and for freedom . . ."

And President John F. Kennedy said in 1962: "Withdrawal in the case of Vietnam and the case of Thailand might mean a collapse of the entire area."

A year later, he reaffirmed that: "We are not going to withdraw from that effort. In my opinion, for us to withdraw from that effort would mean a collapse not only of South Vietnam, but Southeast Asia. So we are going to stay there."

This is not simply an American viewpoint, I would have you legislative leaders know. I am going to call the roll now of those who live in that part of the world—in the great arc of Asian and Pacific nations—and who bear the responsibility for leading their people, and the responsibility for the fate of their people.

The President of the Philippines has this to say: "Vietnam is the focus of attention now . . . It may happen to Thailand or the Philippines, or anywhere, wherever there is misery, disease, ignorance . . . For you to renounce your position of leadership in Asia is to allow the Red Chinese to gobble up all of Asia."

The Foreign Minister of Thailand said: "(The American) decision will go down in history as the move that prevented the world from having to face another major conflagration."

The Prime Minister of Australia said: "We are there because while Communist aggression persists the whole of Southeast Asia is threatened."

President Park of Korea said: "For the first time in our history, we decided to dispatch our combat troops overseas . . . because in our belief any aggression against the Republic of Vietnam represented a direct and grave menace against the security and peace of free Asia, and therefore directly jeopardized the very security and freedom of our own people."

The Prime Minister of Malaysia warned his people that if the United States pulled out of South Vietnam, it would go to the Communists, and after that, it would only be a matter of time until they moved against neighboring states.

The Prime Minister of New Zealand said: "We can thank God that America at least regards aggression in Asia with the same concern as it regards aggression in Europe—and is prepared to back up its concern with action."

The Prime Minister of Singapore said: "I feel the fate of Asia—South and Southeast Asia—will be decided in the next few years by what happens out in Vietnam."

I cannot tell you tonight as your Presi-

dent—with certainty—that a Communist conquest of South Vietnam would be followed by a Communist conquest of Southeast Asia. But I do know there are North Vietnamese troops in Laos. I do know that there are North Vietnamese trained guerrillas tonight in Northeast Thailand. I do know that there are Communist-supported guerrilla forces operating in Burma. And a Communist coup was barely averted in Indonesia, the fifth largest nation in the world.

So your American President cannot tell you—with certainty—that a Southeast Asia dominated by Communist power would bring a third world war much closer to terrible reality. One could hope that this would not be so.

But all that we have learned in this tragic century strongly suggests to me that it would be so. As President of the United States, I am not prepared to gamble on the chance that it is not so. I am not prepared to risk the security—indeed, the survival—of this American Nation on mere hopes and wishful thinking. I am convinced that by seeing this struggle through now, we are greatly reducing the chances of a much large war—perhaps a nuclear war. I would rather stand in Vietnam, in our time, and by meeting this danger now, and facing up to it, thereby reduce the danger for our children and for our grandchildren.

I want to turn now to the struggle in Vietnam itself.

There are questions about this difficult war that must trouble every really thoughtful person. I am going to put some of these questions. I am going to give you the very best answers that I can give you.

First, are the Vietnamese—with our help, and that of their other allies—really making any progress? Is there a forward movement? The reports I see make it clear that there is. Certainly there is a positive movement toward constitutional government. Thus far the Vietnamese have met the political schedule that they laid down in January 1966.

The people wanted an elected, responsive government. They wanted it strongly enough to brave a vicious campaign of Communist terror and assassination to vote for it. It has been said that they killed more civilians in four weeks trying to keep them from voting before the election than our American bombers have killed in the big cities of North Vietnam in bombing military targets.

On November 1, subject to the action, of course, of the constituent assembly, an elected government will be inaugurated and an elected Senate and Legislature will be installed. Their responsibility is clear: To answer the desires of the South Vietnamese people for self-determination and for peace, for an attack on corruption, for economic development and for social justice.

There is progress in the war itself, steady progress considering the war that we are fighting; rather dramatic progress considering the situation that actually prevailed when we sent our troops there in 1965; when we intervened to prevent the dismemberment of the country by the Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese.

The campaigns of the last year drove the enemy from many of their major interior bases. The military victory almost within Hanoi's grasp in 1965 has now been denied them. The grip of the Viet Cong on the people is being broken.

Since our commitment of major forces in July 1965 the proportion of the population living under Communist control has been reduced to well under 20 percent. Tonight the secure proportion of the population has grown from about 45 percent to 65 percent—and in the contested areas, the tide continues to run with us.

But the struggle remains hard. The South Vietnamese have suffered severely, as have we—particularly in the First Corps areas in the North, where the enemy has mounted his heaviest attacks, and where his lines of communication to North Vietnam are shortest. Our casualties in the war have reached about 13,500 killed in action, and about 85,000 wounded. Of those 85,000 wounded, we thank God that 79,000 of the 85,000 have been returned, or will return to duty shortly. Thanks to our great American medical science and the helicopter.

I know there are other questions on your minds, and on the minds of many sincere, troubled Americans: "Why not negotiate now?" so many ask me. The answer is that we and our South Vietnamese allies are wholly prepared to negotiate tonight.

I am ready to talk with Ho Chi Minh, and other chiefs of state concerned, tomorrow.

I am ready to have Secretary Rusk meet with their Foreign Minister tomorrow.

I am ready to send a trusted representative of America to any spot on this earth to talk in public or private with a spokesman of Hanoi.

We have twice sought to have the issue of Vietnam dealt with by the United Nations—and twice Hanoi has refused.

Our desire to negotiate peace—through the United Nations or out—has been made very, very clear to Hanoi—directly and many times through third parties.

As we have told Hanoi time and time and time again, the heart of the matter really is this: The United States is willing to stop all aerial and naval bombardment of North Vietnam when this will lead promptly to productive discussions. We, of course, assume that while discussions proceed, North Vietnam would not take advantage of the bombing cessation or limitation.

But Hanoi has not accepted any of these proposals.

So it is by Hanoi's choice—and not ours, and not the rest of the world's—that the war continues.

Why, in the face of military and political progress in the South, and the burden of our bombing in the North, do they insist and persist with the war?

From many sources the answer is the same. They still hope that the people of the United States will not see this struggle through to the very end. As one Western diplomat reported to me only this week—he had just been in Hanoi—"They believe their staying power is greater than ours and that they can't lose." A visitor from a Communist capital had this to say: "They expect the war to be long, and that the Americans in the end will be defeated by a breakdown of morale, fatigue, and psychological factors." The Premier of North Vietnam said as far back as 1962: "Americans do not like long, inconclusive war . . . Thus we are sure to win in the end."

Are the North Vietnamese right about us?

I think not. No. I think they are wrong. I think it is the common failing of totalitarian regimes, that they cannot really understand the nature of our democracy: They mistake dissent for disloyalty; they mistake restlessness for a rejection of policy; they mistake a few committees for a country; they misjudge individual speeches for public policy.

They are no better suited to judge the strength and perseverance of America than the Nazis and the Stalinist propagandists were able to judge it. It is a tragedy that they must discover these qualities in the American people, and discover them through a bloody war.

And, soon or late, they will discover them.

In the meantime, it shall be our policy to continue to seek negotiations—confident that reason will some day prevail; that Hanoi will realize that it just can never win; that it will turn away from fighting and start building for its own people.

Since World War II, this nation has met and has mastered many challenges—challenges in Greece and Turkey, in Berlin, in Korea, in Cuba.

We met them because brave men were willing to risk their lives for their nation's security. And braver men have never lived than those who carry our colors in Vietnam at this very hour.

The price of these efforts, of course, has been heavy. But the price of not having made them at all, not having seen them through, in my judgment would have been vastly greater.

Our goal has been the same—in Europe, in Asia, in our own hemisphere. It has been—and it is now—peace.

And peace cannot be secured by wishes; peace cannot be preserved by noble words and pure intentions. Enduring peace—Franklin D. Roosevelt said—cannot be bought at the cost of other people's freedom.

The late President Kennedy put it precisely in November 1961, when he said: "We are neither war mongers nor appeasers, neither hard nor soft. We are Americans determined to defend the frontiers of freedom by an honorable peace if peace is possible but by arms if arms are used against us."

The true peace-keepers in the world tonight are not those who urge us to retire from the field in Vietnam—who tell us to try to find the quickest, cheapest exit from that tormented land, no matter what the consequences to us may be.

The true peace-keepers are those men who stand out there on the DMZ at this very hour, taking the worst that the enemy can give. The true peace-keepers are the soldiers who are breaking the terrorist's grip around the villages of Vietnam—the civilians who are bringing medical care and food and education to people who have already suffered a generation of war.

And so I report to you that we are going to continue to press forward. Two things we must do. Two things we shall do.

First, we must not mislead our enemy. Let him not think that debate and dissent will produce wavering and withdrawal. For I can assure you they won't. Let him not think that protests will produce surrender. Because they won't. Let him not think that he will wait us out. For he won't.

Second, we will provide all that our brave men require to do the job that must be done. And that job is going to be done.

These gallant men have our prayers—have our thanks—have our heart-felt praise—and our deepest gratitude.

Let the world know that the keepers of peace will endure through every trial—that with the full backing of their countrymen, they are going to prevail.

GI LETTER FROM VIETNAM

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, we read constantly of those who advocate withdrawal from South Vietnam. We hear from those who demand that the United States stop bombing the aggressor, North Vietnam. We receive letters and petitions from many who should know the tragedy of appeasement, demanding that we quit and come home.

Mr. Speaker, all of the communications and statements that I receive urging that we quit in South Vietnam come from the continental United States—areas far removed from the fighting in South Vietnam. I have yet to receive a letter demanding that we quit from a member of our Armed Forces now engaged in combat or who has recently

been engaged in fighting the ruthless aggressor in South Vietnam.

Having traveled throughout this Nation pleading for support of our men in Vietnam and pleading for unity here in the United States, the following letter from a combat soldier from my congressional district is a source of personal encouragement to me. I commend this letter, straight from a combat soldier's heart, to the attention of those who would create disunity, discord, and doubt here at home:

BEARCAT,
August 28, 1967.

DEAR MR. DORN: Received your most warm and appreciated letter today. I am very truly and honored to have such a fine man, such as yourself, representing that good old Dixie State of South Carolina, and the rest of the U.S.A.

The Reverend George Baker is truly a man of God and he believes in our policy over here as much as anyone. Just today, he sent me a small prayer book, that helps me in so many ways. I want to give him a word of thanks, because he is really a wonderful person just to give me a little of his time each week and write and send the books and etc.

I know your job in Congress has its problems like every other job, and that your job is a big burden sometimes. I know the decisions and questions that you have to decide some times.

Well Mr. Dorn, maybe I can help you see how we GIs feel about the conflict over here. We do not like to kill anyone, but the men know that they have a job to do, and believe me they do it, because we are proud. We are proud because we have something to be proud of. We have the greatest nation, the most opportunities, and last, we are free to go, and do what ever we want to do.

The G.I.'s over here have more spirit than the people back in the U.S.A.

I know this is the most downgraded conflict in our history, and many people cannot understand why we are here, and why we are fighting. If they could be in Viet Nam for a week or so and just see how the Vietnamese make their living, build their homes, and grow their food, and then see the Congs destroy their homes and everything they have in 5 minutes or see innocent children and civilians killed by bombs or mines, I believe they would change their minds about the conflict over here.

So, Mr. Dorn, you don't have to worry about us G.I.'s losing our morale, nor about Army standards because of some bearded demonstrator or someone burning their draft card. I was drafted into the Army, too, but I know when I get out shortly, I will look back over my 2 years in service and say "I did my best" and I can be proud of it the rest of my life.

I know this conflict will go on for years to come. It will just take time, that's all. I know we will win it in the end, because we have great men like yourself and President Johnson and the whole Congress who are giving us 100% backing and support. I remember you came to Whitmire High School a few years back and gave us a very good talk on Character and Respect.

Thanks again for the encouraging letter. The best of luck in all the work you do in the future.

Your friend,

Sp/4c. GARY COLLIER.

BALTIMORE EXPERTS HELP SAVE ITALY'S ART

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, during March of this year, I addressed the House regarding the storms and floods which hit the city of Florence, Italy, and caused the Arno River to overflow its banks.

The world expressed its deep concern that famous treasures of art—paintings, statues, books, and other priceless art objects—were either destroyed or severely damaged. I voiced my own sympathy for the brave and artistic Italian people and strongly urged and recommended that all Americans interested in preserving the heritage of the past aid in every way they can the efforts to salvage as much as possible.

It gives me great pleasure to report to my colleagues in the Congress that, in addition to the many people of the State of Maryland who have contributed money and other help, two experts of the city of Baltimore have been working to restore the flooded Florence art treasures. They are Miss Kay Silberfeld, a young restorer from the excellent Baltimore Museum of Art, and Miss Mary Lou White, a staff restorer at the justly renowned Walters Art Gallery in Baltimore.

The Sun magazine, a part of the Baltimore Sun, of Sunday, October 1, 1967, published an interesting account of the work done by these two very talented artists in salvaging and restoring some of the Italian art.

Believing it to be of such general interest, I include this article in the RECORD, as follows:

HELPING SAVE ITALY'S FLOODED ART: TWO BALTIMORE EXPERTS AT RESTORATION HAVE BEEN WORKING ON FLOODED FLORENCE TREASURES

(By Vera Martin)

FLORENCE, ITALY.—As an American fund raiser had predicted—after collecting a million dollars within one week of the catastrophic Italian floods last fall—Florence is now going through a new Renaissance, but this time the United States has a hand in it.

Since that first million was raised, a great deal more money has come from all over the world to help relieve the disaster.

But money alone was not enough.

Even before the floods, the restorers in this country were understaffed, underpaid and heavily overloaded with work. For years the Italian art experts, conservators and officials complained, appealed, warned—and despaired. But nobody paid attention and many invaluable and irreplaceable treasures were slowly going to ruin.

Then, on the rainy, bleak dawn of November 4 the river Arno took over the city. Its fetid, oily waters inundated practically all the major art centers and monuments—the museums, the churches, the galleries, architectural masterpieces, as well as everything else in the heart of Florence.

In a few hours, the number of damaged art treasures that had accumulated over centuries became only an infinitesimal fraction of all the urgent restoration jobs to be done.

This time the world listened.

Among the people everywhere who heard about the floods, there were many who immediately got on the move to help. Among them was Miss Kay Silberfeld, a young restorer from the Baltimore Museum of Art.

"I was horrified," she said, when I heard the news of the disaster over the radio in Baltimore. It struck me all the more because I had been to Italy and Florence. It was hard to believe that all those magnificent works of art which I had admired ever since I was 14 were drowned in mud and water."

Kay decided that she must go to Florence as soon as possible. She talked to Charles Parkhurst, director of the Museum of Art. "We were busy at the time," she said, "but he immediately agreed to let me go." It was arranged that the museum would continue to pay her salary while she was away; the Committee to Rescue Italian Art paid her travel fare.

A Baltimore party of volunteer helpers was just about to leave for Florence and Kay was able to join it.

"I had to get ready almost at once," she said. "It was a terrible rush to gather all the equipment I wanted to take. I started out with an enormous amount of luggage, and yet I would have willingly taken another thousand things which I knew would be invaluable. I left for Italy with a curious mixture of emotions."

In Florence, it was hard work from dawn to dusk. Such elementary comforts as are usually taken for granted—water, electricity and heating—were rare. Meals tended to be erratic.

"But nobody had time to think about these things," Miss Silberfeld said. "Everyone was determined to accomplish as much as possible in the time available."

On arrival in Florence, each restorer picked an object to work on. Kay had until then been restoring only paintings. Here, however, she was attracted by the curious antique objects from the Bargello, a major museum.

One of the objects was a Sixteenth Century Venetian shield, covered with paint-decorated leather and shaped like a saddle. From the mud-ridden Bargello, Kay carried this to the Palazzo Davanzati. This stupendous Fourteenth Century palazzo was also a museum before the flood, but since then it has been turned into a well-equipped, efficient and certainly the most romantic art restoration laboratory that ever existed.

"It was exhilarating to witness and participate in the enthusiasm of all the young people of different nationalities who set up this laboratory," Kay said.

The shield that Kay "adopted" was a complicated restoration job to tackle. It had a base of wood, then a layer of gesso, a leather cover and, finally, the paint and varnish of the decorations. Each of these four materials required its own treatment.

At first Kay was able to remain in Florence only three weeks, which barely gave time to perform the first stage of restoration, the so-called acid treatment, to stop the damage from spreading. One of the worst after-effects of water damage is mold.

Restoration, like creative art, requires talent, steady application and great patience, in addition to specialized technical knowledge. And unlike a successful artist, a restorer acquires no public glamour. "But it's a marvelous satisfaction when the work comes out well," Miss Silberfeld said.

Upon special request from Signora Cristina Piacenter, in charge of the restorations at the Palazzo Davanzati, Kay returned to Florence at the beginning of summer. In August she was finishing her part of the restoration of one shield; it had been kept waiting for her return. Before it can go back to the Bargello, however, leather experts from Holland will have to come for the final stage.

Kay had another few weeks left before going back to Baltimore. Until then, she was going to work on wood sculptures—yet another new experience.

Kay shared her apartment with Miss Mary

Lou White, a staff restorer at the Walters Art Gallery. Miss White, who speaks fluent Italian, had studied restoration in Rome, Florence and London.

An expert at restoring sculptures and paintings on wood panels, she had spent some six weeks at the Fortezza da Basso, an old army barrack also converted into a restoration center.

"The work going on in the Fortezza is exciting," Mary Lou said. "The paintings often arrive in such a state that you can't even see what they are. The Italians are doing a magnificent job. Even to us, professionals, it seems a miracle the way some practically nonexistent paintings come back to life."

The flooded panels blister and come out in holes like large wounds. "The work I do is like putting jigsaw puzzles together," Miss White said. She estimates that at least 200 panels of great value are still in danger.

"The problem now is to stop further damage—the so-called first-aid treatment—so that eventually they can be properly restored. But there are far too few of us here to do this task in time."

According to Professor Umberto Baldini, head of restoration work at the Fortezza da Basso, another 50 head restorers and about 500 assistants are still needed.

Mary Lou was also leaving Florence soon, but both girls hoped to come back to do more work.

TAX INCREASE AND INFLATION

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KUYKENDALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, in his weekend press conference the President said that unless his tax increase proposal is accepted there will be a tax increase anyway as the result of the inflation which would take place. Just to keep the record straight we should remind ourselves of a few facts.

Inflation is already here and the American taxpayers are hurting now because of it. Especially hard hit are those on fixed incomes and our older citizens on pensions and annuities.

We faced a national financial crisis in 1966 as the result of an $11 billion deficit. Even if the President's 10-percent surtax is enacted without a corresponding cut in Federal spending we will face a deficit of some $22 billion. The result will be that we will get a direct-tax increase, plus a hidden-tax increase caused by more inflation, because without a cut in spending, the inflationary pressures will still be with us.

The only sane course for us to follow before agreeing to a tax increase is to demand concrete proof that there will be a sizable cut in spending to bring the budget more nearly in balance.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MIZE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, during the period September 23 to 30, I had the honor of serving, at the request of the Secretary of the Treasury, as one of the congressional advisers at the annual meeting of the Board of Governors of the International Bank and the International Monetary Fund in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.

I am sure that my colleagues have followed the reports on the meetings and know how constructive the discussions were in helping reach an understanding on international monetary matters.

Because it was necessary for me to be away when the House took action on several measures, I am not recorded as voting on this legislation. So that my constituents and the other Members will know exactly where I stand, I wish to offer this explanation about my position.

On rollcall 273, to provide for the election of a nonpartisan, locally elected school board for the District of Columbia, I would have voted "yea."

On rollcall 274, to permit the new District of Columbia government to issue rules and regulations regarding the sale of alcoholic beverages, I would have voted "nay."

On rollcall 277, the Railsback amendment to the juvenile delinquency bill, requiring block grants to the States, based on population, I would have voted "yea."

On rollcall 278, the Waggonner amendment to the juvenile delinquency bill, to prohibit receipt of funds under the act by the Office of Economic Opportunity, I would have voted "yea."

Or rollcall 282, the recommittal motion on continuing appropriations, I was paired for recommittal. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

On rollcall 285, establishing procedures to relieve domestic industries and workers injured by increased imports from low-wage areas, I would have voted "yea."

On rollcall 287, the amendment to the Packers and Stockyards Act, I would have voted "yea."

FCC CEREMONY HONORS MR. RAYMOND TOBIAS, LYONS, KANS.—A PIONEER IN BUSINESS SERVICE TWO-WAY RADIO

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SHRIVER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, this morning a ceremony was held in the offices of FCC Chairman Rosel Hyde in Washington commemorating the approval of the 100,000th license in the business radio service. The ceremony was arranged by the National Association of Business and Educational Radio, Inc., in coordination with the Federal Communications Commission, to mark the occurrence.

I wish to congratulate Mr. Raymond Tobias, head of the Tobias Dirt Construction Co., of Lyons, Kans., which is in my congressional district, who was the first licensee in the business radio service. Mr. Tobias and his wife are in Washington today for the observance. His license was granted on August 1, 1958, just a few weeks after the business radio service was created by the FCC.

It is a matter of significance and pride that this small businessman from Lyons, Kans., had the foresight and vision to recognize, even before businessmen in the big cities of our Nation, the benefits which the use of two-way radio in business could bring for him and the people he serves.

Today Mr. Tobias also utilizes two-way radio communications in his soil conservation work and in farming. In addition he is engaging in the development of channel catfish, a new and important industry in Kansas.

Mr. Speaker, the ability to contact trucks and all types of vehicles while they are in motion, and even to contact individuals, such as policemen and doctors while they are making their rounds, is one of the miracles of the century. It has opened for us a whole new vista of effective operations, not only in business but in fighting forest fires, conservation work, police work, disaster relief, and in every phase of our daily activity.

The growth in the use of this type of radio communication has been remarkable. According to the FCC's last annual report, there were over 2¼ million transmitters in the land mobile radio services and the FCC reports that applications for new ones are pouring in at the rate of almost 20,000 per month.

A report from the executive office of the President estimates that between the years 1965 and 1970 the number of transmitters in the safety and special services, about one-half of which are in the land mobile radio services, will increase from 5.3 million to 15.5 million, and by 1975 will reach the astounding number of 39 million.

These are impressive statistics and they help drive home the significance of Mr. Tobias' action in becoming the first licensee only 9 years ago. Today the 100,000th license authorization went to the Hooie Plumbing Co., of Rogersville, Ala.

In conclusion, I also want to congratulate the National Association of Business and Educational Radio on its leadership and guidance in behalf of two-way radio users in this country. Last year NABER effectively brought to the attention of the Select Committee on Small Business the plight of small businessmen and other users of two-way radio whose communications are hindered by too little frequency spectrum.

MESKILL REPORTS ON BURLINGTON POSTAL CONFERENCE

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MESKILL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there

objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MESKILL. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, September 29, I attended a conference in Burlington, Conn., which I had arranged some weeks ago so that town officials could meet with a representative of the Post Office Department from the Boston regional office.

For almost 8 years the town of Burlington has been attempting to establish a post office. This town has been served for many years by two rural carriers out of the Unionville Post Office, two rural carriers out of the Bristol Post Office, and one rural carrier out of the Collinsville Post Office.

Burlington has been growing, as have most of the small towns in my district. The town is trying to obtain identification through its own post office. It is experiencing some difficulty with business locations and industrial acquisitions because it does not have a post office address which can be used for mailing purposes. Furthermore, the citizens of this community experience frequent mixups and delays resulting from mail being forwarded from one town to another.

In short, Mr. Speaker, Burlington, Conn., has three zip codes but no post office.

The Friday session was a most productive one and it appears that changes will be made in the postal service which will improve mail delivery to the citizens and also help to give postal identity to Burlington, Conn.

I am grateful to the Department for its cooperation and to the officials of Burlington for their understanding. Although details remain to be worked out, I am hopeful that the postal needs of this growing community will be met in a more satisfactory manner than they are at present.

A LONG-NEEDED AMENDMENT TO THE FEDERAL FOOD, DRUG, AND COSMETIC ACT

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BOB WILSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I am today joining a number of my House colleagues in introducing a long-needed amendment to the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

In 1938, Congress made major changes in the act with respect to drugs, partly as a result of the proliferation of newly discovered drugs in the first four decades of this century. We are faced with the need to again make changes in the law because of the rapid development of food supplements since 1938. It is time for Congress to define for the Food and Drug Administration just exactly what the term "food supplement" means. The definition is taken from the FDA's own regulations, which were in effect until very recently.

In 1966 the Food and Drug Administration published regulations in the Federal Register altering the previous understanding of "food supplements" and drastically interfering with the freedom of individual citizens to purchase the "food supplements" of their choice. The new FDA regulations would require a warning label stating that the food supplement is, in effect, of no scientific or medical value and would establish specific guidelines with respect to the potency, number, combination, and amount or variety of any food supplement.

The Food and Drug Administration is to be lauded for its efforts on behalf of the American people with respect to impure foods, or injurious, improperly tested drugs. Such vigilance prevented the tragedy of thalidomide in this Nation. In the case of "food supplements," however, the question is not whether they are injurious to health, but whether the FDA should be permitted to imply through its regulations that "food supplements" are a waste or money. Although FDA has marshaled a mountain of statistics to show that such supplements are unnecessary for health purposes, we are also aware that statistics can be manipulated to support almost any argument.

The FDA, through its statistics and statements of facts, says that "food supplements" are not necessary if Americans eat properly. Yet, I should like to point out that the Agricultural Department, using its reservoir of statistics, reports that 48 percent of American families are deficient in at least one important nutrient in their daily diets.

My legislation would guarantee the right of Americans to purchase and use nonharmful "food supplements" of their choice. Anything less would be inconsistent with our treasured heritage of individual freedom of choice.

A RESOLUTION CALLING UPON THE PRESIDENT TO PROMOTE NEIGHBORHOOD ACTION CRUSADES

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BOB WILSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, during the summer months our Nation witnessed a spectacle of riot and destruction such as we have never experienced in our history. Anarchy reigned in large areas of our major cities until Federal troops, National Guardsmen, and police were able to quell the disturbances. We are all now searching for long-lasting solutions to prevent any more rioting in our cities.

The best way to attack a problem is to begin at the base and build from there. There is an urgent need for responsible community-level leadership to stem the tide of rabble-rousers and outside troublemakers who have invaded riot-torn cities. Such disturbances are caused by a minority in the area involved, yet all residents suffer severe consequences when their homes, schools, businesses, and churches are destroyed.

For this reason I am joining a number of my colleagues in introducing a joint resolution calling upon the President to promote neighborhood action crusades. These would be composed of local neighborhood leaders, working in their own neighborhoods on a primarily voluntary basis, in order to rally those stabilizing influences within each local community necessary to assure peace in America's cities. The text of the resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 862

Joint resolution to call upon the President of the United States to promote voluntary Neighborhood Action Crusades by communities to rally law-abiding urban slum dwellers in preventing riots.

Whereas the overwhelming majority of Negro Americans are dedicated citizens, strongly opposed to disorder and violence; and

Whereas the involvement of these, our fellow citizens, in keeping peace within their own neighborhoods is essential to the realization of the current crises in our cities; and

Whereas such involvement must be through voluntary citizen participation, organized and directed by local citizens at the community level; and

Whereas the President and the Congress of the United States possess the power of leadership necessary to inspire such locally controlled and directed citizen-involvement: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in *Congress assembled,*

1. That the Congress urges the President to use the persuasive powers of his office to call upon the communities to initiate a Neighborhood Action Crusade to provide continuing communication and positive direction to defuse the tensions now threatening the lives and property of urban America; and

2. That the Neighborhood Action Crusade be composed of local neighborhood leaders, working within their own areas, on a largely voluntary basis in order to rally those stabilizing influences within each local community necessary to assure peace in America's cities; and

3. That the Congress urges the President to place at the disposal of such local governments as may request assistance, such fund and equipment permitted by existing statutes and as may be necessary to support this Neighborhood Action Crusade; and

4. That is is the sense of the Congress that the Neighborhood Action Crusade shall be composed of local programs, developed, organized, and directed by local citizens for such periods of time as may be deemed advisable.

LEGISLATION TO STOP IMPLEMENTATION OF RECENT ARBITRARY FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION RULINGS ON DIETARY SUPPLEMENTS

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. DENNEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation designed to do

two things—first, to stop the implementation of recent arbitrary Food and Drug Administration rulings restricting the addition of dietary supplements to certain foods—House Concurrent Resolution 516; second, H.R. 13249, which will give the American people a choice on how they wish to supplement their diet.

On December 14, 1966, a FDA order redefined "food supplement." Although this definition had stood for 26 years, suddenly this agency, under certain conditions, would now classify food supplements as prescription drugs.

Mr. Speaker, I have received considerable correspondence from my constituents demanding that I, as their Congressman, take action to remedy this arbitrary ruling. It is my belief that enactment of House Concurrent Resolution 516 and H.R. 13249 will provide a suitable solution for their request. For instance, one of the practices that would be affected is the addition of vitamin C to milk. Addition of this much-needed vitamin to milk has provided a low-cost method of supplementing people's diets.

This is especially true in low-income areas with people who do not have sufficient funds to purchase enough fresh fruits. As my colleagues know, recent testimony before a congressional committee demonstrated the excessive profits obtained by certain drug manufacturers which have been and are extracting exorbitant prices for their products. Testimony before the House Ways and Means Committee on medicare also emphasized the high cost of prescription drugs.

As too often the case, we have one agency of the Government attempting to accomplish a task and another agency engaged in activities diametrically opposed to that effort. In this case, OEO, the food stamp program, and other activities of the Federal Government are aimed at improving the diets of needy Americans. On the other hand, the effect of this ruling by FDA is to deny those very same people low-cost vitamins and nutrients.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. HECKLER] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on Friday last, September 29, I was confined to my home because of illness and following the directions of our House physician, Dr. Rufus J. Pearson.

Had I been present for that day's session, I would have voted "yea" on roll No. 287, amendment of Packers and Stockyards Act.

ADMINISTRATION MUST ESTABLISH NEW PRIORITIES

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, for some weeks now the Ways and Means Committee has had under consideration the President's proposal for a 10-percent tax surcharge. An overwhelming majority of the members of the committee—Democrats and Republicans alike—have taken the position that it would be futile to enact increased taxes without at the same time correspondingly reducing the level of Government expenditures.

I am not talking about cutting out any specific program. The threatened $29 billion budgetary deficit for fiscal 1968 can be reduced by rescheduling the priorities and level of spending. Control over the level of spending rests wholly within the discretion of the President. To this extent, almost every expenditure of Government is controllable.

Nevertheless, we seem to have reached an impasse.

Over the weekend, the President is reported to have stated that he would not submit any proposals for reducing spending at this time. If I correctly judge the temper of the members of the Ways and Means Committee—and the American people—they are equally adamant in opposing a tax increase unless spending is reduced.

If the administration persists in its refusal to reduce spending, we might as well be prepared to go through another round of inflation accompanied by higher interest rates, a squeeze on the home-construction industry, and the other dislocations in the economy which occurred last fall. If this should occur, responsibility rests squarely on the administration.

I would like to review the Republican record on this issue.

As early as February 1966—when the Ways and Means Committee reported the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966 (H.R. 12752)—the Republicans urged a reappraisal of domestic spending. While generally supporting the Tax Adjustment Act, the Republicans stated:

> Notwithstanding the inclusion in the budget for fiscal 1967 of nonrecurring revenues of more than $12 billion, coupled with an unprecedented projected level of economic growth and tax revenues, the administration's budget shows a deficit of $1.8 billion. If the administration cannot present a balanced budget under these conditions, when does the administration propose to balance the budget?
>
> If there were any assurance that the war in Vietnam would not extend beyond the fiscal year 1967, there might be some justification for financing that war through a series of temporary expedients. On the contrary, however, we are told to prepare for a long struggle in Vietnam. If this is correct, and domestic spending continues even at the present level, how does the administration propose to raise the additional revenues which will be required for fiscal 1968?
>
> The administration knows that increased expenditures for social programs at home and abroad, in the face of the escalating costs of the war in Vietnam, have already created dangerous inflationary pressures. The administration may be forced to seek controls over wages, prices and credit as well as further increases in taxes, if it continues on its present course. Apparently, the administration is willing to take this risk if the "day of truth" can be postponed until after the November congressional elections.
>
> We are unalterably opposed to the fiscal policies which make it necessary to raise an additional $5 billion in revenues for fiscal 1967. Under present circumstances, however, it is our judgment that the failure to raise additional revenues at this time will increase the danger of inflation and aggravate the problems with respect to our balance of payments, gold flow, and debt management. We therefore reluctantly support this bill. We caution, however, that unless the administration and the Congress are willing to establish strict priorities for its nondefense programs, and put some of them "on the shelf" for a later day, this bill will be only the first in a series of bills increasing taxes and imposing controls on our economy.
>
> (Separate Views of Messrs. Byrnes, Curtis, Schneebeli, Collier, Broyhill (Va.), and Battin on H.R. 12752, H. Rept. No. 1285 (H.R. 12752) 89th Cong., 2d sess.)

On June 2, 1966, in reporting the bill (H.R. 15202) to provide for an increase in the public debt limit, the Republicans reiterated their concern over the fiscal policies of this administration. The Republicans said:

> From the outset, the fiscal policies adopted by this administration have been calculated to deceive the Congress and the American people. Initially, the Johnson administration adopted a cloak of frugality in Government expenditures. Expenditures for fiscal 1964 were held to $97.7 billion and expenditures for fiscal 1965 were held to $96.5 billion. Beginning in the fall of 1965, however, the administration abandoned any pretense of fiscal restraint. As a result, by fiscal 1967, the administration's reported spending will have increased to $112.8 billion. To this amount, there should be added an additional $5 or $6 billion realized from the sale of loan and other Government assets, the proceeds of which are reflected in the budget not as "receipts" but as a reduction in expenditures for fiscal 1967. We are thus faced with an expenditure budget of more than $118 billion for fiscal 1967—a $35 billion increase in the Federal spending since fiscal 1961. Less than one-third of this increase can be attributed to the war in Vietnam.
>
> It is becoming more and more apparent that the Government cannot continue to increase its spending, as the administration proposes, without disastrous consequences. The business and financial community, as well as the economists in our leading universities and industries, have expressed their concern over the inflationary pressures in the economy today. For the most part, they agree that Government spending has largely contributed to these pressures. The administration's spending policies have resulted in a rising deficit in our balance of payments, the threat to international monetary stability, a further drain on our gold reserves, and a serious problem in debt management. Now, as a final consequence the American people must stand by and watch the value of their savings being drained off by inflation.
>
> Instead of being willing to reduce expenditures, and thereby curtail these inflationary pressures, the administration suggests that a further tax increase may be needed. Such an increase cannot be justified on account of any "short fall" in Federal revenues. While differing in amount, both the Treasury Department and the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation point out that tax revenues are running well ahead of estimates made as late as January 1966. If

a tax increase is proposed by the administration, it will only be because the administration is unwilling to recognize that, notwithstanding the record yield of our tax system, there is a limit on the amount of money Government can and should spend. For this reason, we are unalterably opposed to any further tax increase.

(Separate Views of the Republicans on H.R. 15202, H. Rept. 1607 (H.R. 15202), 89th Cong. 2d sess.)

In the fall of 1966, faced with a so-called fiscal crunch, the administration requested the suspension of the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code providing for the investment credit and for accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property. While some of us supported the suspension as being necessary under the circumstances, a majority of the Republicans joined in opposing suspension of the investment credit. They pointed out again that the problem did not arise from business spending, but Government spending. In the report on this bill, those Republicans stated:

In opposing this bill (H.R. 17607), the undersigned Republican members of the committee join in sounding a note of caution. Let no one be misled. This bill is presented by the administration to relieve the inflationary pressures confronting our economy. The basic cause of inflation is clear—excessive Government spending. Without an attack on Government spending, further inflation is inevitable. The Government has been on a spending spree. Today, we are suffering from a "hangover." What is needed is a period of restraint—not just on the part of labor or on the part of business—but on the part of Government.

During the past 6 years a Democrat administration and a Democrat-controlled Congress have proceeded on the assumption that there was no deficiency in our society which the Federal purse and the heavy hand of Federal regulation could not cure. We have seen each piece of legislation beget more legislation—each new expenditure by the Federal Government beget other expenditures.

The level of domestic spending—wholly apart from our defense requirements and the war in Vietnam—has increased from about $46 billion in fiscal 1965 to more than $58 billion in fiscal 1967, and it is still going up.

Spending for national defense, including the war in Vietnam, as presented in the President's budget last January increased from about $50 billion in fiscal 1965 to about $61 billion in fiscal 1967. It is already clear that this is an underestimate of the true cost of the war in Vietnam. The chairman of the House Appropriations Committee recently warned the Congress to be prepared for a further increase of as much as $15 billion if the war continues.

Overall the annual Government expenditures already show an increase of more than $35 billion during the past 6 years, and if we are to add another $15 billion for the Vietnam war, this will mean an increase of $50 billion. The Government will be spending $50 billion more in 1967 than it spent 6 years ago.

It should be surprising to no one that this policy would bring about uncontrollable inflationary pressures. Something had to give—and it turned out to be the consumer's pocketbook.

Prices for food, goods, and services have been increasing at an accelerated rate. Increases in the cost of living index exceed any period in the past 10 years.

Wages have also been increasing, but the purchasing power of the wage earner has not kept pace with increases in the cost of living.

Interest rates—a part of the cost which the American consumer must pay whether he is buying a house, automobile, or a household appliance—have reached the highest level in 40 years. While the dollar buys less and less, it costs more and more to borrow. The deterioration in the value of the dollar both at home and abroad has led to a steady drain on our gold reserves.

* * * * *

At this late date, the administration states that it proposes to reduce the amounts ordered, contracted for, or to be expended by the Federal Government in fiscal 1967 by a total of $3 billion, of which a total of $1.5 billion already has been approved by the President. In spite of repeated questioning on the part of the Republican members of the committee, the administration witnesses were unable or unwilling to substantiate these claims. They refused to identify a single reduction. The promised $3 billion reduction in expenditures—or commitments—is a reduction from an unknown and unidentified expenditure budget. It is wholly illusory. We have no assurance that the administration will, in fact, cut back on its domestic spending programs.

(Dissenting Views of Messrs. Curtis, Utt, Betts, Schneebeli, and Collier, H. Rept. 2087 (H.R. 17607), 89th Cong. 2d sess.)

As one of the first acts of this Congress, we were called upon to enact a further increase in the debt limit. In the report on that bill (H.R. 4573) on February 6, 1967, we said:

The exigencies of the war in Vietnam made it imperative that the administration exercise fiscal restraint. Instead, in order to get the Congress to provide the "butter," the administration deliberately understated the cost of the "guns." The administration came to the Congress with a proposed budget for fiscal 1967 which understated expenditures by at least $15 billion. The administration now admits this.

This bill (H.R. 4573) is the price tag which the American people are being called upon to pay for the failure of the administration to disclose to the Congress and to the American people a year ago the cost which would be incurred in fighting a major war in Vietnam. After refusing for the past 12 months to disclose to the Congress—and to the American people—the true state of the Government's finances, so that the Congress might take appropriate steps to alleviate the problem, the administration now comes pleading an emergency. With threats of dire consequences if the Congress should fail to act promptly, we are called upon to provide forthwith an additional $6 billion of borrowing authority.

* * * * *

Not only did the administration fail to exercise fiscal restraint, but it kept from the Congress the information on which the Congress might have exercised such restraint. The conclusion is inescapable that it has been the gross mismanagement of the fiscal affairs of the Nation by the administration, if not actual bad faith in its dealings with the public and the Congress, which necessitates a further increase in the public debt at this time.

* * * * *

(Separate Views of the Republicans on H.R. 4573, H. Rept. No. 4, 90th Cong., 1st sess.)

Last June—just a few months ago—another increase in the public debt limit was brought to this body. The first time, the bill (H.R. 10328) was voted down. At that time the Republicans again urged a review of the budget. In the report of June 2, 1967, accompanying that bill the Republicans said:

THREAT OF $29 BILLION DEFICIT REQUIRES BUDGET REVIEW

Facing a deficit of this magnitude, the administration and the Congress should "stop, review, and revise" our whole fiscal policy. The impact of such a deficit on our economy could be disastrous.

In a recent statement at Rochester, N.Y., the chairman of this committee emphasized the need for reappraisal. After pointing out that in the absence of a reappraisal, the budget deficit for fiscal 1968 could go as high as $29.2 billion, the chairman said:

"I again emphasize tonight that we must continually reevaluate existing expenditure programs in the light of a very objective measurement of the benefits which they convey and the costs which they will impose. Every new program should be viewed not in terms of its first year cost alone, but in terms of what its cost will be 5 years from now, 10 years from now, or perhaps 15 years from now. It is only by this process that the full impact of spending programs can be objectively evaluated in terms of their demands upon the entire economy."

The administration in January submitted a budget for fiscal 1968 showing a deficit of $8.1 billion. Presumably, the priority of expenditures in the budget were evaluated on that basis. If it now appears that without remedial action the deficit may run as high as $29.2 billion, as the chairman of this committee estimates, the reappraisal of all expenditures and the adoption of new priorities are absolutely essential.

(Separate Views of the Republicans on H.R. 10328, H. Rept. 331, (H.R. 10328) 90th Cong. 1st sess.)

When a second bill (H.R. 10867), was brought to the floor a couple of weeks later, we reiterated this view. Pointing out the danger of a threatened deficit running as high as $30 billion, we said:

REVIEW OF FISCAL POLICY ONLY RESPONSIBLE COURSE

In the face of a deficit running as high as $30 billion—and notwithstanding the action of the House in rejecting a similar bill on June 7—the administration steadfastly refuses to discuss means either for reducing expenditures or for improving the revenues. The administration seeks to ignore the dangers facing our economy. Without regard to the consequences, the administration persists in its refusal to change its spending plans. Under the circumstances, we have no alternative except to oppose this legislation. It is the only responsible course open to the Congress.

Certainly, something must be done to prevent the debt ceiling from reverting to $285 billion on June 30, as provided for in existing law. Before doing more, however, it is equally important—and responsible—to insist upon a review both of expenditures and revenues—a reconsideration of priorities. That is the only responsible course in the face of the magnitude of the threatened deficit.

(Separate Views of the Republicans on H.R. 10867, H. Rept. 368 (H.R. 10867), 90th Cong. 1st sess.)

I wanted to present these excerpts from prior statements by the Republicans on the Ways and Means Committee—not merely to show where the blame rests for our present fiscal mess—but to make clear to the administration the Republican position in regard to the fiscal policy the Nation should pursue.

To increase taxes without reducing expenditures will not get at the root of our problem. Such action will merely

provide more money for the administration to spend, without requiring any reduction in the deficit.

My position is clear. The magnitude of the threatened deficit is such that neither expenditure reduction nor increased taxes standing alone will solve the problem. I am convinced that the best interests of our people would be served by a course of action which resulted in both reduced expenditures and increased Federal revenues. I am not willing, however, to impose additional taxes on the American people while the administration persists in its refusal to take constructive action in order to reduce the level of Federal spending.

AIR POLLUTION DAMAGE TO PLANTS

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GUDE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago, my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] held hearings before his subcommittee of the House District of Columbia Committee on our legislation to provide for the control and elimination of air pollution in the District.

Last week, in connection with our legislation, I went to Beltsville, Md., where Dr. H. E. Heggestad, head of the air pollution laboratories at Agriculture Research Service, is doing commendable scientific work on the effects of air pollution on plants. To say the very least, Dr. Heggestad's findings are alarming.

I think my colleagues both from the suburbs and the cities will be interested in the contents of the following article from the April 1967 issue of Grounds Maintenance magazine concerning air pollution damage to plants. It gives a good description of what has been and is being done in this area of research so vital to our attack on air pollution.

The article follows:

AIR POLLUTION DAMAGE TO PLANTS

Air pollution is on the increase all across the United States. Major cities get most of the publicity, but you can find damage to vegetation in the open country near ore smelters, pulp and paper mills, coal and petroleum burning furnaces, fertilizer and other industrial plants and wherever vehicle traffic is heavy.

There are areas in the United States and foreign countries near ore processing plants where nothing can grow, not even a blade of grass.

The visible air pollution damage to vegetation in California has been estimated at more than $13 million annually (only $500,000 in 1953), affecting over 12,000 square miles. An estimated $18 million in visible damage occurs annually along the Atlantic seaboard from Boston to New York and Philadelphia to Norfolk, Va. Estimated national losses to crops and ornamentals from air pollution amount to $325 million each year.

Losses include both visible injury—foliage discoloration, stunting, abortion of blossoms, reduction in yield or quality, die-back of twigs and branches or death—as well as hidden injury—delayed maturity, early leaf drop, slow decline in vigor and growth suppression.

Smog first became known because of its damaging effects on vegetation. Plants make excellent indicators and compose a vast air-pollutant monitoring network.

Air pollution injury to plants, however, may be confused with disease, insect damage, nutritional imbalance in the soil, neglect and adverse effects of temperature or wind.

Since plants are much more sensitive to smog, sulfur dioxide and other pollutants than human beings and animals, they can serve as warning devices. Once air pollutant injury can be recognized, it will be possible to determine what toxicants are or were in the air, at what time and even the approximate concentrations. Plants become graphic records of the time and nature of past pollutants since each toxic gas produces different symptoms on different plants.

Many factors govern the extent of plant injury as well as the areas in which air pollution occurs. The kind and concentration of the pollutant depends upon the type and location of industry, fuel use and number of motor vehicles. Other factors include the distance from the source, length of time exposed, city size and location, meteoroligical conditions, land contour and drainage, soil fertility and moisture, age of leaf tissues, time of year, plant species and varieties grown.

Air pollution damage usually is greatest in clear, still, humid weather when barometric pressure is high. Toxicants build up near the earth when warm air aloft traps cooler air at ground level. This is called air inversion.

The most important plant-affecting air pollutants are sulfur dioxide, fluorides, ozone, oxidant damage or smog and ethylene. Other pollutants—hormone-type herbicides such as the vapors of 2,4-D, 2,4,5-T, MCPA and related chemicals, ammonia and chlorine fumes, nitrogen oxides, sulphuric acid mist, dust from cement plants and injury from manufactured illuminating gas—are not included in this discussion.

SULFUR DIOXIDE

Sulfur dioxide (SO_2) is the most widely known and studied air pollutant. It is formed by the combustion of nearly all fuels.

Exposure of broad-leaved plants results in dry, papery, white to straw-colored, irregular, marginal or interveinal blotches in the leaves. Yellowing or chlorosis and a gradual bleaching of surrounding tissues is fairly common. Injured grass blades develop long, light tan to white streaks. A reddish-brown die-back occurs at the tips of conifer leaves, usually with adjacent yellowish areas. Damage is easily confused with winter, drought or mite injury.

Damage to sensitive plants may occur at ½ part of SO_2 in 1 million parts of air (0.5 ppm). (1 part per million, 1 ppm, equals 1 ounce of salt in 62,500 pounds of sugar, 1 inch in nearly 16 miles, 1 minute in about 2 years, a 1-gm. needle in a 1-ton haystack or 1 penny in $10,000.)

Very sensitive plants include crabapple, aspen, birch, Douglas fir, hawthorn, larch, sumac, tulip, violet, smartweed, ragweed and curly dock. Somewhat resistant plants include maples, privet and pines.

FLUORIDES, HYDROFLUORIC ACID (F–)

Fluorides occur in smoke from the manufacture of certain metals, ceramics and superphosphate. Fluorides typically cause a killing (scorching) of the tips and margins of leaves of broad-leaved plants and a "tip-burn" of grasses and conifer needles. The tips of gladioli leaves turn white or yellow. A sharp reddish-brown or yellowish line may occur between living and injured tissues. Citrus leaves develop a yellow mottling or spotting prior to the typical burning. Injured areas in stone fruit (apricot, plum and peach) leaves may drop out leaving irregular shot holes.

Young succulent growth is most easily injured. Leaf-fluoride concentrations of 50 to 200 parts per million usually result in injury, although resistant plant species or varieties will tolerate concentrations of 500 ppm.

Very sensitive varieties of gladioli such as Shirley Temple and Picardy are injured by 0.1 ppb (parts per billion) of fluorides. (1 part per billion, 1 ppb, equals 1 inch in nearly 1,600 miles, 1 drop in 20,000 gallons, 1 ounce of dye in 7,530,000 gallons of water, 1 pound in 500,000 tons or 1 second of time in over 322 years.) Other more resistant varieties of gladioli can tolerate 100 times or more this amount F- in the air.

Sensitive plants include crabgrass, gladioli, iris, grape, Chinese apricot, Italian prune, peach, white and yellow pines, larch and citrus. Resistant plants include roses and pigweed. A tremendous variation exists in susceptibility to fluorides among varieties of the same plant.

OZONE

Ozone is a by-product of numerous manufacturing processes, causing collapse, killing of tissue, markings on the upper leaf surface known as stipple (pigment usually red-brown to black), flecking (white to straw-colored), chlorosis or bleaching. Growth is stunted and leaves drop early.

Injury occurs to most sensitive plants when exposed to air levels above 0.15 ppm of ozone.

Sensitive plants include lawn grasses, grape and white pine. Resistant plants include gladioli, geraniums and citrus. Great differences in susceptibility to ozone are often expressed by varieties or clones of the same plant. An active breeding program to develop ozone-resistant varieties of plants is in progress.

Ozone and sulfur dioxide can combine to cause injury at much lower concentrations that either pollutant could cause acting alone. Ozone damage is often found in combination with oxidant damage or smog in the Los Angeles area.

OXIDANT DAMAGE OR SMOG

Oxidant damage or smog was originally described in 1950 in the Los Angeles area. Many chemical compounds and reactions are involved, including precursors, but peroxyacetyl nitrate or PAN has been identified as the principal toxicant. PAN is now known to be a serious air pollutant in and around major cities where organic fuels are combusted in large quantities and vehicular traffic is heavy. Injury may increase as the temperature rises.

The typical leaf marking is a distinctive silvering, glazing or bronzing of the underleaf surface. Injury is often seen as a cross-leaf banding rather than as a blotching or streaking as associated with sulfur dioxide. In grass leaves, the collapsed tissue appears bleached, with tan to yellow lengthwise bands. Conifer needles turn yellow. Petunia leaves show whitish areas near the tip, in the middle or at the base. PAN exposure also results in stunting, early maturity or senescence, followed by early leaf drop. These latter symptoms are common on citrus, elms or other trees. Invisible damage may be more widespread than realized at present.

Very sensitive plants are lawn grasses, Swiss chard and petunias. Pansies are resistant. Atmospheric "oxidant" concentrations above 0.2 ppm are known to result in plant damage.

ETHYLENE

Ethylene once was a problem in greenhouses where manufactured gas was used in heating. With the shift to oil and natural gas, this problem is no longer serious, except where ethylene is an air pollutant.

Damage to broad-leaved plants occurs as a drooping of leaves and shoots, early leaf and

petal fall, chlorosis, stunting and a more spreading type of growth. Specific diseases due to ethylene are "sleepiness" in carnations, dry sepal in Cattleya and other orchids and blasting of rose buds. Damage somewhat resembles 2,4–D in certain plants.

Very sensitive plants include sweetpea, narcissus, snapdragon, orchids and carnations. Grasses are resistant. Orchids are injured at ethylene concentrations of 5 parts per billion or less. Exposure to 0.1 ppm causes injury to sweetpeas.

CONTROL

The solution to air pollution is not easy and involves enforced use of "blow-by" and other devices on automobiles, stopping emission at the manufacturing plant, state and federal legislation, plant breeding, a shift to growing less susceptible plants, passing air through activited carbon filters in greenhouses and possible spraying of high value crops.

Sprays of Ozoban or other ascorbic acid products, as well as fungicides containing zineb, maneb, ferbam, thiram and dichlone often reduce damage from oxidized hydrocarbons. Calcium oxide sprays prevent fluorides injury.

CONTROL METHODS

To learn how to best combat the problem, the Agricultural Research Service has established a new Plant Air Pollution Laboratory at Beltsville, Md.

Basic research in the laboratory will be directed toward a better understanding of how air pollutants act an agronomic, horticultural and ornamental plants; and toward developing methods for controlling damage to plants.

Until now, the ARS air pollution research at Beltsville has been limited to the effects of pollutants on tobacco plants. The new lab will enable scientists to expand the research to include a broad spectrum of plants—both cultivated and wild.

Initially, the scientists will use oats, alfalfa, petunias and beans as test plants. These are representative species known to be sensitive to air pollutants. Tobacco plants will be closely coordinated with other studies at Beltsville and ARS air pollution research in cooperation with the U.S. Public Health Service at Taft Sanitary Engineering Center, Cincinnati, Ohio.

H. E. Heggestad, ARS plant pathologist and a pioneer in research on air pollution damage to tobacco plants, will head the new laboratory, to be staffed eventually with five scientists of various disciplines.

The scientists will concentrate on air pollutants in photochemical smog, including ozone, pheroxyacetyl nitrate (PAN), sulfur dioxide and nitrogen oxide. Fuel combustion and auto exhausts produce the major portion of these pollutants.

In their research, the scientists will:

Characterize pathologic, physiologic and biochemical changes induced in plants by air pollutants.

Study the effects of pollutants on plant pigments and stomatal action and their relation to premature development of leaves and yield and quality of flowers, fruits and seeds.

Identify species and varieties that are resistant or susceptible to air pollutants. Until the level of air pollution can be reduced by prevention at the source, identification and development of resistant plants is probably the best method of controlling damage.

Further explore the possibility of using chemicals as antioxidants to reduce damage.

Special fumigation chambers in the laboratory will help the scientists better understand what air pollutants do to plants. In these chambers, plants can be exposed to specific levels of pollutants for specific time periods.

The laboratory will also include greenhouses equipped with special carbon filters that will remove most of the air pollutants in photochemical smog from incoming air. Performance of plants grown under filtered air will be compared with plants grown under non-filtered air.

Carbon filtered greenhouses are now used experimentally and commercially in some parts of California. Research at Beltsville indicates that they may be necessary along the Eastern seaboard for growing sensitive plants without serious injury from polluted air

WASHINGTON POST PERFORMING OUTSTANDING PUBLIC SERVICE IN EXPOSING THE SECOND MORTGAGE RACKET IN HOME IMPROVEMENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the series of articles which began Saturday in the Washington Post by Leonard Downie, Jr., and David A. Jewell on the victimization of low-income families in Washington by fast-buck operators peddling home improvement contracts, which turn out to be mortgages on the property at unconscionably inflated prices, is journalism at its best.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs and as the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Housing of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, I am not a bit surprised by any of the information Mr. Downie and Mr. Jewell have brought to light. The names or individual cases may be different, but the pattern is one we are thoroughly familiar with.

I was glad to see a report over the weekend that the ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] wants to see legislation enacted to block these vicious practices. He has always opposed second mortgage rackets, I know.

TRUTH IN LENDING MUST COVER ALL MORTGAGES TO BE EFFECTIVE

Mr. Speaker, there is an excellent opportunity before the Committee to help solve this problem through the passage of effective—and I repeat the word, "effective"—truth-in-lending legislation. The bill which passed the Senate, S. 5, which the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] and some other minority members of the committee are cosponsoring in the House, would solve some of the problems brought to light by the Washington Post as they relate to disclosure of finance charges on second and third mortgages, and to balloon notes, blank contracts, and all of the other fraudulent practices described in these cases.

But S. 5 and Mr. WIDNALL's companion bill, H.R. 11602, exempt "first mortgages." As those of us who have sponsored the consumer credit protection bill, H.R. 11601, have repeatedly pointed out in our hearings, unconscionable contracts, such as the Downie-Jewell articles have been describing, become first mortgages whenever a previous mortgage is retired.

ELDERLY OWNING HOMES FREE AND CLEAR OFTEN VICTIMS

Elderly couples who have paid for their homes over the years and then find they do not have the funds for costly repairs are frequently victimized by the kind of schemes reported by the Washington Post. But under H.R. 11602 and similar truth-in-lending bills sponsored by six of the 12 members of the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs, such mortgages would nevertheless be exempt from finance charge disclosure requirements as long as they were "first" mortgages. On the other hand, under the Sullivan-Gonzalez - Minish - Annunzio - Bingham-Halpern bill, H.R. 11601, and H.R. 11806 introduced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] and numerous other Members, they would not be exempt.

Mr. Speaker, following is the first article in the Washington Post series on mortgage racketeering, telling how low-income families purchasing homes of their own were sold improvement contracts which ended up costing them far, far more than they had been led to believe, at interest and finance charges bordering on the fantastic:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Sept. 30, 1967]

HOMEOWNERS LOSE MILLIONS IN MORTGAGE SCHEMES HERE—100 SUITS STIR PROBE BY FOUR U.S. AGENCIES

(By Leonard Downie, Jr., and David A. Jewell)

Hundreds of low-income Negro homeowners in Washington are complaining that they are being bilked in second mortgage schemes that Federal authorities say net more than $1 million a year.

In more than 100 suits filed in General Sessions and U.S. District Court here, homeowners allege that these mortgages deeds of trust were obtained by a dozen home improvement businesses here through high-pressure salesmanship, fraud and, in many cases, false notarization. Two officers of one company have already been indicted for forging signatures of eight homeowners on deeds of trust.

A four-month investigation by a team of reporters from The Washington Post revealed that some second mortgages obtained here have been sold at a discount to a national credit firm. This company is also involved heavily in second mortgage business in Philadelphia, Boston, Cincinnati, Columbus, Texas, Indiana and New Jersey.

The home improvement companies who obtained the mortgages—and the creditors who bought and are now collecting on them—are being investigated by United States Postal Inspectors, the Federal Housing Authority, the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice.

The second mortgage practices have been going on since 1962, and many millions of dollars are involved.

INDICTMENTS EXPECTED

In the wake of this newspaper's investigation, U.S. Attorney David G. Bress said he expected indictments in the cases here within two weeks.

In case after case in Washington, home owners are being forced to pay exorbitantly or lose their homes:

Two elderly blind women who are paying $7500 plus interest say all they received was a black-and-white portable television set and installation of a small gas heater and a rusting radiator, worth a few hundred dollars.

A retired couple in their 70s told reporters they ended up with $15,000 in mortgages after having $7,500 in old mortgages paid off and an "American Townehouse Front" installed, which consisted mostly of aluminum siding, put on the upper part of the house front, paint on the rest, and a new front door.

A 67-year-old charwoman has two mortgages on her home totaling $9000 as a result

of two cash loans she received that totaled $5000.

TEN LOSE HOMES

At least ten families facing similar debts have lost their homes through foreclosures here in the past two years. Scores more are fighting in court to save their houses.

Many other homeowners who signed contracts for home improvements with any of a dozen local firms did not know—until contacted by reporters from The Washington Post—that their signatures were also on mortgages on their homes filed with the D.C. Government.

When questioned by reporters, these nearly 100 homeowners—selected at random from District real estate records—voiced nearly identical complaints as those found in the court suits.

The United State's Attorney's office here first began receiving complaints about some of these firms more than two years ago. Two isolated indictments—charging the officers of one firm with forgery and the notary public for another with false notarization—were handed down early this year.

[The practices complained of do not affect most of the several hundred home improvement contractors licensed to do business in the District. These contractors are reputable businessmen whose work is financed conventionally through normal commercial channels.]

On March 30, Federal investigators sent United States Attorney Bress a lengthy report on the activities of one firm.

The report also contained a strong indication that there were many other firms in the District engaged in similar schemes.

FRAUD SQUAD SETUP

In July, after The Washington Post investigation began at the courthouse, Bress decided to set up a special fraud squad in his office to work on the case "because of the voluminous nature of the investigation."

Bress said this week that the fraud charges are "not the crimes of violence that I am now primarily interested in, of course, but it is the kind of illegal conduct we will look into."

Named in many court suits as offenders are Custom House Construction Co., Monarch Construction Co., United Mortgage Co. (trading as Bankers Mortgage Co.) and United Home Enterprises Corporation.

A majority of the financial paper from these firms involved in litigation here has been sold the Atlas Credit Corp., of Philadelphia, a giant credit firm listed on the New York Stock Exchange, which was recently renamed Sunasco, Inc., as the result of a merger. Sunasco lists assets of $400 million.

The pattern was this:

The home improvement firm would sell the paper at a discount to a local Atlas broker. He in turn would sell it at a discount to Atlas in Philadelphia which would then turn it over to a wholly owned subsidiary company to make collections.

Two Federal agencies (the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice) are looking into Atlas' activities in a number of cities, including Washington.

Suits have been filed against four other local firms which also allegedly originated or passed on debt paper to Atlas during the past two years. Some other firms that have sold such paper to Atlas have gone out of business during that time. In some cases their officers have helped start other firms that have also dealt with Atlas.

NOTARY SUIT CITED

First public attention to these schemes came last year when one notary public from Maryland pleaded guilty in U.S. District Court here to falsely notarizing two D.C. mortgages in favor of Custom House Construction Co.

Deeds attested by the notary, Louise Beane, are involved in five suits filed by homeowners against Custom House. The suits say that no notary public was present when they signed, as the law requires.

One lawyer representing eight homeowners filed damage suits claiming a "money lending scheme" involving Atlas Credit Corp. of Philadelphia and Bankers Mortgage Co. of 722 11th st. nw.

That lawyer, like many others who pressed their charges of fraud vigorously, won settlement exceptionally favorable to his clients.

Government investigators say that much of the financial paper generated by Custom House was sold for more than a 40 per cent discount, and some of it has been discounted by as much as 60 per cent.

CANVASS BY PHONE

Here is how some of the home improvement companies have worked:

They canvassed low-income Negro neighborhoods, generally by phone, seeking people interested in anything from home improvements to television sets, air conditioning or carpeting.

The telephone canvassing is usually done by women who use real estate directories and cross-indexes listing phone numbers by street address. One company called 6000 homes in 28 months.

A visit by a salesman usually occurs, complete with sales talk, and the quotation of a low price. The suits claim that some fast shuffling of papers to be signed follows.

If the homeowner is buying a product, it is delivered quickly. In the case of home improvements, work begins promptly. Weeks later, a payment book arrives in the mail from a finance firm the homeowner has never heard of.

PAYMENTS SOAR

If the homeowner bothers to multiply the monthly payments by the number of months he must pay, in some cases he may find the principal owed is anywhere from double to four times the amount he thought he had signed up for.

If he protests, he discovers that not only has he signed a note for this amount, but that he also has signed a deed to his home, and that there is not much he can do about it.

The holder of the deed (the firm that sent the payment book) has bought the note and mortgage and thus can claim that it is a "holder in due course." The law presumes that a holder in due course is entitled to his money, since he has paid for the paper "in good faith." He is merely the financier, and quality of work, for instance, is not his problem. The original salesmen, in effect, wash their hands of the affair.

DEBTS "CONSOLIDATED"

In some cases, a homeowner protests he can't afford whatever it is the salesman is selling because he already is heavily in debt.

At that point he is told he will be "helped" by debt consolidation.

The salesman arranges for him to get a loan to pay off all his old debts and also cover the cost of work to be done or an item purchased.

He is then told that the new monthly payment will be less than the combination of all the previous monthly payments on the other debts.

Sometimes, a few hundred extra dollars is added to the note for the homeowner to use as he pleases.

After the deal is signed, the homeowner sometimes finds the debts are not paid off and he winds up with a large new debt plus some of his old ones.

LOSS OF HOMES LIKELY

Scores of homeowners are in danger of losing their homes over the next few years because of a clause in the contracts relating to the method of financing involved.

It is called balloon payment and works like this:

Say a note is signed which, including interest and finance charges, totals $7000 to be repaid in five years.

The payments are $50 a month. Sixty months times $50 equals $3000.

This leaves $4000 yet to be paid. The clause in the fine print says that the full note is due and payable on the same day as the final payment.

In other words, if the victim cannot come up with the extra $4000 on month number 60 he can lose his home.

PRESSURE ON LOANS

Balloon payments are an accepted part of many bank mortgage loans. Most borrowers understand how balloon payments work, though, and assume they would be in a position to refinance their notes when they fall due. In the cases involved here, the homeowners often do not understand the meaning of the balloon payment arrangement.

In some cases in which banks make loans insured by the Federal Housing Authority to customers of the home improvement firms, the homeowner is pressured into signing a certificate that the work has been completed long before the work is done. The FHA warns homeowners against signing before completion.

The reason the firms press for the signatures is that banks will release loan money to the firms only after a signed certificate is presented.

BANKS HELD NEGLIGENT

Another factor working for the home improvement firms has been the apparent failure of some banks to investigate thoroughly the firms they regularly do business with.

According to FHA regulations, this investigation should find if the home improvement firm is "reliable, financially responsible and qualified to perform satisfactorily the work to be financed."

Thus the FHA is now investigating some of the local home improvement firms, as are the postal inspectors. The post office is involved because some of the firms advertised in newspapers that travel through the mail.

In 1961, the District Commissioners drew up regulations requiring local home improvement firms to register at the District Building and, when registered, to keep their sales practices within detailed guidelines.

The regulations have a loophole, though, according to an official of the District's Department of Licenses and Inspections. The rules say that firms do not need licenses if they do not collect their money until jobs are completed—precisely what some of these firms are doing: getting money after completion certificates are signed.

Several of the firms have registered anyway, but none has been prosecuted for violating the regulations.

A WOMAN'S COSTLY BARGAIN

One homeowner who signed up for more than she bargained for is Lucy Kinard, above. Mrs. Kinard is blind, and lives with her 76-year-old mother, Mary Williams, who is partially blind, at 1103 5th st. nw. She says that she and her mother bought a portable television set for her nephew and had a gas hot water heater and a radiator installed. The total cost, she thought, was $900, so she and her mother made their marks on a contract for that amount.

Soon afterward, Mrs. Kinard says, a man called her to tell her he had bought a note and a deed of trust against their home for $7500, plus 7 per cent interest. She told the man she hadn't signed for that much and couldn't afford to pay. Then, she says, the noteholder came to the house and threatened to foreclose on the mortgage.

Unable to afford a lawyer, Mrs. Kinard, who is 56, and her mother, are now paying $50 a month on the note, in addition to

payments on a first mortgage. They have now made 15 payments on the note, but still owe $7402.34 on the principal. The note was discounted, by the way, and the noteholder's price for it was $3494.

SECOND ARTICLE IN WASHINGTON POST SERIES QUOTES COURT RECORDS

Mr. Speaker, the second article in the series by Washington Post reporters Leonard Downie, Jr., and David A. Jewell on mortgage rackets in the home improvement field appeared in yesterday's newspaper.

In addition to numerous interviews, the two writers went to the court records to find sworn statements on the methods allegedly used by home improvement salesmen in signing them up for work on their homes resulting in extremely high credit costs. This article follows:

FIRM DUPED THEM, SAY RESIDENTS

(By Leonard Downie, Jr., and David A. Jewell)

A current Washington ghetto synonym for "you've been had" is "you've been Monarched."

The genesis of the term goes back to 1963, when the Monarch Construction Company began its massive canvassing here of low- and middle-class homeowners, selling private "urban renewal": the "American Townehouse Front," other home improvements, debt consolidation, the works.

By the beginning of last year—after Monarch disbanded and its president, Nathan H. Cohen, left town—Monarch had sold contracts to hundreds of Washington homeowners and grossed $2.5 million, according to one estimate.

Cohen said yesterday he would not answer any questions about Monarch operations, whether the company was still in business, or about court suits alleging fraud.

He was reached in Baltimore where he and his mother, who was also a Monarch officer, operate the Baltimore Business School, 303 E. Fayette st., a computer training school.

In more than 25 civil suits in General Sessions and U.S. District Courts here, homeowners have charged that Monarch used high-pressure salesmanship and fraud to get their signatures on contracts and home mortgages.

Monarch's Townehouse Front usually is a combination of white aluminum siding, black aluminum shutters, new windows and door, carriage lamps and trim put on the front of a row house. It can look handsome from a distance, but some owners have complained that the work is shoddy and deteriorating.

Interviews with dozens of Monarch customers draw similar complaints: the Monarch salesman mentioned something about urban renewal and being forced to make improvements; the Townehouse Front looked so nice in the photographs; there were apparent endorsements of Monarch by Negro leaders and Congressmen; there were so much shuffling and signing of papers; finally, there was the debt—often thousands of dollars more than the price they remembered quoted or the worth of the job. Almost always, the note was secured by a deed of trust.

In a civil suit in the Court of General Sessions, Judge Catherine B. Kelly found that Monarch was guilty of using "fraudulent representation" to procure the signature of Alberta K. Smith, 778 Irving st. nw., on a home improvement contract.

Mrs. Smith testified that the Monarch salesman said he was a "representative of urban renewal," that her home "would not be torn down" if she signed the contract and that "urban renewal" would pay $2000 of its cost.

When she called the Redevelopment Land Agency the next day, she testified, she was told it had no connection with Monarch. Mrs. Smith called Monarch immediately and ordered the firm not to do any work.

Monarch sued her for the contract price of $4500. Judge Kelly in July, 1966, awarded Mrs. Smith $1525 punitive damages instead. She has not been able to collect.

Monarch might be termed the "granddaddy" of the nearly dozen firms here that have engaged in second mortgage schemes. A number of companies are under investigation by four Federal agencies and by the U.S. Attorney's office.

Usually, Monarch got the customer's signature on a mortgage to his home, too. Several homeowners complained in the court suits and interviews with reporters that they did not know they were signing mortgages, that no notary public was present, or that the amount of the debt was not the same or did not cover all the work as they had been told.

When Monarch obtained mortgage loans insured by the Federal Housing Administration through a reputable bank, the amount was usually $3500 total cost for the job plus $837 financing charges.

MAXIMUM ALLOWED

The final $4337 amount on the mortgage is the maximum allowed by the FHA under its Title I home improvement program. Usually the customer received the American Townhouse Front which, court suits show, cost Monarch about $1500.

The FHA allows 15 per cent overhead and 40 per cent profit. This would total about $2500 for a Townhouse Front. Monarch usually charged about $3500, plus interest.

Like the customers of nearly a dozen other home improvement firms investigated by reporters from The Washington Post in the past four months, the homeowners who were "Monarched" must pay or lose their homes.

At least three homeowners have lost their homes after signing Monarch contracts. At least six more are in court trying to stave off foreclosures.

Clarence and Georgia Winters, who live in a modest row house at 1102 Park st., ne., are trying to fight that inevitable fate.

Winters, 61, has worked as a skilled laborer for a Washington construction firm for 20 years. His wife, who is 54, has worked for the past seven years as a cook for Sen. Stuart Symington (D-Mo.).

GOOD CREDIT RECORD

In buying furniture, appliances and cars on time over the years, the Winterses have maintained a good credit record. During the 16 years they lived in the house on Park Street, they whittled the first trust on their home down to less than $1000. That is, until Monarch came along in December, 1964.

What happened since to the Winterses is recounted by them under oath in separate depositions filed in their suit in the U.S. District Court:

A woman had called Mrs. Winters talking about improvements to be made in her neighborhood. It was not until two men came to her house a few days later that she knew the call came from Monarch. (Monarch is believed to have called 6000 homeowners while it was in business.)

The salesmen "were so friendly and nice" and showed them photographs of other Negro homeowners, some prominent Washington Negroes and homes "improved" with an American Townhouse Front.

"They said that Roy Wilkins sent them there," Mrs. Winters attested.

One salesman "said he was going to do the whole entire front, and he was going to remove the windows and give us new windows, and build a brick wall all around the front, and a cement porch, and the aluminum siding."

The Winterses said their kitchen was what really needed work. The salesman told them that the kitchen work would be included, too, and the whole job would be $2000 cheaper than usual "by letting him write it up in December."

The Winters family says the prices quoted that night and on other nights by Monarch salesmen varied from $2500 to $4000. They said they signed one set of contracts the first night, which were taken away from them and replaced by others when the salesmen came back later.

Then, one night three months later, the salesmen came to the Winters home again and asked the couple to sign the top page of a "big pad" of documents.

In their depositions, the Winters couple states further that one of the men identified himself as Nathan Cohen and explained that the other papers were copies of the top page.

"It is just as much for your benefit as it is for mine," Mrs. Winters says Cohen told her as they sat at the dining room table. "We have to get some more copies."

When Winters asked why so many copies were necessary, a man who had accompanied Cohen told Winters to "calm down, you're getting all upset." He took Winters into another room to look at the Winters furniture. The man told him that some of it appeared to be "antiques."

Cohen placed the thick pad in front of Mrs. Winters and told her to "press hard, press real hard," according to her deposition. When Winters came back into the room, he saw his wife's signature and signed himself.

It was only later, the Winterses said, when they got a payment book from Citizens Building and Loan Association of Silver Spring, that they discovered their signatures were on a mortgage (deed of trust) on their home for $4337 and on a completion certificate for the work.

As work progressed on their home, the Winterses found several things that displeased them: cement splashed on the front door, rags and other refuse left on the front lawn, sticky windows, a loose lamp.

Winters, who worked as a carpenter's helper on his construction job, was particularly upset by "the rough job" a workman was doing in his kitchen: such as wooden panels installed upside down, with wide gaps between them.

REFUSED TO PAY

He stopped Monarch's carpenter from doing anything further on the kitchen and began calling Monarch to complain. The Winterses said they never got a satisfactory answer to their complaints and, when they received the payment book from the bank, called to say they would not pay until the job was finished right.

That was when they found the Citizens Building and Loan had already paid Monarch its $3500 out of the $4337 loan insured by the Federal Housing Authority. The bank said Monarch had presented a signed completion certificate required by the FHA.

The Winters insist they never signed a completion certificate since the work was never finished. The completion certificate the bank's attorney has introduced into the court record has no date on it, in violation of FHA regulations.

The bank has introduced into the suit the mortgage it holds to secure the Winters loan. It bears a different date than the mortgage recorded with the District Recorder of Deeds.

Complaints about Monarch first surfaced in the autumn of 1964, after it had been in business for a little more than a year.

In a story published in The Washington Post on Nov. 1, 1964, several owners of homes on unrestored fringes of Capitol Hill complained about Monarch's sales tactics. One woman had already filed suit in U.S. District Court, charging Monarch with "trickery" and "false pretenses."

The homeowners said that Monarch's telephone solicitation, sprinkled heavily with references to urban renewal and "talking to you about schedules for your property and your street," led them to believe the Government was somehow behind it.

NO MONOPOLY

Cohen told a reporter then that "we don't think the Government has a monopoly on the words." He said then: "Our program is to rehabilitate a large part of Washington over a period of ten years. If we'd remodel the insides of houses nobody'd see them, while on the outside you can see the change right away."

At the same time, the Capitol Hill Restoration Society complained about Monarch to Government agencies. Some homeowners and a former Monarch salesman went to talk with prosecutors in the U.S. Attorney's Office about Monarch in 1964.

Yet Monarch's business continued to flourish. In January and February of 1965, it took out full-page newspaper advertisements criticizing Federal urban renewal as "far more urban removal" and boasting its own "private urban renewal program" as having "created $2,149,500 in new first trust loans" and $300,000 worth of approved Title I FHA loans."

But the FHA was investigating Monarch by then and, on May 11, 1965, placed the firm on its "precautionary measures list."

Notice went out to all banks handling FHA-insured loans that FHA had information "indicating that the subject has not conducted his operations . . . consistent with the purposes and objectives of the FHA Property Improvements Program."

Banks were instructed to deal with Monarch only in cases in which bank officers personally checked the contractors' work and to have completion certificates signed in the presence of bank officers.

Monarch no longer obtained FHA insured loans. Instead, it sold some of its second mortgage notes to Allstate Mortgage Corp., now of 1111 Massachusetts ave. nw. Allstate, in turn, sold some of the mortgages to the Atlas Credit Corporation of Philadelphia (recently renamed Sunasco as a result of mergers). Atlas assigned the notes to its subsidiaries to collect payments from the Washington homeowners.

Monarch also was still able to obtain, from reputable banks, new first mortgage loans not insured by the FHA for its customers. Money from these mortgages was used to pay off the customers' old mortgages and, in some cases, also to pay Monarch for home improvements.

In many of these cases, records indicate that Monarch also obtained the customers' signatures on a new second, and sometimes a third, mortgage. Money from these also went to Monarch for home improvement contracts.

After being involved in more than 50 suits in Washington's courts—more than 25 involving charges of fraud against it—Monarch has suffered one judgment against it and lost four other times on dismissals when it failed to answer questions filed by opposing attorneys.

Monarch and the dozen other firms under investigation are a minority of the home improvement contractors who do business in the city. Most contractors are reputable businessmen who tell customers just what they are getting and how much it will cost.

NOMINEE IS MONARCH AGENT

Margaret Haywood, one of nine Washingtonians selected Thursday by President Johnson for the new City Council, has been registered agent and attorney for the Monarch Construction Co. for the past two years.

Mrs. Haywood, a Republican, said yesterday she plans to "reassess" her relationship to Monarch and her other clients in view of the nomination which is subject to confirmation by the Senate "to make sure there is no conflict of interest."

As registered agent, she is available to accept service of suits against the firm. She represents Monarch in court, as well, but performs no other functions of the concern, she said. The lawyer-client relationship precluded her commenting on the reports in The Washington Post about Monarch's activities, she said.

Her total earnings from Monarch last year were less than $2000, she said.

BILL EYED TO PROTECT UNWARY HOMEOWNER

A ranking Republican House member yesterday said he will seek legislation to prevent recurrence of "the despicable conduct" of home improvement and finance companies who have obtained millions of dollars from low-income homeowners in the Washington area.

Rep. William B. Widnall of New Jersey, referring to the series on home improvement schemes presently running in The Washington Post, said he was "shocked to learn that allegedly reputable firms have made millions by taking advantage of the unwary and uneducated."

Widnall said he was calling for an immediate investigation of the entire industry and its method of doing business. Widnall is the ranking Republican member of the House Banking and Currency Committee and also of the special House subcommittee on Housing.

"At the same time," Widnall said in a statement issued by his office, "the Congress should investigate the matter to determine what remedial legislation is needed to prevent such despicable conduct from recurring."

Rep. Charles McC. Mathias Jr. (R-Md.) said the revelations "have far more than local significance. They are part of the national picture of the deliberate attempt of widely organized forces to single out the urban poor as targets."

Mathias said the newspaper series pointed up the need for an increased force of Federal lawyers and enforcement officers to press the campaign against exploitation of the urban poor.

TODAY'S WASHINGTON POST ARTICLE REPORTS HOW SALES CONTRACTS TURNED INTO MORTGAGES

Mr. Speaker, this morning, the Washington Post carried the third article in the series on home improvement frauds written by Leonard Downie, Jr., and David A. Jewell. It tells about homeowners interviewed by the reporters who had no knowledge, until the reporters informed them, that there were second mortgages on their homes as a result of their signing contracts for home improvement work.

The material in this series of articles is incredible, but those of us who have been investigating these rackets over the years are certainly not surprised by any of the revelations. I am convinced that these articles will provide tremendous momentum for the kind of truth-in-lending legislation for which former Senator Douglas, of Illinois, worked so hard and so long, and which Senator PROXMIRE, of Wisconsin, has sponsored in the Senate—including coverage of first mortgages. The Senate-passed bill, however, does not include first mortgages.

After reading these articles, I do not see how any Member of the House could oppose inclusion of all mortgages under the coverage of this legislation, as H.R. 11601 would do.

The article in this morning's Washington Post follows:

SUITS HIT MORTGAGE PRACTICES—MISLED ON LOAN TERMS, CLAIM HOMEOWNERS

(By Leonard Downie Jr. and David A. Jewell)

Custom House Construction Co. went into the business of home improvement construction on March 3, 1966, in an office at 7849 Eastern ave., Silver Spring.

Almost six months to the day later, Custom House went out of business, according to its president, Harvey W. Davis.

Records in the D.C. recorder of deeds office show 55 second mortgages worth $250,000 made out to Custom House.

In the past four months, a team of reporters from The Washington Post interviewed 23 Custom House customers.

All are low-income Negroes, elderly and often widowed, and in each case the price of the job done or products received (such as a paint job or a color television set) was secured by a mortgage on their homes.

DIDN'T KNOW OF MORTGAGE

Four Custom House customers said they had no idea there was a second mortgage on their homes until they were told so by reporters. The other 19 said they first learned of the mortgages from United States postal inspectors, who are investigating Custom House.

At least one customer, Chester Thompson, has lost his home through foreclosure on the second mortgage. Six others—faced with foreclosure—filed court suits charging that their signatures on the mortgages were secured through fraud.

A pattern appeared in the complaints:

The customers were contacted by Custom House, not vice versa.

The customers said they signed what they thought was a contract but later turned out to be a note and mortgage.

The customers said there was no notary public present when they signed the "papers" although the mortgages on their homes bore notarization seals.

All said they received payment books in the mail from companies they had never heard of demanding payment of notes they didn't know they had signed.

The 23 additional Custom House customers interviewed by reporters said the same points apply in their cases.

Custom House is one of nearly a dozen home-improvement firms under investigation by Federal authorities for their second mortgage dealings in Washington. The U.S. attorney's office expects grand jury action within two weeks.

The vast majority of home-improvement firms in Washington enjoy good reputations.

PRICE ABOVE APPRAISALS

Sources said that one professional appraiser who dealt with Custom House said that when he had done appraisals for Custom House the firm automatically increased its prices well above the appraisals.

Suits in court indicate that Custom House would then quote prices to the customers but give them contracts to sign, the face values of which would be double the quoted prices.

In two court suits, customers have claimed notes and mortgages were filed against their home for at least double the amounts quoted on the jobs by the Custom House salesman.

The contract in one case tells the story:

One customer had the front of his house painted "for the total sum of $2350." The contract says that the customer agrees "to pay the sum of $2350 upon completion, secured by a note of $5875 plus 8 per cent interest in monthly installments of $58.75."

When reporters asked the customer, an elderly man who cannot work because he is being treated for cancer, why he agreed to pay $5875 for the work that cost "the total sum of $2350," the homeowner replied:

"I thought just the monthly payment was $58.75."

USED TELEPHONE SALESGIRLS

Custom House employed a battery of girl telephone solicitors. One of the girls told an investigator about the sales talk:

The girls were given phone numbers of houses in low-income Negro areas selected from a cross-index file.

They were told to hang up if they judged a white person had answered.

Otherwise, they were to find out within 60 seconds if the resident of the house owned or was buying the house.

If it was discovered the resident was only renting, they were under orders to terminate the conversation and make another call.

Otherwise, they would try to interest homeowners in anything from a television set to a new roof. If the prospects seemed good, they would then turn the files over to salesmen.

One of Custom House's first jobs was on the home of Albert and Mattie Smalls, at 401 11th st. se.

SMALLS FILE SUIT

After being threatened with foreclosure, the Smalls filed suit againt Custom House charging "willful, deliberate and malicious fraud."

The Smalls' suit says the salesman told them he could fix up the front of their house for $800.

They thought that would be nice, but lamented that they already had debts of $4900 and didn't feel they could afford it.

The salesman then said he could arrange to get them a loan that would permit them to pay off the $4900 as well as cover the cost of fixing up the house front, according to the suit.

They agreed to this, and signed papers they thought were contracts and loan application forms.

The job was done. They learned later, however, that only $575 worth of outstanding debts were paid off, leaving them with $4397 in old debts plus a mortgage on their home for $5000 that they didn't know they signed, the suit says.

The couple paid $1000 on this note until they contacted attorney John J. Carmody, Jr., who filed suit. On July 24, 1967, U.S. District Court Judge Joseph C. Waddy issued a temporary restraining order against the present holder of the Smalls' note, prohibiting the holder from making any further collections until the court case is decided.

ACCEPTANCE CORP. NAMED

The Smalls' suit also named as defendant a company called Universal Acceptance Corp., located at 6400 Georgia ave. nw.

According to official D.C. records, a founder, a director and president of Custom House is Harvey W. Davis of 8313 Raymond st., Potomac.

According to these same records, Harvey W. Davis is also secretary, treasurer and a director of Universal Acceptance, with an address at that time of 8804 Lanier dr., Silver Spring.

Davis told a reporter: "I really can't answer your questions I really don't know much about that. I took in a partner who knew the home-improvement business. He did the selling and I did the bookkeeping. I never knew any contracts were fraudulent."

All notes and mortgages generated by Custom House were sold immediately, sometimes within hours, to second parties, known legally as "holders in due course."

The Smalls' case was no exception. Their note was sold to Universal Acceptance. Much of the paper generated by Custom House went to Universal.

The Smalls' suit contains the following allegation:

"Davis conspired with both Custom House and Universal to hatch a scheme whereby Custom House would fraudulently obtain a promissory note, reinforce its right to enforce the terms of the note by fraudulently obtaining a deed of trust (mortgage) against the property, fail to perform the consideration for said note, sell the note to Universal at a fraudulent discount rate, allow Custom House to lapse into insolvency thereby defrauding potential creditors and hide the whole behind the sham shield of the 'holder in due course' defense of Universal."

NOTE DISCOUNT CLAIMED

The suit also alleges that Universal bought the Smalls' $5500 note from Custom House for $2200—at a discount of 60 percent.

Many Custom House notes were sold at discounts ranging from 40 to 60 per cent.

The U.S. Court of Appeals here has characterized discounts of 40 per cent or more as "outrageous" and stated that such discounts, if there are also circumstances such as the purchase of notes executed by unknown persons whose credit has not been investigated, constitute a "badge of fraud."

An answer to this suit was filed on behalf of Universal by Bernard T. Levin, a local attorney. The answer denied all allegations of fraud and maintained that Universal had purchased the note in the ordinary course of business.

In its answer, Universal argued that it was merely a "holder in due course," and it also filed a counterclaim against the Smalls for $5119.55 not yet paid on the note, plus attorney's fee.

Custom House Construction Co. has not yet answered the allegations contained in the Smalls' suit.

The signature of the notary public who swore she witnessed the Smalls' signatures' on the $550 mortgage on their home was Louise Beane.

In January of this year, Louise Beane, a licensed notary public in Maryland, was indicted and charged with the false notarization of two mortgages in Washington.

NOTARY PLEADED GUILTY

Mrs. Beane pleaded guilty and received a suspended sentence in U.S. District Court here.

Those two mortgages had been generated by Custom House. Mrs. Beane notarized a total of 27 mortgages generated by Custom House.

In six court suits, homeowners have claimed that they did not know they signed mortgages, that no notary public was present when they signed papers and that they had never seen anyone named Louise Beane, either in their homes or in Maryland. Numerous other homeowners made similar claims to reporters.

Seven Custom House notes were purchased by a District realtor named Leonard Freedman, of 761 17th st. nw., for what investigators say were 40 per cent or greater. Freedman denies the discounts were that large.

One of those mortgages was on the home of an elderly widow, Alberta Kibler, of 1737 D st. se.

After her home was threatened with foreclosure, she filed suit against Custom House and Freedman, charging that her mortgage was secured by fraud through a conspiracy between Custom House and Mrs. Beane.

Her suit alleges that Custom House's dealings with her were "part of a conspiracy in which Louise Beane similarly made many false notarizations for Custom House."

It says that she was quoted a price of $2750 for a new kitchen and discovered a mortgage against her home she didn't know she had signed for $5550.

FIRM DENIES FRAUD

Custom House answered this suit with a denial of fraud and conspiracy and denied that Mrs. Beane was an agent of Custom House.

Freedman answered by saying he was without sufficient knowledge to admit or deny the charges since he was merely a "holder in due course" and he denied any conspiracy existed. He said yesterday that "all I can do is check the District records to see that it's a legitimate mortgage. I dealt with Custom House the same way I dealt with everybody else."

One Custom House customer, Amanda Green, 56, of 829 Sheridan st., nw., bought four air conditioners for what she thought was "a little over $2000" and later learned there was a mortgage on her home for $5800, plus 7 per cent interest.

Her paper was purchased from Custom House by Freedman. He showed her a note bearing her signature that called for payments of $33.50 a month for 60 months.

At this rate Mrs. Green could not have paid off the interest due on the note by the end of the 60 months, much less the principal.

Since by the 60th month she would have only paid $2,010, much of it having gone to pay off interest, Mrs. Green stood to lose her home unless she could pay the balance or obtain a new loan for it.

If she refinanced the note for the same schedule of monthly payments, she would not have been able to pay off the principal due in her lifetime, Federal investigators say.

Mrs. Green hired an attorney before making any payments. He hired an appraiser who valued the air conditioners at $974. U.S. postal inspectors had them appraised for $971.

Mrs. Green's attorney reached an agreement with Freedman whereby he wiped off the mortgage on her home in return for a payment of $1,000.

LABORER SUES

Frank Harris, of 124 10th st. ne., an illiterate, elderly laborer has filed suit saying he was tricked into signing a $7,450 mortgage on his home and received only $500 worth of work in return.

His suit claims he signed certain papers because Jack Shulman, Davis's partner and the salesman in this and many Custom House transactions, promised him that Custom House would pay off two previous mortgages on his home.

On the original two mortgages, he was paying a total of $100 a month, Harris said, in the suit. He also said that he had to pay $80 a month on the new mortgage held by Custom House, plus the same old $100 he had been paying.

He earns $65 a week.

Shulman, of 5300 Westbard Ave., Bethesda, and Custom House answered the suit and denied any fraud or wrongdoing.

MENTIONED IN SUITS

Shulman is mentioned in most of the Custom House suits as the salesman involved and by most of the customers contacted by reporters.

Shulman told a reporter that none of the mortgages signed up by him were obtained by fraud.

"You will find they were all legitimately said," said Shulman.

Shulman said that in each instance he was accompanied by a notary public, including those in which Louise Beane's signature appears on the mortgage.

The activities of Custom House, and several other home-improvement contractors, are being looked into by Federal authorities. Most home-improvement contractors are reputable businessmen who tell customers what they are getting and how much it will cost.

Five Custom House mortgages ended up in the hands of Atlas Credit Corp. of Philadelphia, which has been renamed Sunasco, Inc., following a merger. Atlas is now also under investigation by Federal authorities.

Atlas buys second mortgage paper from

firms in 40 states and two Canadian provinces.

PAINT JOB

Custom House painted the front of a Northwest rowhouse. As a result of signing a contract "to pay the sum of $2350" to Custom House for the work, the homeowner now has a $5875 mortgage on his home. And, if he continues to pay the $58.75 monthly payment set up by Custom House, several thousand dollars will still be due on the note when it matures in 1971. If he cannot pay the balance, or get a new loan for it, he stands to lose his home.

BAD NEWS FOR AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, on the weekend of September 9 and 10, 1967, more than 2,000 persons, including Communists, Socialists, and black power advocates, gathered in New York City for what was called the third annual conference of Socialist scholars.

Few Americans are aware of the frightening things that transpired during the weekend meetings, and for the simple reason that the conference was ignored by the Nation's major news media.

The only report I have seen on the conference was written by Alice Widener, the publisher of U.S.A. and a nationally syndicated columnist. Her report ought to be read by every American.

She tells of the plans which were made for a "military struggle" in the streets of 20 American cities next year and of the discussion about "defense courses" to train "serious activists" for future guerrilla warfare in our urban communities.

One of the more incredible facets of the conference was the fact that some speakers gloated that many of those who plan to organize the "military struggle" in 1968, including the burning of some 20 cities, are receiving money from the Johnson administration's so-called war on poverty.

Why would this important conference not only receive the attention of the national press, radio, and television? Perhaps Alice Widener has the best answer to that question when she says in her report:

> The news, it seems, is based on what happens, not on what is being planned. But when what is being planned happens, it will be very bad news for America.

The full report by Alice Widener appears in the September 8–22 issue of U.S.A. Extensive excerpts from it appear in "Barron's Weekly" for September 25, which I commend to the attention of my colleagues:

LONELY WEEKEND—A REPORT ON THE THIRD CONFERENCE OF SOCIALIST SCHOLARS

The Third Annual Conference of Socialist Scholars took place at the New York Hilton Hotel, Rockefeller Center, Manhattan, during the weekend of September 9 and 10. There were more than two thousand registrants, including Communists as well as Socialists; two guests from the Soviet Union, Timor Timofeev and Yuri Zamoshkin, Institute of World Labor, Moscow; and a guest of honor Owen Lattimore, the University, Leeds, England.

In 1952, the U.S. Senate Security Subcommittee reported unanimously, after conducting an exhaustive inquiry into the activities of the Institute for Pacific Relations, that Dr. Lattimore, a leading figure in the IPR, had been "a conscious articulate instrument of the Soviet conspiracy."

The official printed program of the Socialist Scholars carries ads from the Communist publication, Science and Society, the Communist publishing firm "International Publishers," and the American Institute for Marxist Studies, of which Herbert Aptheker of the Communist Party, U.S.A., is director.

The program flyleaf states: ". . . Formed in 1965, the Socialist Scholars Conference is an independent association bringing together scholars from many disciplines to stimulate research, analysis and theory. A Steering Committee elected by the members invites scholars to present papers and comments on the basis of known competence in a particular area and not according to political or ideological criteria.

"The Conference is not a political organization; meetings are intended for expression of ideas unencumbered by partisan purposes, political rhetoric or polemic. As a scholarly association, it is not a forum at which political organizations may propound their views, nor is its purpose to organize or guide political activities.

"All those sharing an interest in scholarly analysis from a socialist perspective are invited to join the Conference."

On its face, the Socialist Scholar's program statement is self-contradictory and deceptive. A socialist perspective is per se political and ideological. Moreover, not a single paper written from a capitalist perspective has been presented at any panel discussion in the first, second or third Socialist Scholars Conferences.

At the New York Hilton, Socialist Scholars from more than two dozen U.S. and Canadian institutions of higher learning took part in the weekend Conference, including McGill, Alberta, Temple, Yale and Boston universities; Queens, St. Mary's and Bennington colleges; St. Thomas Seminary; the universities of Illinois, Michigan, California, Pennsylvania and others. The Conference program included the following topics for panel discussions: Marxism and International Economic Relations; Mass Media and Radical Critics; Marxism and Sociology; Radical Intellectuals in the 1930s; Class, Party and Revolution; Poverty in America; Soviet Society; Planners for the Ruling Class; Black Power; Marx and the Industrial Proletariat; Anthropological Studies of Peasants; Historical Studies of the Cold War; the Working Class in the World Arena; Radicals and Hippies; Catholicism and Socialism; the Welfare State.

A very large audience attended the Saturday afternoon discussion on "Poverty in America," which featured Michael Harrington, board chairman of the socialist League for Industrial Democracy and author of "The Other America," the book that is conceded generally to have inspired the government's Poverty Program. Discussion panel chairman Russ Nixon alluded to the fact in introducing Mr. Harrington, but both gentlemen were quick to let the assembly know of their thorough contempt for the Poverty Program as totally inadequate for what they conceive to be nation's needs.

Eloquently, Michael Harrington argued that "the poor" alone cannot make a successful revolution in the U.S. Evidently bearing in mind results of the National Conference for New Politics' (NCNP) convention in Chicago, which was controlled by a minority of Communists and Black Power militants, he pleaded passionately for the democratic socialist reformist way of changing our society.

His was the classic "soft socialism." He was a Menshevik, a revolutionary who believes in legal means, among an audience that was most Bolshevik, revolutionaries who believe in attaining their goal "by any means." At the end of the discussion, however, Michael Harrington evidently changed his mind, after fellow panelists Hyman Lumer, national education secretary of the Communist Party, U.S.A., and Stanley Aronowitz, chairman of the West Side Committee for Independent Political Action (CIPA) in Manhattan, had argued for radicalism rather than reformism in the path toward U.S. revolution.

"Okay," Harrington conceded finally, "If you think it will work, I'm all for it."

Though most of the audience was much more responsive to Lumer and Aronowitz, it was hard to understand what prompted Harrington to surrender. He is a witty, articulate, dynamic speaker. Hyman Lumer offered only a deadly dull standard Communist dialectical commentary in a thickly monotonous voice. Aronowitz was humorless, fanatical and polemical (despite the Socialist Scholars' disavowal of "political rhetoric or polemic").

Tearing into Harrington's paper, Mr. Aronowitz identified himself with "a revolutionary action group," and said only such a group could attain socialist objectives in America. Whereas Harrington had discoursed on "the need for racial entrance into American society of the industrial working class," and had insisted that "welfare recipients are a class and have a relation to authority," Aronowitz called for destruction of existing authority. "Racism is based on the profit system," he declared.

The police, claimed Aronowitz, are the arm of the ruling class in the ghettos. "They are the oppressors," he said, adding that Negroes in urban areas, South and North, have self-defense communities of their own. Violently, Aronowitz attacked the entire Poverty Program except for a single aspect which he described as "a valuable tool" for the radical movement. "At least," he said, "it has given employment to the organizers."

The audience burst into laughter, applause and cheers. "That's right, man," called out someone from the floor. "It gave our organizers some bread." In Leftist slang, bread means money.

Certainly there seems to be no shortage of bread in either the Old or New Left. Not only the leaders but also the rank and file travel from coast to coast and city to city with the greatest of ease. Over Labor Day weekend, they were assembled in such posh capitalist surroundings as the Wabash, Crystal and Scarlet room of the Palmer House in Chicago; a week later, hundreds of the same people were in the Gramercy and Murray Hill suites of the New York Hilton, and in its Sutton Ballroom, where a capacity crowd of fashionably dressed Socialist Scholars and friends dined by candlelight at $12.50 a head and then sat back, full of food and in a relaxed spirit of camaraderie, to listen to Dr. Owen Lattimore.

Nothing could be more understandable than the intellectual spell that Owen Lattimore seems to have cast over U.S. foreign policy makers during the crucial years between 1941 and the fall of China to the Communists. The mild-mannered, smiling way in which he says the ugliest things about our country must be very disarming to all those intellectuals who believe that it isn't what is said that counts, but the way it is said.

Dr. Lattimore is a past master at making offensive statements inoffensively. He is an artist in knowing what to highlight and what to obscure during an alleged historical analysis. He is civilized, cultivated, cultured and urbane. He looks like a bank president, not a professor. Above all, he is very, very clever.

Listening to Owen Lattimore in the Sutton Ballroom of the New York Hilton, one could grasp the full significance of what the U.S. Senate Internal Security Subcommittee had in mind when it reported to the Amer-

ican people, 15 years ago, that he was one of the persons active in and around the Institute of Pacific Relations who "knowingly and deliberately used the language of books and articles which they wrote or edited in an attempt to influence the American public by means of pro-Communist or pro-Soviet content of such writings."

Dr. Lattimore's main thesis at the Socialist Scholars dinner was that it is the U.S., not the Soviet Union or Red China, which is "expansionist." The borders of the Soviet Union and of Red China are merely their historic ones, he alleged, dating back to the great eras of the czars and Chinese imperial dynasties. He never mentioned Czechoslovakia, East Germany or Tibet as being subject to Red expansionism, but he identified as subjects of present day U.S. expansionism, "Guam and Japan and the Philippines." He accused the U.S. of seeking to make Asia "the privileged reserve of white men." He derided the intellectual ability of American scholars and foreign policy molders, and he lauded "the great Lenin's mature, sophisticated understanding of world politics."

Lattimore described the Chinese Communist Party as "nationalistically patriotic." He also belittled the notion that the present civil chaos in Red China and dissension among Communist leaders signify a breakdown there. He said that what is taking place is "turbulent debate—not the precursor of general massacre."

All notions that there will be a Sino-Soviet conflict over border regions between the Soviet Union and People's Republic of China are sheer nonsense, according to Dr. Lattimore. He said the present frontiers of both Communist nations "are of an enviable stability." He said neither nation seeks expansion. "Expansionism," he said, "is in the areas where American forces are."

After his speech, the audience of Socialist Scholars was invited to ask questions. Someone inquired when the Chinese are going to take Hong Kong from the British imperialists.

Dr. Lattimore beamed with delight at the question. A most apt historical analogy, he said, could be found in a true story about Lawrence of Arabia. When Lawrence was defending the Arabs against the Turks, he would bomb the Turkish railroad across the desert in intermittent attacks, a strike here, a strike there.

A subordinate asked, "Why don't you blow the whole bloody thing all at once and get it over with?"

"Ah," replied Lawrence, "I want them to suffer a permanent hemorrhage."

Dr. Lattimore paused and looked all around the Sutton Ballroom, beaming at the Socialist Scholars and the dinner guests. "A permanent hemorrhage," he repeated, with utmost satisfaction, smiling benignly as if he were a minister pronouncing the benediction.

Those were just about his last public words to the Socialist Scholars at their Third Annual Conference. They found them inspiring. Their applause was rapturous. Dr. Corliss Lamont of Columbia University, seated next to Yuri Zamoshkin of the Soviet Union, looked pleased as Punch.

While comfortable, complacent capitalist Americans went to church or played golf or lolled around at home reading the papers or watching television, Sunday morning, September 10, a Black Power panel session at the Third Annual Conference of Socialist Scholars was talking about burning down 20 American cities next year and waging "a military struggle in the streets."

The session took place in the Rhinelander Gallery, which seats 1,000 and was filled to overflowing. Chairman of the panel session was James Boggs of Detroit; the panelists were Raymond S. Franklin of Queens College, who delivered a paper on "The Political Economy of Black Power"; Ivanhoe Donaldson, campaign manager for Julian Bond in Georgia and a member of the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee (Snick); and Gilbert Osofky of the University of Illinois, Chicago.

James Boggs declared, "Black Power is a scientific concept whose time has come." He described it as "clashing with every segment of society," and said it must "bring the struggle to the streets." Black Power forces, he continued, will force existing authority in America to "increase militia and police" beyond its capacity by bringing the struggle "not to a few cities" but to 20 next year. He said there will be "military battles" in these cities. Addressing himself directly to the Socialist Scholars, Boggs said, "There is no in-between. You are either with the revolution or you are not. The U.S. as a nation is a counterrevolution."

James Boggs said the Black Power revolution is talking "a language the American people don't understand and say they won't understand, but that they've got to be made to understand." He said, "All revolutions start with a minority, from Haiti on down. I don't think over 3% of the Russians were ready for the revolution."

Ivanhoe Donaldson of Snick, who was a member of the steering committee for the National Conference for New Politics' recent Labor Day convention in Chicago, declared from the Socialist Scholars Conference dais: "The struggle of the Sixties isn't the ballot or having jobs—it is a physical struggle." He said about the present social and governmental structure in the U.S., "Our position is—tear it down because we don't want to be part of it!" Donaldson said, "In Detroit we defeated the police and the National Guard." He said Newark and Detroit put a strain on existing police and military forces, and that next year "two or three Detroits at the same time are going to pin down the American forces."

Donaldson said that in the struggle in 10 or 20 cities next year, the revolutionary forces would not be confined to burning down the black areas, that the forces would "go downtown" and "begin to burn down the white ghetto banks and ghetto draft centers." He said, "There's a Chase Manhattan Bank at 125th Street in this town. We're trying to get jobs in a bank we ought to destroy."

During the question period from the floor, Boggs and Donaldson explained why urban areas in the U.S. are more favorable to the success of guerrilla warfare than the countryside, unlike Cuba and elsewhere. They explained in coldly calculated terms that from the strategic point of view, guerrilla warfare is much more likely to be successful in the cities, where a combination of "violence, sabotage and traffic tie-ups can bring down the system."

From the floor, a questioner asked Ivanhoe Donaldson, "When do we start a guerrilla war?"

James Boggs grabbed the microphone and said, "If he started to answer that, I'd shut his mouth!"

That was the end of the Sunday morning meeting, which began at 10 o'clock and lasted for more than two and a half hours. As soon as Boggs had officially adjourned the meeting, he announced over the microphone that another Black Power meeting would take place immediately in the Morgan Room, "to plan how to do things now and next year."

A gray-haired woman in a brown dress said, "Did you say we're meeting in the Morgan Room?" "Morgan Room is right," he answered. "But not 'we.' Our meeting is for blacks only."

A tall, professorial-looking man stepped up and asked him something. "Sorry," Boggs said. "I'm catching a plane at four o'clock. I've been to Cleveland and Columbus. They put us down in Cleveland last time. But I'm riding out to the airport with someone who's going to tell me how we can fix it so they won't be able to next time."

In America, in 1967, after Watts and Cleveland, after Chicago and Rochester, after Newark and Detroit, most people still believe a Red-Black Power revolution can't happen here.

"Are you sure that's the way it was?" ask some readers of this reporter's newspaper columns and magazine articles. "I don't mean to question your accuracy or integrity, but are you sure? I mean, was there any kind of printed program or something you could send me a copy of?"

At the Sunday morning meeting of the Socialist Scholars Conference at the New York Hilton, there was distribution to the more than one thousand persons present a single-page, orange-colored leaflet with the following text:

"Please inform your members—some may want to take advantage of this. Then post.

"Demonstration defense course

"Techniques in crowd control and demonstration defense against:

"*Individual *group *horse and *police attacks!!*

"1st Session: 13 Classes—7 weeks + $7.00 (Applicants must be approved by instructor.)

"This course is being provided for serious activists who wish to develop and participate in coordinate defense techniques for future street actions.

"Class will be led by a former U.S. Marine 'D.I.' having training and experience in these areas."

The full class schedule is printed, with the date and time of a series of 14 sessions during September and October 1967. Among the subjects taught are: "Coordinated Movements; Tactics; Hand and Foot Techniques; Crowd Control; Defense Against Clubs and Horses; Inter-Group Actions."

In the Lower Plaza at Rockefeller Center on Sunday evening, crowds of law-abiding, contented Americans watched the fountain water splash and listened to the sound of music. The traffic flowed smoothly.

High up in skyscraper offices of CBS, NBC and ABC, and in upper floors of the Time-Life Building, lights were on as editors, cameramen, writers and researchers busily worked on regular weekend schedules to accomplish the communications media objective of bringing the up-to-the-minute news to America.

On Monday morning, September 11, there were no reports in the press or on television or radio about the Red-Black Power session that took place Sunday morning at the Third Annual Conference of Socialist Scholars in the New York Hilton. For all Americans knew, the weekend had been relatively uneventful, except for street demonstrations in Milwaukee and the Brownsville section of Brooklyn.

There was not a word in the press or over the air about plans for "a military struggle in the streets" of 20 American cities next year. Nor was there a word about demonstration "defense" courses to train "serious activists" for future guerrilla warfare in our urban communities.

The news, it seems, is based on what happens, not on what is being planned. But when what is being planned happens, it will be very bad news for America.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE CARL HAYDEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, today is the 90th anniversary of the birth of Arizona's beloved senior Senator, the

honorable CARL HAYDEN. I have taken this time to wish him a very happy birthday, and many happy returns of the day. I know my colleagues in the House, in which CARL HAYDEN served for 15 years, join me in extending felicitations to our distinguished friend and colleague, Senator CARL HAYDEN.

Senator HAYDEN was born at a place then known as Hayden's Ferry. This place has grown into the thriving and important city of Tempe, Ariz. He was educated in the public schools of Tempe, attended the Normal School of Arizona, which is now Arizona State University, and later attended Stanford University, being a member of the class of 1900.

CARL HAYDEN was elected treasurer of Maricopa County in 1904, and sheriff in 1906 and again in 1908. He held the position of sheriff of Maricopa County when Arizona became a State. In fact, he left that office to come to Congress as the first Representative of the fledgling State of Arizona. Senator HAYDEN told me that the hardest adjustment he made in coming to Washington was getting used to the absence of the weight of his six-shooter, and the feel of it against his thigh.

CARL HAYDEN married Nan Downing on February 14, 1908. Never were two people better suited for each other, or better equipped emotionally and intellectually for the great career which they shared. Mrs. Hayden was beloved by all who knew her, and the high regard the people of Arizona had for her manifested itself many times during her long illness which ended in her death on June 25, 1961.

In 1926 CARL HAYDEN was elected to the U.S. Senate. He is now serving his seventh term as a Member of that body. He has served longer in the Congress of the United States than has any man in the history of the Republic. He now serves as President pro tempore of the Senate, and as chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee.

CARL HAYDEN'S legislative activities have covered a very broad scope. Perhaps his greatest accomplishments have occurred in the legislation with regard to Federal aid to highways and for the development of the water resources of the West.

CARL HAYDEN has always been an ardent champion of reclamation. His efforts have been decisive in authorizations and appropriations to build many reclamation projects. Among these are the upper Colorado storage project, the Fryingpan-Arkansas project, the Bonneville project, and the great central valley project of California. Federal funds in excess of $4 billion have been invested in the central valley project alone, largely through the efforts of CARL HAYDEN.

Ever since he came to Congress, CARL HAYDEN'S fondest dream has been the construction of a Federal project to bring water from the Colorado River into central Arizona. He was active in the fight within the State of Arizona which finally culminated in the ratification of the Sante Fe Compact in 1942. This compact purported to divide the waters of the Colorado River, and its ratification was a necessary prerequisite to any Federal effort aimed at helping Arizona to use its water. Immediately after ratification CARL HAYDEN went to work on getting a project in shape for authorization. The central Arizona project was the subject of legislation in 1948 and again in 1950. In both of these years the bill to authorize this project passed the Senate, but died in the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

In 1952 Arizona filed suit against California to quiet title to its share of Colorado River water. This suit became necessary because of the doubts in the minds of Members of Congress as to whether or not Arizona really had a legal title to the water. The suit finally culminated in a decree of the Supreme Court of the United States handed down in June of 1963 which gave title to the State of Arizona to 2.8 million acre-feet of water each year from the mainstream of the Colorado River.

Almost the next day, Senator HAYDEN and the rest of the Arizona delegation introduced bills to authorize a central Arizona project. Hearings were held in the Senate that year, but no further action was taken until 1965, when exhaustive hearings where held in the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The effort in the House culminated in the approval of H.R. 4761 by the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee in late 1966. The chairman of the Interior Committee did not see fit to ask for a rule to bring the bill up in the 89th Congress, and therefore it became necessary for the whole procedure to begin again in the 90th Congress.

In this Congress, Senators HAYDEN and FANNIN introduced their bills early, and action came on the Senate side of the Capitol which culminated in the passage of S. 1004, again authorizing the central Arizona project. Concurrently, hearings had been held by the House Interior Committee, but once again that committee has adjourned for the year without doing anything whatsoever about voting out a central Arizona bill. For reasons which he apparently deems to be good and sufficient, Chairman ASPINALL has once again decided that Arizona shall have no water from the Colorado River.

This week, Senator CARL HAYDEN will begin one of the great battles of his career. He has decided to try to put his S. 1004, authorizing the central Arizona project, on to the public works appropriation bill for fiscal year 1968. Such an amendment can be accomplished in the Senate by two-thirds vote. When the House and the Senate go into conference on the public works appropriation bill, House conferees cannot accept Senator HAYDEN'S amendment, assuming he has been successful in attaching it to this bill. The rules of the House provide that any material in a bill which is not germane to the bill itself must be brought back to the House in technical disagreements. This will be done by the House conferees. Then a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment will be made. After 1 hour's debate, this amendment will be voted either up or down.

This procedure is unusual, but not without precedent. The Colorado-Big Thompson project was authorized in an appropriation bill. There have been other instances in which legislation has been put on appropriation bills, and the House has concurred in such legislation.

Senator CARL HAYDEN and the entire Arizona delegation have always favored legislating by orderly means. However, when a State and a civilization are drying up, and when committees of the Senate and House have held exhaustive hearings on a project and, when both committees have from time to time reported out bills favoring the project, it seems that emergency action to nullify the blocking action of one man is reasonable. We ask for the support of our colleagues in this effort, which we take more in sorrow than in anger.

I have taken this occasion of Senator CARL HAYDEN'S birthday to inform the House as to his plans and the plans of the Arizona delegation. You will be receiving further details on this undertaking, and the reasons for it as time goes by.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to no one in my admiration and respect for the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. He is one of the noblest, grandest, and most effective persons it has been my experience to meet in my political life. Since 1939 when I became a member of the Appropriations Committee, it has been my responsibility to work with him on numerous occasions. Since I have become chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, my work has thrown me more and more frequently in contact with this great personality of the Senate, CARL HAYDEN, the distinguished chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee. No one could be finer to work with.

I am grateful to the gentleman now addressing the House for calling attention to this memorable event. I join him and others on both sides of the aisle in paying tribute to the life and record of this great statesman from Arizona who has done so much for America.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Arizona [Mr. UDALL].

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, few Americans ever stay around long enough to celebrate their 90th birthday, and no American has ever been around on his 90th birthday or any other birthday to complete 55 years of service in the Congress of the United States.

Yet today CARL HAYDEN celebrates his 90th birthday, and he celebrates 55 years of outstanding service to this country and to the Congress of the United States.

In Arizona, CARL HAYDEN is more than just a man. He is an "Arizona institution." We have to stop and really pause to grasp the fantastic span of his years of service. This man has served 15 years in the House of Representatives and 40 years in the U.S. Senate. He was born as the transition was being made from the

administration of Ulysses Grant to that of Rutherford B. Hayes. He has lived under 18 Presidents and served in the Congress with 10.

I can best put in my own perspective the length of this congressional service when I stop and contemplate that he was serving here in this House 10 years before I was born.

CARL HAYDEN, Mr. Speaker, is a quiet man, but one of the most effective Members the Congress has ever seen. He has often said that Congressmen are divided into workhorses and show horses, and that he decided a long time ago to be a workhorse. He speaks infrequently. I have heard him say many times that he never heard of a Member who was beaten in an election by a speech he never made, and I have heard him say many times, "What is the use of making a lot of speeches when you have the votes?"

So CARL HAYDEN operates and has operated in quiet, honorable and effective fashion throughout these years.

Mr. Speaker, this House may soon have an opportunity to demonstrate to Senator HAYDEN the good faith of the people of the United States and the Congress in keeping a promise long delayed and long withheld.

As my colleagues know, Senator HAYDEN has practically made a career of trying to pass the central Arizona project, a reclamation undertaking which would enable Arizona to utilize its legal share of the waters of the Colorado River. After many years of effort and passage twice by the Senate this project was delayed in 1951 with a demand in the House that Arizona go to the Supreme Court to prove its right to certain waters of the Colorado. For 12 years Arizona fought that case, and in 1963 Arizona won. But the project still eludes us, and to Senator HAYDEN this is a bitter pill.

Before Arizona set out on its long, expensive, and harrowing legal suit it had assurances from its neighbors that, once the court had ruled, obstructionism would end. Three years before that painful decision was made to go to court, Governor Earl Warren of California had said:

> Whenever it is finally determined which waters belong to Arizona, it should be permitted to use that water in any manner or by any method considered best by Arizona.

And similar assurances came from the other Western States for whom Senator HAYDEN had fought many a reclamation battle. Yet today two of those Western States which Senator HAYDEN has helped are exerting every possible pressure to prevent passage of that project for which Arizona has waited so long. And they are doing it for the same reason they opposed the project before that legal battle was fought. The reason is simple: they want to continue to use Arizona's share of the water.

Mr. Speaker, for an octogenerian, now turned nongenerian, Senator HAYDEN has shown amazing energy in advancing Arizona's cause in the 4 years since the Supreme Court handed down its decision. He has devoted long hours to negotiations, hearings, writing, and rewriting sections of the bill, entertaining new approaches, conferring with the administration and leaders of the various Western States. He has displayed a capacity for work that a man half his age could be proud of. And yet the project is still not a reality.

Mr. Speaker, let me review the developments that have occurred since the Supreme Court handed down its decision in 1963.

Immediately following the decision Senator HAYDEN and the Arizona House Members introduced identical bills similar to the bill put on the shelf at the start of the Supreme Court litigation. Hearings were held on that bill both in the House and Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committees in 1964. It was reported favorably by the Senate committee.

In 1965 a more comprehensive bill, seeking to solve water problems of the seven Colorado River Basin States, was introduced, and hearings were held in the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Nearly a thousand pages of testimony were printed. In 1966 additional hearings were held, and another 700 pages of testimony were printed. In August 1966 this bill was reported by the House committee on a vote of 22 to 10, but it was blocked before it could get to the House floor.

This year more hearings were held, and another 700 pages of testimony were printed, but again this has been to no avail. Markup of the bill has been delayed indefinitely because of a new alliance that has developed between the States of California and Colorado.

Meanwhile, the Senate has passed the central Arizona project bill. By an overwhelming margin the Senate has indicated its approval of this long-delayed reclamation project.

Because of this frustrating legislative history on a project, nearly everyone agrees is meritorious, Senator HAYDEN has decided to take an unusual, though not unprecedented, course of action next week. He plans to ask the Senate to suspend its rules and amend the Public Works and Atomic Energy Appropriation Acts to include authorization of the central Arizona project.

This is not the way Senator HAYDEN would prefer to bring this matter to a vote in the House. But at the age of 90, having been working on this legislation since he was in his 40's, Senator HAYDEN has lost just a little of his patience. He is all for the seniority system and proper procedures, but he also believes the National Legislature ought to be able to work its will—at least once in 50 years.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with Senator HAYDEN, and I intend to do all I can to see that his years of dedicated service are rewarded, not only with a vote but with a victory for the cause of reclamation in Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. STEIGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, it is my great privilege to join today with my colleagues as well as the people of the great State of Arizona in wishing a very happy birthday to our senior Senator, CARL HAYDEN, on this, his 90th birthday.

Born in 1877, this remarkable gentleman has spanned, with the exception of 13 years, the entire history of the Territory and the State of his native Arizona.

He has served that State since 1912; 15 years as a Representative and 40 years as a Senator, a record not likely to be duplicated—ever.

We happily tip our hats to the distinguished Senator and wish him many, many happy returns of the day.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues from Arizona in wishing the distinguished Senator from Arizona, CARL HAYDEN, a happy 90th birthday. Senator HAYDEN is one of the most amazing men in history. He was serving in this House before most of the Members now serving were born. He has broken all records for legislative service in this country. But he will be remembered more by the quality than by the length of his service.

America is richer because of his long tenure in the Congress. He is a great and noble man. All the Members love this distinguished American. The gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL], has said that Senator HAYDEN is an institution in his State. I say, Mr. Speaker, he is an institution in this House. He is an institution in our country. He has earned the respect and admiration in which he is universally held.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I thank the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Arizona yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, the minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I should like to add to and supplement the wonderful words on behalf of Senator HAYDEN just expressed by my distinguished friend the majority leader in reference to Senator HAYDEN.

There is an old saying that aristocracy is of the soul, not of the word. That statement, I believe does indicate the kind of a person Senator HAYDEN is.

He says very few words on the floor of the Senate or in other legislative deliberations.

I have had experiences in conferences, where he was the chairman of the conference between the House and the Senate, and he would sit at the head of the conference table, with Members of the House and the Senate on either side, and barely say a word over many hours of deliberations, where compromises were sought between the different versions of an appropriation bill. It was his patience which in the long run would inevitably bring the differences to a point of compromise, which could be justified in sending a version back to both Houses for subsequent approval.

For those of us who are many years younger, many years less experienced, and in many respects probably less wise, it was a wonderful lesson in how our system can best work for the benefit of all.

I can say, as one Member, that I benefited immeasurably from my associations with him. I know, on his 90th birthday, there are literally hundreds of others either here or elsewhere who can say the same concerning their experiences with a great statesman, the distinguished senior Senator from the State of Arizona.

I wish him well on his 90th birthday.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I thank the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my friend and colleague from the great State of Arizona, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES], who is today paying tribute to one of the great men in U.S. congressional history.

Senator CARL HAYDEN, President pro tempore of the U.S. Senate, the man who has served in Congress longer than any other man in history, a man who was sent to the Senate when Arizona became a State 56 years ago, is celebrating his 90th birthday.

It has been a great privilege and honor for me in the last 14 years of my own service in the House of Representatives to have come to know, respect and admire CARL HAYDEN. Because I serve on the House Appropriations Committee, I have had the great opportunity of serving on many conference committees with the Senate on appropriations matters. As chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, CARL HAYDEN has always impressed me with his vast knowledge of the very complex Federal programs that we in Congress are called upon to finance each and every session.

CARL HAYDEN has been a great voice for his beloved State of Arizona, an inspiration to Members of Congress in both bodies and from both parties for more years than many of us have been privileged to live on this earth.

I am grateful for the opportunity to join the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] in paying a well-deserved tribute to the dean of the U.S. Senate on the occasion of his 90th birthday.

May God grant him many more.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank my friend for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to echo the words of praise which have been given to the senior Senator, not only of Arizona but, I believe, of the Senate of the United States, the Honorable CARL HAYDEN.

The West, including the State of Arizona and including the State of California, certainly owes to this great man a great deal of praise and a great deal of appreciation over the years for the cooperation we have had. We are unstinted in our praise of this great man because he has been one of the great leaders.

If the words of Daniel Webster, which are engraved in stone above us here, mean anything at all, they certainly apply to this great man.

Let me read them:

> Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests and see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered.

I used those words once upon a time in praise of MIKE KIRWAN, of Ohio, chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Works of the Committee on Appropriations. I use them with the same feeling of genuine approbation in applying them to the works of this great man.

My good friend, my Democratic colleague [MOE UDALL] mentioned a number of things which I believe call upon me to say that although we revere and respect this great man, there have regrettably been instances between the great State of California and the great State of Arizona where there were differences of opinion. These differences of opinion have never in any instance descended to personalities or recriminations between the members of the Arizona and California delegations. Nevertheless, those differences have obtained. They have been honest differences between honorable men, and some of those differences still remain. This is not the time or the place to go into the areas of failure to agree which undeniably exist. I shall not utilize the time that the gentleman from Arizona has granted me for that purpose but will just end by saying that I believe every member of the California delegation respects and honors this great senior Senator from the State of Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I thank my good friend from California. I assure him it is as deep a source of regret to the Arizona delegation as it is to him that we have had these differences between our two States. They are sister States and neighbor States and should be working together instead of separately. The gentleman knows I have felt that way for many years, and I know he has, too. I know he joins with me in the hope that the day will dawn, and soon, when this will occur and we may have these vital issues settled. Possibly they will not be settled to the satisfaction of either group, but so that we can face the future together instead of apart.

Mr. Speaker, when I called the senior Senator from Arizona this morning to wish him a happy birthday, I said, "How do you feel?" He said, "Well, I will tell you. I hope you feel as good when you are 90 as I do right now." My answer to that was, "Senator, I hope that when I am 90 I am half the man you are."

I believe this is the way we all feel toward a great statesman, a great American, Senator CARL HAYDEN.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy and privileged to join with my dear friend, and able and esteemed colleague, Congressman JOHN RHODES, in hailing and saluting on his 90th birthday one of the truly great Americans that it has been my privilege to know during my service in the Congress, the Honorable CARL HAYDEN, outstanding U.S. Senator from the great State of Arizona.

Senator HAYDEN is unique. There is no one like him in Washington today. His service in public life commenced about the turn of the century and has continued since that time with steady advancement to high and higher levels of service, culminating in the House and U.S. Senate. He has served for the past 55 years with outstanding distinction, fidelity to duty, great ability, extraordinary diligence, and an exceptional spirit of devotion.

CARL HAYDEN is a great American. His country, his State, and all of us who know him may well be very proud of his illustrious career in the public service and be grateful for the opportunity to know and to serve with such a great public servant who is admired by all.

The Senator served in public office with some great people from his State. It was my privilege as a young man to meet him with my own great, patriot-statesman friend, the late, lamented Senator David I. Walsh, and another great illustrious figure from the State of Arizona, and one time distinguished chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the later renowned Hon. Henry Fountain Ashurst.

Senator HAYDEN is physically rugged and inexhaustible and is blessed by the good Lord with a very keen mind, untiring energy, and the ability and patience to tackle and handle multifold duties and an incredible volume of official work with hardly the wink of an eyelash.

I could not pay adequate tribute to such a great man, but must observe that he is truly incredible, not only in the amount of work he can accomplish, but also in his amiable, relaxed personal qualities and great respect for the dignity of his colleagues and fellow men and women.

I want to thank my valued, very able friend, Hon. JOHN RHODES, an outstanding Member of this House, for giving me this opportunity to join in the wholehearted, deeply-felt tribute of esteem and high regard that Members of the House are paying on this occasion to this great Senator of the United States, who has served his country over such a long period of time with such unflagging devotion, loyalty to the people from whom he has sprung, and the Nation, and deep concern for this great system of Government and for the American people.

I wish for Senator HAYDEN, esteemed national leader and friend to very many, continued success in his work, good health, real happiness, and peace for many years to come. He is, indeed, one of God's noble men and a great credit to his State, his Nation, and the Congress of the United States.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to

extend their remarks on the subject of the 90th birthday of Senator CARL HAYDEN.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE of Illinois). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

PROPOSES WAY FOR CONGRESS TO RESOLVE VIETNAM DILEMMA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE of Illinois). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, in his statement on Vietnam policy last Friday in San Antonio, President Johnson raised an important question when he asked:

> Is the aggression (in Vietnam) a threat, not only to the immediate victim but to the United States and to the peace and security of the world of which we are a part?

The answer of course must be affirmative. The expansion of Communist territorial control any place does indeed constitute a threat to the United States as well as the immediate victim, and it is therefore an event of deep concern to our people.

The affirmative answer, however, does not automatically define the form and extent that our response to the threat should take. Proper definition is both crucial and complicated.

The President also asked, appropriately, "What would be the consequence of letting armed aggression against South Vietnam succeed? What would follow in the time ahead? What kind of world are they (who question whether present policies are worth the price) prepared to live in 5 months and 5 years from tonight?"

These question do not yield easy answers, partly because they pose only one side of the grave dilemma now facing the American people. They can be considered and answered satisfactorily only in conjunction with other, more fundamental questions.

For example:

What would be the consequence of permitting the costly military stalemate in Vietnam to continue along present lines for another year, 5 years, or even longer?

How would continued stalemate affect our national interests elsewhere in the world, especially in Western Europe—which, by all standards, must be considered as the most important dimension of our foreign policy?

How would continued stalemate affect South Vietnam, its people, and their attitude toward us?

How would continued stalemate affect our response to mounting problems at home—inflation, high taxes, civil strife, and the influence of the military-industrial complex of which former President Eisenhower warned in his farewell address?

How would continued stalemate affect the willingness of the American people to share in future world responsibilities? Would they, in bitterness, turn their backs elsewhere on our 20-year-old policy of Communist containment? Would they compromise their commitment to NATO? Would they duck the costly and continuing chore of helping to avert worldwide famine as the food-population crisis worsens?

What would follow in the time ahead? What kind of a world would we then live in?

These questions—together with the ones voiced by the President—show the awesome and tormenting scope of the American dilemma in Vietnam.

As we ponder the consequence of letting armed aggression against South Vietnam succeed, as the President put it, we must also ponder the consequence of continuing along the present lines.

Must we choose between those two unattractive alternatives? If so, the choice is a grave one, and in making the decision all evidence must be weighed with the greatest care. I, for one, do not accept the conclusion that America must necessarily choose between present policies, on the one hand, and letting the Communists take over, on the other.

Because both of these alternatives, on their face, seem to be unacceptable—other possibilities must be carefuly explored and evaluated.

One such alternative is for Congress to place reasonable new conditions on further U.S. military action in Vietnam. The conditions could take various forms, of course. One possibility would be to require broader participation by other Asian powers—including South Vietnam—in meeting the cost of the war, in terms of both combat troops and money. This would likely mean that an allied high command would supplant the present U.S. command to make basic decisions on strategy and tactics, but so much the better.

In all important respects, these new conditions—if fulfilled—would have the effect of de-Americanizing the war. The advantages of this transformation are obvious.

Is it attainable? No one can foretell with certainty, of course, but if the proposal is presented formally as an absolute condition of further U.S. military operations in Vietnam it might well shock the other Asian powers at long last into taking up their proper share of the burden. If they reject the proposal, then they would, in a sense, share the responsibility for whatever consequences might result from the cessation of present U.S. military policies in Vietnam.

If that bleak consequence should come, then all major Asian powers and not just the United States alone would, in effect, have decided that the military defense of the Saigon regime is not worth the price.

No doubt other alternatives are possible, and certainly all should be thoroughly explored.

The President's statement shows clearly that he is caught on the horns of dilemma. He sees only two possibilities—present policies, or pullout—and therefore plans no basic changes in Vietnam policies. Judging by his speech, it is his intention to continue along the present lines indefinitely.

This underscores the importance of the Congress itself taking a new look at basic policy in Vietnam. Accordingly, I will press this week for consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 508, which would instruct the appropriate committees of the Congress to do just that. As the first step, I will ask Chairman COLMER of the House Rules Committee to schedule hearings.

In this resolution, I now have the support of 55 other House Members. In addition to the 50 names—46 Republicans and four Democrats—appearing on the resolution introduced a week ago by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] and myself, these House Members have introduced the same identical resolution: Representative OGDEN REID, Republican, of New York, Representative KEN HECHLER, Democrat, of West Virginia, Representative MARGARET M. HECKLER, Republican, of Massachusetts, Representative CHARLES M. TEAGUE, Republican, of California, Representative GEORGE E. BROWN, Jr., Democrat, of California. In addition, Representative RONALD E. LUKENS, Republican, of Ohio, announced his support for it.

The Congress itself must resolve the Vietnam dilemma: first, because it is the most representative branch of the Government and, therefore, best suited to deal with the complicated, vital question of war; and second, because it bears the clear constitutional responsibility to do so.

No Representative and no Senator will relish the task. In fact, several have told me privately, and with feeling, that they are determined to avoid having to vote on any question of basic war policy. This reluctance is understandable. But can any Congressman honorably neglect the constitutional duty to which he is sworn, especially this one, touching as it does so intimately the lives and well-being of all our citizens?

INFORMATION NEEDED

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POOL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, there is a nationwide organized plan to destroy our draft laws. I know that the Members of the House will be interested in reading the Friday, September 29, editorial from the Dallas Morning News, which is as follows:

INFORMATION NEEDED

An ironic footnote to the John Birch Society's failure to get booth space at the State Fair is establishment of the "draft information center" across the street from Fair Park.

The purpose of the center, according to Dallas' Rep. Joe Pool, is to advise young men how to dodge the draft. This is being done by "counselors," he said.

One such "counselor" told The News that "we only make information available to anyone with questions."

He said that he himself is presently trying to get his draft board to classify him as a conscientious objector. He is active in the

Dallas Committee for a Peaceful Solution in Vietnam.

There are a good many questions about this activity that occur, such as:

Who is sponsoring this center? Who is paying the costs? What organizations are involved?

Rep. Pool, who has introduced a bill to prevent disruption of Selective Service operations, suggested that an investigation may be made soon to learn the answers to these and other questions about the center.

At a time when the nation is involved in a shooting war, an investigation seems to be needed. And legislation to outlaw organized draft-dodging campaigns is needed as well, and as soon as possible.

The left wing will jump on Dallas' Pool and the committee, as usual. And as usual, Pool and the committee are justified in making investigations like these.

DEALING WITH URBAN PROBLEMS

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, following the outbreak of civil disorders in many of our urban centers, there has been a rash of proposals for governmental action. Nearly all of them are characterized by the common denominator of more Federal aid. This is a very disturbing trend for those of us who are interested in maintaining a strong Federal system.

The ultimate in these proposals was made on July 31 in a Daily Bond Buyer editorial which suggested that the Federal Government take over not only the financing of most urban poverty problems but their administration as well. The effect of this proposal would be to put many municipal employees on the Federal payroll.

This outrageous suggestion was strongly attacked by one of my colleagues on the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, the Honorable William O. Beach, county judge of Montgomery County, Tenn. The Commission is a bipartisan body created by the Congress to study questions of Federal-State-local relations and to make recommendations to the appropriate levels of government for their resolution. I have the privilege of serving as one of the Representatives of this House on the Commission along with the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER] and the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ULLMAN].

At this point I would like to insert in the RECORD both the editorial from the Daily Bond Buyer with which I take strong issue, and Judge Beach's very persuasive letter to the editor:

RELIEF FOR THE URBAN AGONY

The nation is still so stunned by the raw physical catastrophe inflicted by race riots and armed insurrections that little thought has yet been given to appraising the financial consequences.

The money payoff in due course will no doubt be felt soon in the closely related insurance community and the public market for municipal bonds.

Fire and casualty insurance companies now own about $13 billion of the $105 billion of outstanding bonds of state and local governments. In recent years, they have been the market's second largest institutional buyer of such securities.

It is feared in market circles that the casualty companies will not be as big buyers in the future as before. What is more, it seems certain that some insurance companies may have to sell blocks of local government bonds to raise cash to meet underwriting losses sustained in the recent disorders. Who will buy these liquidated portfolio holdings and at what price?

Perhaps some losses can be spared the insurance companies if they can show that the losses were the result of planned armed insurrection, rather than the casualty of impromptu riot. Armed insurrection should not be hard to prove in view of the public calls to riot and arms that are being reported almost daily in the New York Times and other general circulation newspapers. But even so, the arson-and-pillage bill will have to be paid by pretty much the same people, if not in higher insurance premiums for everybody, then through public taxation. In finance, it doesn't seem to make much difference how slums are cleared.

Meantime, the wounded cities are left nursing these distressing questions:

Will private insurance continue to be available for dwellings and business quarters in the pillaged and burned-out areas?

Who will buy the bonds of the stricken cities, and on what price terms? How does an investor feel about owning the bond of a city in flames?

Who will continue to dwell in such cities if they can move out? How can business and industry in such cities be persuaded not to go away?

Is not the urban neighborhood ghetto destined to mushroom into the ghetto-city, or even the ghetto-state? What will dissuade propertied families from quitting urban areas? What will dissuade propertyless families from continuing to move in?

In the wake of the urban disorders is a great disenchantment.

There no longer can be warrant for the wishful thought that municipal government of itself can cope with the problems of mass poverty, mass unemployment, and swelling spiritual bankruptcy that abide in the postwar city slums.

Municipal government has neither the financial means for ministering to the urban congestion of this social sickness, nor the police power to protect the community as a whole from the violent impact of social protest and revolt.

It is a Federal problem.

And if the issue is to be faced squarely as a Federal Government problem, a new approach may be in order.

Perhaps the current makeshift of money grants and loans to the cities, and the collateral state and Federal Government investments in such things as public housing, hospitalization, education and urban renewal should be re-examined with soul-searching thoroughness.

Is it not still true that "everybody's business is nobody's business"? Has it ever been good sense either economically or politically for one government jurisdiction to raise money and for another government jurisdiction to spend it?

It will take time for a Congressional investigation to establish the extent to which the riots and insurrections have been due to the social despair of unpropertied and jobless Negroes, to the naked hooliganism of juveniles; and how much to the conspiratorial tactics of dedicated revolutionaries, whose first and perhaps only aim is to discredit and break down public authority.

While such an investigation is going on, perhaps a new approach to the urban ghetto problem might be explored.

One suggestion stems from the rapidly-spreading conviction that the relief of the propertyless and jobless urban population is a financial responsibility of the Federal Government.

If this is so, why should not the Federal state undertake not merely to *finance* the relief of the propertyless and jobless, but to *administer* such relief as well? This would take an immense financial and political burden from the local government part of the public sector.

The only precedent at present for Federal administration of community affairs is in Washington, where the nation's Federal business is administered through a Federal district—the District of Columbia.

It could be that the time has come to experiment with a regional application of the Federal district idea. Why could not the whole urban problem of relief to the unpropertied and jobless be transferred to regionally-established Federal districts?

These districts need not be in urban areas. Like the District of Columbia, they could be models of city planning. Conceivably they could come to house not only recipients of public relief, but could be "demonstration cities" that would attract not only people on the Government payroll or the Government relief rolls, but, like Washington, lure into residence a host of discriminating outsiders who would cherish the new Federal district cities for reasons of voluntary choice rather than compulsion.

AUGUST 25, 1967

THE EDITOR,
The Bond Buyer
New York, N.Y.

DEAR SIR: I have read your editorial, "Relief for the Urban Agony," in the July 31st issue of *The Daily Bond Buyer*. I am shocked at your suggestion that the Federal Government take over the *administration* as well as the financing of urban poverty problems.

If the Federal Government is better fitted to administer programs designed to remedy poverty, then what argument is there that it would not also be better fitted to administer any and all other local affairs that happen to be beyond the financial capability of local government?

I grant that there are some inherent difficulties in the American federal system, one of which is that in some cases one governmental jurisdiction must raise money and another spend it. The situation of course arises from the imbalance between the great resources of the federal government and the relatively meager resources of state and local governments.

But is this defect so serious or so basic as to warrant the overthrow of our federal system of government—our three-level federal-state-local partnership, which, with whatever defects it may have, provides a substantial amount of government close to home and thus assures broader citizen concern, participation and control? These important features of democratic government would be absent in any scheme of national administration of local problems, it seems to me.

Nor is it enough in my opinion to say that poverty is a national problem rather than a local problem. The fact that it exists in many places throughout the nation does not necessarily mean that it can be effectively attacked only through a single national administrative agency. For in every locality where ghettos, sub-standard housing, inadequate educational opportunity, and other poverty-begetting conditions exist, the remedies must come from the efforts of an aroused and concerned local citizenry, or they will not come at all. No team of federal administrators are as likely to be able to provide the leadership that will motivate and arouse the people at the grass roots level

as the officials who are elected and known at home.

Admittedly local leadership has fallen short of the mark in solving the problems of urban blight. I do not know how we are to be sufficiently motivated. But of one thing I am convinced; the Federal Government with all its money and expertise cannot get the job done alone.

I can find nothing in my experience as a county administrative official on which to base any support for your proposal. Also it runs counter to what I believe to be the philosophy of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, of which I am a member, which gives constant and continuing study to the problems of the relationship of the three levels of government in the American Federal System. (I must make it clear, however, that I do not presume to speak for the Commission.) Your proposal might at first blush give appealing promise of greater administrative efficiency, but I believe it would soon prove to be both stifling to local initiative and concern and unproductive of any real remedy for the urban agony.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM O. BEACH.

THERE ARE MANY LEGITIMATE FARMER COOPERATIVES

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. RESNICK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, I have recently charged that many of the Nation's farmer cooperatives are perpetrating a fraud upon the American farmer and American taxpayers. These co-ops have issued to their members between $4 and $6 billion in worthless patronage dividend certificates, instead of issuing cash from their profits.

I would like to point out that there are many legitimate cooperatives throughout the country which are run by farmers for the benefit of farmers. Intercounty Cooperative, Woodbridge, which provides feed and marketing services for farmers in Sullivan and Ulster Counties, is an example of a legitimate co-op. The Dairymen's League is another example. I am certainly not referring to co-ops like these.

My charges are directed toward those co-ops which practice the following abuses:

First. Co-ops which are controlled by gigantic corporate entities so that member farmers do not have an honest voice in the operation of the co-op.

Second. Co-ops which issue dividend certificates and do not redeem them for 30 or 40 years, even upon the death of the patron.

Third. Co-ops which take over independent taxpaying businesses, bring them under the tax exempt umbrella, and drive private competitors out of business.

The worst offenders seem to be the Farm Bureau co-ops and other gigantic co-ops in the Midwest—in Ohio, Illinois, and Iowa. There are many co-ops which provide much needed services to the American farmer, and are a valuable part of rural America. We must stop the abuses of the Farm Bureau-type co-op so that the legitimate co-ops can continue to serve the American public.

INDUSTRIAL REVENUE BONDS

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, in the past 2 years much concern has been expressed by the U.S. Treasury Department, as well as some of my colleagues, regarding industrial revenue bond financing. Opponents contend that such financing is an abuse of the tax exemption privilege granted State and municipal bonds.

However, the advantages and contributions which this form of financing provides our States, must not be overlooked. Southern and Midwestern States have found industrial revenue bond financing of tremendous value in obtaining new industry, and consequently, a wider geographical distribution of industry is emerging. It has also made a major contribution in raising the standard of living in rural and distressed areas by bringing in new industry, and broadening the tax base of such communities.

Because of these advantages, 40 States now have industrial revenue bond laws, and my own State of Florida is now seriously studying this type of financing.

I commend to my colleagues the following letter from the Committee for the Evaluation of Industrial Aid Financing which further explains, with the use of data from the Federal Reserve flow of funds, the use and advantages of industrial revenue bond financing:

THE COMMITTEE FOR THE EVALUATION OF INDUSTRIAL AID FINANCING,

Washington, D.C., September 8 1967.

LETTER MAILED SEPTEMBER 8, 1967, TO ALL U.S. SENATORS, CONGRESSMEN, AND STATE GOVERNORS

DEAR ———: The use of Industrial Revenue Bonds to finance a relatively small portion of the industrial construction in the United States is being criticized in some quarters of Congress and, in particular, the Treasury Department. Ignoring the many benefits derived from such economic expansion by the states and their municipalities, and even the Federal Government, the criticism is based on the belief that Industrial Revenue Bonds deny the Treasury additional income in the form of "lost taxes."

The municipalities, for their part, by encouraging and assisting in financing of plant construction increase economic productivity within their locality, thus incurring the benefits of increased employment, expanded commercial activity and the development of a larger tax base. The net result is the minimizing of welfare costs and the maximizing of the municipality's ability to finance other local government services.

It is notable that the Economic Development Administration and the Office of Regional Economic Development were established in the Department of Commerce to create new jobs by attracting business and to rural communities. For the period ending June 30, 1966 EDA approved . . . a total of $383 million for the construction of facilities on the justification that "when these facilities are completed the industrial and commercial firms using them will create thousands of new and permanent jobs." It is ironic that little or no recognition is given to the role that Industrial Revenue Bonds play in attaining the same basic economic goal.

The statement that the tax-exempt Industrial Revenue Bond constitutes a "tax dodge" by the business corporation leasing the facility is untrue. Granted that such financing provides a lower rate of interest in today's tight money market; the belief that the Treasury would derive greater benefit if these undertakings were all financed with taxable corporate bonds is open to serious question. Consider, for example, that in 1965 the total volume of corporate financing approximated $8.1 billion and according to the Federal Reserve flow of funds only $3 billion went into the hands of investors where the interest income was fully subject to taxation. What many fail to recognize is that the taxable-bond market is dominated by purchasers such as pension funds, foundations, life insurance companies and mutual savings banks who have themselves been granted full or partial tax exemption by the Federal government.

Let us examine the postulated loss of income taxes to the Federal Government on the $504 million Industrial Revenue Bonds which the Investment Bankers Association of America estimates were issued in 1966. Assume that these bonds were issued as taxable securities and that the holders of the bonds were also fully taxable; taxable income at an interest rate of 6% would only amount to $30 million. However, if one wishes to assume the ratio of taxable-nontaxable ownership of securities aforecited by the Federal Reserve, the taxable income on the $504 million securities would be reduced to $11,250,000. Assuming, further, a 50 per cent tax bracket for the holders of these securities, the government would have received only $5,625,000 total gross income. One cannot help but compare this minimal amount with the $383,600,000 expenditure by EDA to attract new industry.

Therefore, by this very simple comparison, it appears that there are those who are using Industrial Revenue Bond Financing as a "straw man." The Federal government, with the tremendous burden of Viet Nam is limited in its assistance to such battle scarred communities as Newark, New Jersey. Needless to say that if the state of New Jersey had an Industrial Revenue Bond law it could prove to be of great service in providing new industry in rebuilding this community and in eliminating pockets of unemployment.

The incentives offered by states and their municipalities to attract new business via the Industrial Revenue Bond route are no less tempting than the incentives offered by the Federal Government, the difference being that there is no interference with local and states rights and no direct expense upon the Federal Government.

LESTER M. HADDAD,
Washington Representative.

QUEST FOR PEACE

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] may extend his remarks at this time in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, in these troubled times the United Nations frequently comes under

attack because it does not always have a ready answer and instant solution to complex and difficult problems, which the world faces.

It is my feeling to the contrary that the United Nations has provided a very important focal point for all international discussions and peace efforts and accordingly deserves a large measure of credit for what stability and peace we do have today.

A short time ago William Randolph Hearst, Jr., editor in chief, Hearst Newspapers, summed up the situation in an "Editor's Report" which I feel is an outstanding declaration of the strong points and merits of the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I place this report in the RECORD at this point:

SAN FRANCISCO.—Out here in this naturally air-conditioned city—easily the most beautiful in America—the doings back at the United Nations in New York are geographically remote.

Nevertheless, the opening of this session is news of interest to every literate human being.

Twenty-two years ago this summer, I was here when this organization—created to help the nations of the world settle their problems through reason and logic—was born.

The atmosphere of hope which prevailed at that time around the shining new baby was a far cry from the gloomy air hanging this week in New York over its big, cold, marble and glass slab of a building on the East River.

As the delegates gathered to again begin hashing over the problems of this messed-up world, the professional cynics, doomsayers and other pessimists had a field day. And with good cause. The outlook for any constructive action again was as bleak as any sourpuss could hope for.

In fact the outlook is even more dismal than usual in recent years. Exactly as predicted by the handwringers, opening statements by the United States and Russian spokesmen in essence were mere restatements of previous positions on the overriding problems of the Middle East, Vietnam and disarmament.

This means the present stalemate not only probably will continue during three months of fruitless talk ahead but is likely to become more and more bitter. Literally nothing meaningful can be done by the assembly—or the Security Council—where the U.S. and the Soviet Union are not in agreement.

So, it may well be asked, of what value is this gathering of 122 nations which are anything but united? And if it may be on the verge of following the old League of Nations into oblivion because of impotence, as some of the doomsayers believe, what of it?

Being neither a cynic nor a pessimist but by nature rather an optimistic realist, I would like to try to answer those questions by doing what Al Smith always recommended—taking a look at the record. When you do that you find that the UN despite its depressing failures, has a very real value indeed. Its demise, further, would be a real tragedy in man's continuing quest for peace.

* * *

The underlying trouble with the UN—the reason it never has been able to function fully as the peacekeeping body it was supposed to be—is that none of the big powers, understandably, has been willing to give up their sovereignty. Thus it has all the trappings of a superstate and none of the authority.

In actual operation the General Assembly has been primarily a world forum for general debate. The 15-member Security Council, which does have power to enforce peace, in actuality has largely been hamstrung by the veto right accorded to five permanent members—the U. S., Russia, Britain, France and Nationalist China.

Yet despite these basic hobbles the UN has been able to snuff out many dangerous situations by sending truce teams, fact-finding missions and what it calls "neutral-nations commissions" to various parts of the globe. It was responsible for the 1965 ceasefire between India and Pakistan. And on five major occasions it has intervened with UN forces in the interests of peace.

Those occasions began with actual warfare in Korea, from 1950 to 1953, a joint undertaking against Communist aggression made possible only because Russia was boycotting the Security Council and thus was unable to cast a veto.

The interventions include the buffer force set up in the Middle East between 1956 and this year to help keep peace between Israel and the Arabs. Removed at the request of Egyptian President Nasser just before the outbreak of new hostilities last June, the UN is now back as an "observer" of the shaky truce line.

Still other on-the-spot peacekeeping operations included the Congo, from 1960 to 1964, which ended when Russia and France refused to pay their share of the costs, and Cyprus from 1964 to the present. A force of 7,000 UN troops was sent to Cyprus to end fighting between Greek and Turkish Cypriots and is still on the island.

In addition to these direct interventions to restore peace or halt aggression, the UN since its formation in 1945 has helped greatly in maintaining what world stability there is through a tremendous variety of economic and social uplift programs. The fact that the U. S. has borne the lion's share of the cost, as usual, does not detract from the fact that these efforts represent international cooperation.

So, on the record, the UN has been far from a complete washout. It has and is helping millions of underprivileged people throughout the world understand what mankind can do when it works together. And so far as the big crises are concerned, there is little doubt it repaid its investment just by averting an almost inevitable major East-West showdown over the Congo in 1960.

Certainly, the UN has proven a disillusionment to many who thought it could police the world. Certainly it is depressing that the UN has failed in so many situations, past and present. One thinks not only of Vietnam and the continuing Mideast mess, but of Tibet, Czechoslavakia, Hungary, Goa and many others, including Berlin.

But the disillusion is the result of overoptimism. The properly optimistic view to take of the UN—indeed the practical view—is to judge it not by its failures but by its successes. They have not been inconsiderable.

It is not the fault of the UN that the world has not known real peace since the end of World War II. It is the fault of the Communists. Every major crisis since 1945 has been the direct result of Communist aggression, or aggression encouraged by the Communists in keeping with their policy of stirring up trouble for non-Communist states.

Communists—whether Russian, Chinese or Cuban—simply are not interested in peace. Moscow claims it is, but the truth is demonstrated by the more than 100 vetoes it has cast in the Security Council in the past 22 years. The U.S., by contrast, has never used its veto power even once.

Between now and the adjournment of the General Assembly on Dec. 19, Russia and her supporters will be continuing their campaign of vilification against the U.S. and our allies. They apparently will keep repeating the same tired and futile demands for this country to get out of Vietnam and for Israel to surrender the territory she was forced to occupy for her own continued existence.

The aim of the verbal attacks, of course, will be to attempt to win some kind of a diplomatic victory to replace failures of force. The attempt will not succeed, nor will anything at all come about until reality replaces delusion.

And end to the Mideast crisis could come quickly if Moscow would stop abetting the Arabs in their unrealistic attitude toward Israel. An end to the war in Vietnam would come even quicker if Moscow stopped supplying arms to Ho Chi Minh and his armies of aggressors.

Russia, obviously, is not yet willing to do either. Her Communist masters will take such steps only when they decide it is in their best interests to do so.

Meanwhile the non-Communist world continues its quest for peace. Part of that quest—an important part—consists in the battle of words being waged in the world forum of the UN.

There, at least, certain rules must be followed and objective observers from all corners of the earth therefore can listen and separate the truth from the lies.

Even if it served no other purpose but this, the UN would be indispensable for all who retain hope for eventual peace among nations. There can be no lasting peace without universal freedom. And it is hearing the truth that can set men free.

TO REBUILD THE SLUMS

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, that there is an unmet need for decent housing within the means of low-income families is by now axiomatic. How best to meet the need is the question. Recent proposals lean heavily on greater Federal incentives to private capital to enter the low-income housing field. The New York Times on September 25 analyzed these proposals and concluded that the involvement of private capital is not a substitute for public housing. With regard to the Percy and Kennedy proposals, the Times pointed out that "The subsidized interest rates, tax concessions, and other inducements are a roundabout way of doing what the Government could do straightforwardly if the public understood that decent housing for the poor cannot be a goldmine for private profit."

I think my colleagues will be interested in the respected Times' analysis of various housing proposals, and I place the full text of its September 25 editorial, entitled "To Rebuild the Slums," in the RECORD at this point:

TO REBUILD THE SLUMS

In the task of rebuilding the urban slums neither Congress nor the nation itself has looked squarely at the housing problem.

The underlying truth remains what it was twenty years ago when the late Senator Robert A. Taft became a convert to public housing and set out to persuade the real estate industry to relax its doctrinaire opposition. There is no way, Mr. Taft often said, that private enterprise can build housing for the very poor at a profit. But Congress has never been willing to appropriate sufficient money for a large-scale public housing program.

Federal housing officials and city mayors have complicated the problem by pursuing unrelated objectives. They have pushed for so-called "middle-income housing" to persuade a remnant of the middle class not to flee to the suburbs. They have promoted urban renewal programs to revitalize the rotting downtown commercial areas and lure shoppers back into the centers of cities. These are both worthwhile purposes, but they do nothing to rehouse slum-dwellers and may actually reduce the supply of housing available to them.

The political impasse which has long existed in the housing field, now made more visible by the budget stringency of the Vietnam war, has stimulated enterprising politicians in both parties to devise ways of luring private business into this unpromising activity. President Johnson has a committee at work studying the possibility of a mixed public-and-private Comsat-type corporation, Senator Percy, Republican of Illinois, and Senator Robert Kennedy have introduced ambitious, complex bills to encourage the entry of private capital into the field.

None of these plans will directly help the people in the slums who are worst-off—the 32 million Americans, or one person in every six, who live in families where the breadwinner is unemployed, on welfare or whose income hovers at or slightly above minimum wage levels.

Senator Kennedy concedes that under his bill apartments would rent for $70 to $100 a month, which is more than the really poor can afford to pay. The same is true of Senator Percy's bill, which is nominally intended to convert slum residents into homeowners. As with most existing Government housing programs, except public housing, these proopsals would most help white-collar and blue-collar workers in the $4,000 to $7,000 bracket.

Private capital's involvement, however, is not a substitute for public housing, much less a panacea. The subsidized interest rates, tax concessions, and other inducements of the Percy and Kennedy plans are a roundabout way of doing what the Government could do straightforwardly if the public understood that decent housing for the poor cannot be a goldmine for private profit.

NEW APPROACH GIVES NEW HOPE FOR THE JOBLESS

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, it is well known by now that the key to solving the problem of poverty in the central cities and in our rural poverty pockets is to find jobs for the jobless and to train those who are not equipped to find jobs. Accordingly, the announcement yesterday by President Johnson of a new pilot program to mobilize the resources of private industry and the Federal Government to help solve the job problem will be welcomed by everyone concerned about the state of health of this country. If anyone wondered about the seriousness of purpose of the President and the speed with which this new program would be launched, those doubts must have disappeared today when Secretary of Commerce Trowbridge and Secretary of Labor Wirtz held a joint news conference to set forth in detail the proposals made yesterday by the President. Present at the news conference today was Mr. William E. Zisch, a highly respected business executive in the aerospace industry, who will serve as Secretary Trowbridge's Special Representative to get this program moving with all speed. Through Mr. Zisch, the businessman will have a single point of contact in the Federal Government. This pilot program has many aspects, but there is a common theme—deep involvement by private enterprise in the creation of job opportunities. I am particularly pleased to learn that San Antonio is one of the five cities where initial contacts have been made by Secretary Trowbridge. A Federal team will be going to San Antonio to take a look at prospective new uses for surplus Federal property and facilities, new uses which would aid in the creation of jobs and the training of potential workers. I can assure the President and Secretary Trowbridge that this Federal initiative will be matched with equal enthusiasm and cooperation by the people of San Antonio. In my view, this program is an example of creative federalism and business responsibility at their finest. I unhesitatingly predict fruitful results from the steps that have been taken yesterday and today.

MEMORANDUM FROM THE WHITE HOUSE

To: The Secretary of Defense, Secretary of Commerce, Secretary of Labor, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, Administrator of General Services Administration, Director of Office of Economic Opportunity, and Administrator of Small Business Administration.

We are launching today a major test program to mobilize the resources of private industry and the Federal Government to help find jobs and provide training for thousands of America's hard-core unemployed.

The heart of this new effort is to reach the forgotten and the neglected—those citizens handicapped by poor health, hampered by inadequate education, hindered by years of discrimination and by-passed by conventional training programs.

To succeed in this venture will take more than promises or good intentions. It will require—on an unprecedented scale—the concerted action and involvement of the private sector, working closely with the Federal Government.

As we embark on this new course, let us be clear about what is involved: our purpose is not to hand out but to help up, to help provide every American the opportunity for a good job at a good wage.

Our goal is to replace the waste and failure of unemployment with the productivity of meaningful work.

We call upon private industry to join us in tackling one of America's most urgent domestic problems. I have no doubt that the private sector will respond. For we have witnessed in the past few months a remarkable series of events which attests to the dedication of American business in meeting the needs of the society in which it flourishes:

On September 12, 1967, the insurance companies in this country agreed to commit $1 billion of their funds for investments in city core areas to improve housing conditions and to finance job creating enterprises. Some of these resources are already financing promising housing projects and insurance company executives and officials of this Administratin are working together to develop other projects.

A project has been launched to use surplus Federal lands to meet the housing needs of our cities in which the efforts of private developers will be the most important single element.

A Committee, headed by Edgar F. Kaiser and composed of distinguished industrialists, banker, labor leaders and specialists in urban affairs is examining every possible means of encouraging the development of a large-scale efficient construction and rehabilitation industry to reclaim the corroded core of the American city.

Upon the recommendation of the Kaiser Committee we have begun the "Turnkey Plus" project to encourage private industry not only to develop and build, but also to *manage* public housing.

In this effort, we will again attempt to bring the great resources of the private sector to bear on a critical national problem. Through the great talents and energies of private industry, with full support from the Federal Government, we hope to:

Bring new job training opportunities in existing plants to the hard core unemployed.

Create new jobs and new training opportunities for the seriously disadvantaged in plants which will be established in or near areas of concentrated unemployment.

Encourage new enterprises combining the resources of big and small businesses to provide jobs and job training opportunities for the disadvantaged.

To initiate this effort, the resources of the Department of Commerce, Defense, Labor, Health, Education and Welfare, and Housing and Urban Development, the Office of Economic Opportunity, the General Services Administration and the Small Business Administration will be combined to provide maximum assistance and to minimize the added cost of these in private industry willing to assume responsibility for providing training and work opportunities for the seriously disadvantaged.

Initially, nearly $40 million from a wide variety of existing programs will be made available, as will millions of dollars worth of surplus Federal property and excess Federal equipment.

We will offer to private industry:

A full spectrum of aid to assist them in recruiting, counselling, training, and providing health and other needed services to the disadvantaged.

Aid which will enable them to experiment with new ways to overcome the transportation barriers now separating men and women from jobs.

Surplus Federal land, technical assistance and funds to facilitate the construction of new plants in or near areas of concentrated unemployment.

Excess Federal equipment to enable them to train more disadvantaged people.

Assistance to joint enterprises combining the resources of big and small businesses to bring jobs and training opportunities to the disadvantaged.

I have asked the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Labor to direct this test program and insure that all available Federal resources are utilized. The Secretary of Commerce will designate a full-time Special Representative as the single point of contact for private employers participating in this project. The Special Representative will provide employers with one-stop service for the entire Federal Government and will make whatever arrangements are appropriate with the various Federal agencies for all forms of Federal assistance.

The Secretary of Labor will designate a full-time officer in the Manpower Administration to work with the Special Representative of the Secretary of Commerce in connection with the training and employment elements of these projects.

I have also asked the Secretaries of Defense, Health, Education and Welfare, and Housing and Urban Development, the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Administrators of the General Services Administration and the Small Business Administration to assist the Secretaries of Commerce and Labor in this test program and to assign a single official in their agencies

who will coordinate their efforts in support of this program.

Provision will be made for continuing liaison with local projects and for careful research and evaluation to crystallize field experience into guidelines for future action.

I have asked the Secretary of Commerce to invite corporations throughout the country to join this new effort to bring meaningful employment to disadvantaged citizens both in existing plants and, where feasible, in new locations near areas of concentrated unemployment.

I have directed each Department and Agency of this Government to give top priority to all phases of this important effort.

PRIVATE HOUSING MONEY SHOULD BENEFIT CITIES

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FULTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, our American insurance companies' plan to invest in the building and improvement of housing in the Nation's deteriorated slum areas is indeed noteworthy. I join the applause that greeted it, and I ask that the RECORD include the editorial remarks of the Nashville Tennessean which, on September 16, also praised the companies' involvement in the problems of the Nation's cities. The editorial is as follows:

PRIVATE HOUSING MONEY SHOULD BENEFIT CITIES

The Nation's life insurance industry has agreed to invest $1 billion of mortgage money to build and improve housing in the big city slums.

The decision is a hopeful step toward greater involvement of big business in the problems of the nation's cities—an effort in which business has as great an interest as anyone else.

The 350 insurance companies participating in the plan will incur little risk to their investment, since the loans will be guaranteed by the Federal Housing Administration. But the companies will have to accept somewhat lower interest rates than they could get in other investments. This represents a financial sacrifice for the companies in a commendable effort to serve the public interest.

The $1 billion which the companies will put into the plan represents a considerable percentage of the approximately $16 billion which the companies have to invest each year. There may be additional investments in slum housing later, but the companies are not committing themselves on this yet.

The plan does not involve government spending, except for the guaranteeing of the loans by the FHA. Each participating life insurance company will negotiate individually with each borrower, and there will be no centralized machinery for coordinating the program. The money will go for projects in slum areas which would ordinarily not be financed under normal business practices.

The plan has possibilities of becoming a positive effort between business and government to clear slums and improve the housing conditions of millions of Americans.

One possible stumblingblock to be avoided is the threat of establishing segregated housing patterns and recreating ghettoes out of the old slums. This problem is great enough in redevelopment involving all government funds. The situation could be even more troublesome where private funds are involved.

Federal housing officials, in meetings in Nashville Wednesday night, appeared to be confused about this aspect of the Edgehill urban renewal project.

Mr. Deane C. Tucker, member of an advisory team from the Department of Housing and Urban Development, said the project probably would create a ghetto unless the Nashville Housing Authority alters present intent. "We would prefer that it not end up in all-Negro housing," he said, "but it probably will."

Mr. Gerald Gimre, executive director NHA, said the agency intended to rebuild the ghetto. "We want to preserve the neighborhood but create a better environment."

Slum clearance and the redevelopment of ghettoes obviously present many agonizing problems. If private funds are to be invested to the best advantage, it seems that the federal agencies are going to have to decide on some clear agreement for investing government funds.

CONGRESSMAN ANNUNZIO URGES CONTINUATION OF RENT SUPPLEMENT PROGRAM

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, the insurance companies' declared intention to invest large sums in rent supplement housing is good indication that private enterprise is enlisted in the Nation's total effort to improve living conditions in our cities. The Chicago Sun-Times on September 24 discussed this development and suggested that the House cannot ignore the companies' show of faith in America, and should provide the means for continuing the rent supplement program. With permission I insert the editorial in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues:

THE HOUSE MUST AID THE CITIES

The Senate has responded to the reality of the times by approving enough model-city and rent-supplement funds to get the program under way. Now it is up to members of the House to reverse themselves and follow the Senate's lead.

The Senate last week allotted $537,000,000 for model cities. The House in May set the figure at $237,000,000. The Senate approved $40,000,000 for rent subsidy, the House approved nothing. The Senate bill now goes to House conference, and it is incumbent on the conference either to adopt the Senate figure or offer a reasonable compromise.

The administration has pledged to cut some non-war spending, and it should. Yet there are programs that must be given overriding priority, because they benefit both the poor and the general economy. Model-city and rent-subsidy programs mean slum clearance and new construction, with resultant jobs, private profit and tax revenue.

The life insurance industry recently pledged $1 billion as backing for construction of housing whose tenants would be aided by rent-supplement money. That's a billion dollars worth of faith in common sense that the House simply can't ignore. It's time to allow a cure for urban sickness to begin.

NEW HOPE FOR DICKEY

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HATHAWAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, New England needs it and the vast majority of New England people want the Dickey-Lincoln School hydroelectric power project.

To those of my colleagues who have supported my efforts to bring about construction of this needed project, I extend my deepest gratitude. Their votes for Dickey have been votes for New England's welfare and progress.

To those esteemed colleagues who have seen fit to oppose me and have sought to prevent or delay Dickey's construction, I issue another call that they reexamine the facts. There is no legitimate basis to justify opposition to this project. The need for it has been fully demonstrated, and its merits established beyond any doubt.

Especially do I urge those of my New England colleagues who have opposed the Dickey project to reconsider their position. I do so confident that their opposition does not reflect the wishes of the majority of their constituents. The many expressions of support I have received from labor, consumer, and other organizations as well as from numerous individuals throughout New England have persuaded me that this is the case.

Leading New England newspapers share my view of the importance of this project and the broad support it enjoys in the area. The Providence Journal is one of those newspapers.

On September 19, 1967, it published an editorial endorsing Dickey, reiterating the fact that it is important to all New England and strongly urging its support by all Representatives of the area. In a desire to share this excellent editorial with all my colleagues, and in the hope that some of them may be persuaded to lend me their support, I place this editorial in the RECORD:

NEW HOPE FOR DICKEY

Hope for the buffeted Dickey-Lincoln School public power project in northern Maine is flickering again. The White House itself has taken the lead in gathering supporters of the big dam for another effort at winning approval in the House of Representatives.

Deletion of the modest 1.7 million dollar appropriation for this project from the giant four billion dollar public works bill by the House carried a sad commentary on the state of regional cooperation in New England. The negative vote of 16 New England congressmen of both parties was an example of the kind of regional "split personality" that New England no longer can afford. The region already has fallen behind other sections of the country in economic growth; and long-range forecasts indicate that dramatic measurers will be needed to halt that trend.

The arguments for the Dickey project are straightforward enough. It will provide up to 700,000 kilowatts of "peaking power" that is needed for high demand periods and emergency use—the kind of demand for which

steam plants are uneconomic. It is needed as a "yardstick" against which to measure the performance and rates of privately generated power in an area that has the highest electric rates in the nation. It is an opportunity to get a needed facility for New England with the aid of federal funds which, in the power field, have all gone elsewhere—to the South and the West—in the past.

The private utilities have lobbied Congress hard on this issue. The irony of the split New England position in the House is suggested by the fact that the Dickey appropriation was the only one deleted on the house floor from a huge bill containing projects for all other parts of the country. The argument of the private companies that they can provide the needed power without Dickey would ring less hollowly if the mere threat of the project, plus the abortive proposal to import two million kilowatts of Canadian hydro power, had not already resulted in some voluntary rate reductions.

Nor does the 11th-hour opposition of a Maine conservation group sit well with many supporters who are equally concerned about preservation of natural resources. In fact, to some this opposition smacks of breach of faith because many backers of a St. John River power dam concurred in curtailment of the project in order to preserve the recreational treasure of the tributary Allagash River.

While the Senate can be expected to restore the appropriation that will keep the Dickey project alive, the more conservative cast of the House this year leaves the final outcome still in doubt. House members would be performing a high public service to take their cue from the White House when the report of the conference committee comes back to them for approval. A vote for Dickey will be a vote for progress in New England.

CALL TO CONGRESS FOR ACTION NOW

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, Joseph A. Beirne, president of the Communications Workers of America, and a vice president of the AFL–CIO, recently declared that there is strong public support for stepped up congressional action on housing, education, and employment.

Mr. Beirne based his statement on early reaction all over the Nation to the union's nationwide petition to Congress. He said in an interview on "Labor News Conference," AFL–CIO public service program, heard on the Mutual Broadcasting System, that most Americans seek effective answers to the problems of slums.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that the text of the broadcast interview be reprinted in the RECORD as follows:

[From the Mutual Broadcasting System, "Labor News Conference," Sept. 26, 1967]

CALL TO CONGRESS FOR ACTION NOW

Guest: Joseph A. Beirne, president of the Communications Workers of America, and a vice president of the AFL–CIO.

Panel: Alan Adams, Washington correspondent for Business Week magazine Murray Seeger, economic correspondent for Newsweek magazine.

Moderator: Harry W. Flannery.

FLANNERY. Labor News Conference. Welcome to another edition of Labor News Conference, a public affairs program brought to you by the AFL–CIO. Labor News Conference brings together leading AFL–CIO representatives and ranking members of the press. Today's guest is Joseph A. Beirne, president of the Communications Workers of America, and a vice president of the AFL–CIO.

Early this month, the Communications Workers launched a nationwide drive for petitions calling on Congress to provide jobs, housing and education to meet the needs of the cities. Here to question Mr. Beirne about the progress of the union's petition effort and what it is hoped will be accomplished by it, are Murray Seeger, economic correspondent for Newsweek magazine, and Alan Adams, Washington correspondent for Business Week magazine. Your moderator, Harry W. Flannery.

And now, Mr. Adams, I believe you have the first question.

ADAMS. Mr. Beirne, your union has launched this signature campaign—this petition to Congress—why does your union feel that such a petition is necessary at this time? These issues have been before Congress for some time now.

BEIRNE. Well, for a number of reasons, Mr. Adams.

First and foremost, we are concerned about what is happening in the country. The riots in many cities during the summer pinpointed the neglect of areas in our big cities, as well as the neglect of millions of people throughout the country.

Our concern stems from the reactions that have appeared in Congress—reactions typified by the vote of the House on the original rat extermination bill in July—the reaction in Congress in handling riots by passing, or trying to pass, a law controlling riots—to send people to jail for fomenting them.

And, finally, we believe that a hardening of attitudes is setting in among Americans toward the problems that we have. The hardening would make it impossible for the kind of progress needed in the areas of poverty that actually exist.

So, thinking about ways in which we could affect Congress—ways in which we could go to our own members and have them think about the problems that face us in this nation—we latched upon this method of educating our own members on the need for jobs and housing and education by getting signatures of the public to present to Congress. We hope to thereby persuade Congress to do what I believe, way down deep, most of the American people want to do—the right thing—to solve the problems stemming from our disadvantaged citizens.

SEEGER. Mr. Beirne, what is wrong with Congress? Why did Congress react in such a negative way to the events of this summer? Why has Congress turned down bills like the rat extermination bill?

BEIRNE. Well, my personal opinion, Mr. Seeger, is that they reacted as they did because they had no answers to the problems. And, having no answers, it is quite understandable. Congressmen, I have noticed, perhaps more than any other group of people in America, are apt to react to their own frustrations in a most negative way. Now, most people do that, but I have noticed that Congressmen, because they are in a fish bowl, tend to show their reactions more than others do. Having no answers, and recognizing that something must be done, in their frustration, they howled instead of quietly thinking about the things that might be answers to these problems.

ADAMS. Mr. Beirne, your petition will be circulated throughout most of September. When the signature drive is over, do you think it will reflect that the people's views are really hardening on the subject, or, do you think it will show that they are concerned and want Congress to do something positive in this area?

BEIRNE. Well, we are going out for more than a million signatures. I have every reason to believe that we will succeed in getting many more than a million signatures in some 46 of our 50 states. Many governors have signed our petitions and it is our hope that we can persuade them to accompany our people to Washington to meet with the Congressional delegations of their states. Meeting with the Congressional delegations, we want to talk about the points that are made in the petitions—jobs, for instance—having the federal government become the employer of last resort. In other words, if a person is willing and able to work, but can't find a job in private enterprise, then it is the obligation of society to provide gainful employment at a fair wage for that person. And, we hope to educate the Congress on that point.

Now, we believe that our own members, getting behind this drive and taking the time to tell people what is behind each of these three major items—jobs, housing and education—is an educational process. We have had so many stewards of our union who have enthusiastically gone out to get signatures that we know the educational program works. We already have reports from stewards about some of the resistance they run into. But, when they explain it to the people, they sign the petitions. So, there is no doubt in my mind that our organization, in its own small way, is making a terrific impact with this educational process.

FLANNERY. Do these stewards get only signatures of members of the Communications Workers? You don't have a million members.

BEIRNE. No—they are not limited to just our own membership. There are some 440,000 members of the Communications Workers of America—and there are at least two or three other people in the families of our members. This brings us to more than a million people in the family of the Communications Workers of America. But, we are going beyond our own jurisdiction as a union. We are reaching the public. This is a public problem, so, the members are reaching as many citizens of their communities as they can.

ADAMS. Mr. Beirne, how are these petitions being circulated? Where will the public see them, look them over and, perhaps, sign them?

BEIRNE. Well, it is handled in different ways in various parts of the country. We want to involve as many of our stewards as possible in the program. Very often, they take the petitions to the people in their own neighborhoods.

FLANNERY. Stewards are union officials of some kind?

BEIRNE. Union representatives at the lower echelon of the union structure. They work alongside other members day in and day out. They handle the small problems that arise each day when humans are working together. We have some 60,000 stewards throughout the country. They will be seeing their own neighbors. Many of them belong to clubs of one kind or another and will circulate petitions there. I know of an instance where one of our members, a veteran of Korea, went to his post of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and got the members of that organization to sign the petition. I know that in New York City they have a table on the street. In the first week that they had the table there they got the signatures of thousands of people who took the time to stop and read the big sign that carried our message. After reading it and talking to the person manning the table, they found that they were in agreement with what we were trying to do and signed the petition.

SEEGER. What kind of jobs would you have the government provide, Mr. Beirne? Are we

talking about the old leaf-raking idea of the depression days?

BEIRNE. If all we have to do is rake leaves, then let's rake the leaves. At least our streets and our parks would be clean.

But, there is so much unfinished business that only the federal government can tackle, that you would finally get to leaf-raking, way, way down the lne.

I'll give but a few examples.

Back in the '30's, when the WPA (Works Progress Administration), the PWA (Public Works Administration) and all the other initiated organizations began, great fun was poked at the building of bridges. Everyone remembered the raking of leaves. But, any motorist traveling on our highways, if he would take the time to stop, would see that many of the sturdy bridges in use today were built by the WPA back in 1934 and 1935. Those bridges certainly have served a very useful purpose, and they are there long after the leaf-raking has been forgotten.

But, if it gets to leaf-raking, yes, if this will keep people off the streets, particularly young men and young women. One statistic we ought to burn into our memories is this—for every Negro in poverty there are two whites in poverty. So this is not a race question, although the riots last summer would lead many to believe that everything connected with poverty and disadvantage is a race question. It is not.

Congress is seeking right now to cut into the Appalachia program. Well, there are hundreds of thousands of white citizens whose forebears came to this country early in its life who are absolutely desolate now—people who have absolutely nothing except what comes out of the Appalachia program. They are human beings. They are Americans. They are white. No race is involved. They are of sturdy stock that has been in this country since its founding days. The rest of society in our judgment, owes those human beings the best it can give them. If Congress cuts down on the Appalachia program, the degradation of children would be even worse. This is unthinkable, as far as we are concerned.

ADAMS. Mr. Beirne, jobs, with the government as the employer of last resort, is just one phase of your program. You talk about education and housing. How do these fit into what you feel Congress should do?

BIERNE. Well, take housing. I believe that every person should walk into the slums in our cities—walk into the slums in the countryside—the rural slums—and take a look at the kind of housing many Americans live in. I have heard people come back from visits to other countries, and say they have seen the slums—in Lima, Peru, for example. They were just astounded at the filth. They were just astounded at the way human beings are living at the animal level.

Well, you don't have to go to Peru to see that sort of thing. You can go, here in Washington, D.C. You can go in New York City. You can go in Chicago, in Detroit. You can go in St. Louis. I could name countless cities in which you would find exactly the same conditions—where human beings are living just a short step above the level of animals.

Now, how do you take care of that? Well, there is only one way.

So long as private enterprise, so long as real estate operators look at the almighty dollar and forget that the dollars they are collecting—and many of them welfare dollars—are being collected from people who don't even have four decent walls or a decent roof over their heads—when the private sector will not take the steps needed to clean up these areas—when the cities do not have the money—when the state cannot tax enough to take care of it—then we say that the federal government, working in conjunction with the states and the municipalities and the private sector, has an obligation to take the lead. It is the only organized group in America with the strength and the wealth capable of taking the lead to clean up these slums. If these areas can't be repaired, then get the bulldozers and level them—build the kind of houses that human beings should live in.

Now, that is on housing. It will take a couple of billion dollars to get it going, but I am sure that we have the kind of talent in the private sector that once the federal government took the lead, would come forward with their skills, with their expertise, and with their dollars and make our slums decent places.

On education, we happen to believe that public education is worth fighting for. In the latter part of the last century, many people screamed that if we had public schools, there wouldn't be enough money to send all the children in America to school. Well, that has been proven wrong and we now have required public education, usually, up to the 16th year—about half way through high school, or about 10 years of basic education.

Well, a century has gone by since that was established. We think it is time to re-examine our education policies.

In this age of space, when we are thinking of defenses against China, with missiles that go so fast that the eye can't follow them—when we are thinking of a communications system with but three satellites to connect the entire world in split-second, instantaneous electronic connection—in this kind of age, it is time for us to go beyond the concept that every child up to the age of 16 is entitled to a free public education. It is time for us to ask ourselves, is not every child entitled to a free education from pre-kindergarten to the doctorate degree, if the ability and desire of the person leads to it?

In the Communications Workers of America, we have answered that. We have said yes. Every person is entitled to a free public education from pre-kindergarten through the doctorate degree, with only desire, motivation and ability as the criteria.

Now, we can afford it. And, we will get more back in taxes from people who are equipped to earn more money than we will by piddling around trying to revise an antiquated school system. It needs revision.

SEEGER. Mr. Beirne, the Administration has legislation before Congress covering most of these areas you have been talking about. Are you going to tell your people that these pieces of legislation are what they should be supporting, or, don't these go far enough? What is your feeling about that?

BEIRNE. My feeling is twofold.

First, to go back to my opening remarks, we think there is a hardening in Congress as a result of the riots. There is a frustration that causes them to duck the real hard answers that are self-evident. The hard answers are the three I mentioned. And, most people agree on that.

We hope to unfreeze the approach that Congress has taken. It is so awfully negative.

Now, the bills that are before the Congress in these three areas—and there is no Administration bill that I know of on employment—but on housing and education, yes, they are insufficient. So, we go beyond supporting what the Administration has proposed. We go much beyond that. We need massive action. What is being proposed is just the normal, routine, political approach to problems—keeping the hard economic view as the criteria, rather than the soft human problem. In Roosevelt's day, property rights versus human rights was the big issue of public dialogue. Well, it's back with us. I believe, and always have, that human rights and human needs are the great areas in which our federal government must give leadership. Yes, we go beyond what is being proposed. In one area they haven't urged anything—namely employment—and we think this is a big key.

ADAMS. Well, there is a pragmatic issue that goes along with this, Mr. Beirne. Does your union have a solution to how the bill for these programs is going to be paid by the federal government?

BEIRNE. Yes, this is a very simple thing that gets awfully confused at times. But, to face right up to the answer, you pay all bills through taxes and in no other way. It has always been that way, and it always will be that way, where a group of people get together in their own society and want a government to keep order. And so, we will pay the taxes. It is just that simple.

FLANNERY. Would it save money in the long run?

BEIRNE. Of course it would save money. It has been proven time after time after time, that the greater the opportunity for people to earn higher salaries and better wages, the more money automatically flows into government through taxes, because they are participating in the economy, they are participating in the affairs of the country, they are paying their way.

FLANNERY. Would you also say that if these programs went into effect this year that there wouldn't be any riots next year?

BEIRNE. No, because again, we have to go back, and keep emphasizing so that everybody will understand, that the riots are only an effect. We have to get at the cause of the riots. And the cause of the riots is deprivation. Now, I have lived long enough to know that the federal government is not going to move fast enough to eliminate the utter deprivation that exists in so many of our cities by next year. So, therefore, the possibility of riots has to be looked at squarely. It is there.

SEEGER. We keep hearing from Congressmen the argument that these kinds of programs are butter, when the big bills that we are trying to pay now are for guns in Vietnam. What is your answer to that argument?

BEIRNE. Well, I think we can have butter and bread, and also live up to our international obligations. To me, it is again the question of how much taxes can we afford. The last proposal was a 10 percent surtax, and we certainly can afford a 10 percent surtax. We can afford much more than that. These are the things we have to start taking a look at, so that the critics of America who say we have such a materialistic society, that we have lost our soul, will be proved wrong. In America, it is the spirit of the people who have come together in this country of ours that is the real wealth of the nation.

FLANNERY. Thank you, gentlemen. Today's Labor News Conference guest was Joseph A. Beirne, president of the Communications Workers of America and a vice president of the AFL–CIO. Representing the press were Alan Adams, Washington Correspondent for Business Week magazine, and Murray Seeger, economic correspondent for Newsweek magazine. This is your moderator, Harry W. Flannery, inviting you to listen again next week. Labor News Conference is a public affairs production of the AFL–CIO, produced in cooperation with the Mutual Radio Network.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE IN STARR COUNTY, TEX.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I wish to share with my colleagues a recent report prepared by the Texas Advisory Committee to the U.S. Com-

mission on Civil Rights. The report deals with the administration of justice in Starr County, Tex., as a consequence of the continuing efforts by farmworkers in that area to organize for the purposes of collective bargaining, and wage and fringe benefit guarantees.

The facts as set forth by the Texas Advisory Committee are clear, as well as highly revealing. Hearings conducted in Starr County bear out the charge of repression and brutality by law enforcement personnel. Moreover, it is plain that law enforcement officials are not conducting themselves in an impartial manner.

Are not the days of the company detectives over and done with? It appalls me that American citizens seeking to organize themselves into unions in this year of 1967, are faced with such hostile actions as those displayed in Starr County, Tex. I hope that we will see an end to such activity soon. I am confident that once the public at large is apprized of the facts, they will show an indignation similar to that of a great many of the Members of this House.

I would remind those present, Mr. Speaker, that farmworkers are still not protected by the National Labor Relations Act. This inequity can be corrected by approval by the 90th Congress of H.R. 4769 and S. 8.

The report follows:

[A report prepared by the Texas Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights]

THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE IN STARR COUNTY, TEX.

INTRODUCTION

On May 25–26, a Subcommittee of the Texas Advisory Committee to the United States Commission on Civil Rights held closed meetings at the Starr County Courthouse, Rio Grande City, Texas, to receive information relating to allegations of denials of equal protection of the laws in the administration of justice. These meetings were undertaken in response to requests from the League of United Latin American Citizens; the American G.I. Forum; the United Farm Workers Organizing Committee AFL–CIO; the Texas State AFL–CIO; Texas Advisory Committee members; and interested individuals. All the persons who appeared at the meeting did so voluntarily and their statements were not made under oath.

Members of the Subcommittee present were Garland Smith, attorney, Weslaco; Rafael H. Flores, attorney, McAllen; Albert Armendariz, attorney, El Paso; and Carlos Truan of Corpus Christi. Assisting the Subcommittee in its investigation was Mr. William B. Oliver, Field Representative from the South Field Office of the United States Commission on Civil Rights.

Approximately 30 persons appeared before the Subcommittee to testify and submit sworn statements relating to the administration of justice. Among the persons who appeared were representatives and members of the United Farm Workers Organizing Committee, AFL–CIO (UFWOC); religious groups; private community organizations; attorneys for the unions; growers; attorneys for the growers; the County Attorney; the District Attorney; and individual citizens. Although the Texas Rangers received a written invitation to participate in the meeting, none appeared.

Early in 1966, the UFWOC began a campaign in Starr County to organize persons employed by growers and packers. Since the beginning of this drive, there have been reports alleging sabotage of farm machinery and other reports alleging physical violence. As a result of these allegations, the Starr County law enforcement officials requested the assistance of the Texas Rangers. About the time of the appearance of the Texas Rangers, the Committee began to receive requests to investigate allegations of denials of equal protection of the laws in the administration of justice.

The Texas Advisory Committee has forwarded this report and recommendations to the United States Commission on Civil Rights in Washington, D.C., with a request that they be made public. The Staff Director of the Commission has approved this request.

REPORT

On May 25 and 26, a Subcommittee of the Texas Advisory Committee held closed meetings in Rio Grande City. At these sessions, the Committee received information including sworn statements submitted by members of the United Farm Workers Organizing Committee, AFL–CIO (UFWOC) and other citizens. On the basis of this information, the Committee concluded that members of UFWOC and other citizens active in the organizing campaign have been denied their legal rights in Starr County.

These denials included:

1. Physical and verbal abuse by Texas Rangers and Starr County law enforcement officials;

2. Failure to bring promptly to trial members and union organizers against whom criminal charges have been alleged;

3. Holding of union organizers for many hours before they were released on bond;

4. Arrest of UFWOC members and organizers on the complaints of growers and packers without full investigation of the allegations in the complaints. In contrast, law enforcement officials made full investigations before acting on complaints filed by members and officers of UFWOC;

5. Encouragement of farm workers by Rangers to cross picket lines;

6. Intimidation by law enforcement officers of farm workers taking part in representation elections;

7. Harassment by Rangers of UFWOC members, organizers, and a representative of the Migrant Ministry of the Texas Council of Churches which gave the appearance of being in sympathy with the growers and packers rather than the impartiality usually expected of law enforcement officers.

The majority of the farm workers and members of the Farm Workers Organizing Committee are Mexican Americans. To many Mexicans, the Texas Rangers are a symbol of oppression; their appearance in Starr County only served to aggravate an already tense situation. While the Committee supports fair and objective law enforcement and recognizes the possible need of Starr County law enforcement agencies to seek outside assistance in this situation, it questions whether the Texas Rangers are the appropriate source for such assistance.

The Committee also collected information indicating that many Mexican Nationals who possess alien-resident receipt cards (Green Cards) but who are living in Mexico, are being utilized as a source of labor on farms which are being picketed. Several persons alleged that this practice constitutes a violation of the spirit, if not the letter, of Federal Immigration Law.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the above findings, the Committee recommends to the United States Commission on Civil Rights:

1. That the information received by the Committee be transmitted to the U.S. Department of Justice;

2. That the Commission request the Attorney General of the United States to undertake immediately an investigation of the denial of equal protection of the laws in Starr County; and further, that if the Attorney General's findings corroborate the information obtained by the Committee, the Department of Justice take immediate action to secure injunctive relief in Federal District Court.

3. That the Commission request the U.S. Secretary of State, the U.S. Secretary of Labor, and the U.S. Attorney General, through the Immigration and Naturalization Service, to re-examine the regulations and policies which permit and encourage persons residing in Mexico to cross the border and engage in agricultural labor in the United States on a daily basis to the detriment of citizens or other persons permanently residing in the United States.

4. That the Commission continue its investigation of denials of equal protection of the laws to farm workers in South Texas and other Southwestern states.

The Texas Advisory Committee intends to continue its exploration of the problems affecting farm workers and at an early date will seek meetings with State officials to explore possible remedies to the situations in Starr County and to prevent similar situations from arising elsewhere in the State of Texas.

VIETNAM

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, on Friday night last the President spoke to the Nation from San Antonio, Tex., on the subject of Vietnam. The speech was generally considered to be an effort to allay the mounting doubts of the American people concerning our involvement there. The comments made after the speech by the press and political figures were largely to the effect that nothing new was said, and that not many doubters would be convinced.

I watched and listened to the President as he spoke. I have read his speech in detail. There is one impression that comes through clearly. The President believes, strongly and sincerely, that the course on which he has directed this country is the right course. By whatever path he may have reached this belief, and there are many, he has apparently now so committed himself to it that he cannot draw back.

This is unfortunate for our country, for the Democratic Party, and for President Johnson. I strongly believe that our country has made, and will continue to make, its greatest progress under Democratic leadership. I respect and admire the ability of President Johnson to develop and to achieve new goals for the progress of the American people. But on the issue of Vietnam, I believe that this country has been both wrong in its approach and mistaken in its judgments of success from the beginning. In escalating our commitment to these errors, President Johnson is losing the support of the American people, as well as most of the peoples of the world. And in making clear the sincerity and strength of his commitment to these errors, the Pres-

ident is making it more difficult for his supporters to maintain their opposition to his Vietnam policies without opposing him as a leader and as a candidate for reelection.

The mounting disenchantment of the American people with the administration's Vietnam policy rises from a rapidly growing awareness of its increasing impact on our society—increased taxes, greater casualties, and a deferment of action on many pressing domestic problems—and an increasing awareness of the tenuous grounds on which this impact is justified. The President provided nothing in his speech that would stem this disenchantment.

Thoughtful Americans are today questioning the very assumptions on which our involvement is based, assumptions which the President projects as almost to be taken on faith. Let me discuss briefly the nature of some of these assumptions, stressed repeatedly by the President in San Antonio, and many times before.

He said:

Vietnam is also the scene of a powerful aggression that is spurred by an appetite for conquest.

The American people, and most of the rest of the world, know that the Vietnamese are one people, with an overwhelming desire for national identity, and that they were promised that national identity by the Geneva Conference of 1954. We have collaborated in frustrating that desire because we believed it would result in a Communist-dominated state. But the American people are now asking whether a deep Vietnamese commitment to national unity, which we support in principal throughout the world, can be transformed by the words of the President into "an appetite for conquest" merely because it is led by Communists. The President fails to answer, or even ask, this question.

The President has used the term "moral commitment" to describe American entry into the Vietnam war. Here again the American people, with a profound desire to be guided by morality, are questioning any moral result from this involvement. How can we judge as moral a course which destroys a people we claim to be helping to freedom and democracy? How can it be moral to attempt to convince a people of the rightness of our cause by destroying their villages, corrupting their cultural values, buying their young women, maintaining in power a government with only the most tenuous support of its people, purchasing the support of that government and its supporting elite class by closing our eyes to the most flagrant enrichment of its officers by graft and corruption? Again the President's speech does not answer these questions.

The President attempts in his speech to make the keystone of our involvement the matter of our own security. He says, "But the key to all we have done is our own security." And the American people could be convinced of the worth of our effort if they could see that one point—even if they questioned all other points. But they cannot see how the fate of one-half of a backward Asiatic country can affect the security of the greatest power on earth.

If our security is threatened by the possibility of a neutralist or Communist-leaning South Vietnam, why was it not equally threatened by the militantly Communist North Vietnam? If we are, in fact, threatened by North Vietnam, why do we not act to destroy North Vietnam and replace its government by a military dictatorship favorable to us, as we are doing in South Vietnam? If the loss of South Vietnam would threaten the stability of Laos, Cambodia, Thailand, Burma, and the rest of Asia and the Pacific, why did not the loss of North Vietnam pose a similar threat?

The fact is that these questions have no satisfactory answer, so they are swept under the table by the President and his spokesmen. Our original support of France in Indochina, and opposition to the nationalist aspirations of that region, was based on our policy of the containment of Russian communism and our fear that the fall of China to communism strengthened the U.S.S.R. We know today that such is not the case. Russia is as threatened by Chinese Communist nationalism as we are, and Vietnamese Communist nationalism is of little aid to Russia. While the facts changed, our policies did not. Instead we created the new specter of Chinese Communist wars of national liberation as the vast, new conspiracy against which to guard. We ignored the fact that wars of national liberation are endemic to mankind, and will flourish wherever a people are repressed. The leadership of such wars may come from a George Washington or a Simon Bolivar, or it may come from a Fidel Castro or a Mao Tse-tung—depending on the course of history. But it will come to every people who see hope for progress only in the violent overthrow of the status quo.

Yet we persist in equating our security as a nation with the repression of revolution, when over most of the world we should be supporting revolution—peaceful, where possible, but revolution nevertheless. Our repeated and stereotyped identification of all revolution as Communist-inspired, and our adherence by our actions to the myth of monolithic communism as the ultimate evil in the world only separates us further from the aspirations of the masses of mankind oppressed by both tyrannical governments and the even worse tyranny of poverty and ignorance.

The true enemy of freedom and democracy is this latter tyranny. The magnitude of this problem can be illustrated simply. If all of Asia were to make economic progress at their present rate for a hundred years they would be further behind the economic level of the United States—assuming that the United States continues to advance at its present rate—than they are today, many times over. If the Asian countries were to progress at twice their present rate of increase in GNP/capita, for a hundred years, their level would still be below what the United States is today. This is the massive fact that overshadows all others in the world today. This is the real threat to the security of the people of the United States. And our insistence on mouthing the cliches of the cold war in the face of this overriding reality is the certain path to our own ultimate loss of that leadership to which we may be entitled by history, and the loss of any security for our people.

The citizens of this country are increasingly aware of this threat to our security, and they look to the President for meaningful answers to these questions. He has neither given the answers nor posed the questions. Instead, he has called the roll of client states whose subservience to our policies we have bought, or pressured, but whose own problems of achieving freedom and democracy, with a few exceptions, remain unsolved, and tried to use their support as justification for our own mistakes. The danger to our children and grandchildren, with which the President and all of us are concerned, is vastly greater in a world of skyrocketing population and decreasing rates of economic progress for the poor nations than from any other possible cause.

The last comment I must make on the President's speech is his repetition of our desire to negotiate, and Hanoi's unwillingness to meet with us. To quote him:

It is Hanoi's choice—not ours, not the world's—that war continues.

To believe such a statement, as I am sure the President does, requires a total conviction of the rightness of our course in Vietnam. It requires a conviction that the National Liberation Front has no legitimacy in representing some of the aspirations of the people of Vietnam, for we have made it clear we will not negotiate with them. It requires a conviction that they should have no voice in the Government of South Vietnam, or any part of it, for we have made it clear that we will not tolerate such a voice. It requires a conviction that the people of South Vietnam are best served by a government of generals, made rich by their willingness to serve first France and then the United States, for we will consider no other government. It requires a conviction that these values are so great as to justify the military devastation of all Vietnam if necessary, for we have made clear our intention to do this rather than negotiate any alternative possibility. And because Hanoi and the National Liberation Front reject these basic conditions underlying our offer to negotiate unconditionally, we place the blame on them for continuation of the war.

I think that the American people increasingly understand the nature of this impasse, and want it resolved by a simple offer by the President to accept any government for South Vietnam in which all the people vote without coercion, and any candidate may run without fear. They have to date received no such affirmation by the President.

Thus the President's speech, while it revealed his own sincere commitment to the course we are following, gave the country little hope for the success of that course—or even a more convincing justification for it.

Perhaps just by coincidence, shortly after the President spoke, two widely read and greatly respected columnists ap-

peared in print with analyses, drastically different from those of the President, of the war in Vietnam and America's role in the world. Joseph Kraft, returning to the United States after 2 months in Vietnam and elsewhere, wrote a column entitled, "We Can't Win in Vietnam." Calling for a halt to the bombing of North Vietnam, Mr. Kraft says, in two key paragraphs:

Then there is the matter of political objectives. Since the President has never spelled these out in detail, the field has been dominated by men in Washington and Saigon who give the impression that the American aim is an anti-Communist South Vietnamese state.

But the other side will negotiate only if there is some prospect that at some time in some way its political objectives can be obtained. Thus, as a further prelude to talks, Washington and Saigon will have to lower their political objectives. They will have to open a channel whereby the insurgents on the other side can re-enter South Vietnamese political life, and maybe even come to power.

In another column, Walter Lippmann, comparing the role and problems of President Johnson and Charles de Gaulle in a philosophical vein, tries to explain the unpopularity of military and diplomatic adventures abroad. He concludes by saying:

France cannot remake Europe and President Johnson cannot remake Asia. They have to remake France and America.

And if this be isolationism, so be it. It is nevertheless an almost universal human sentiment in the world today.

For the benefit of my colleagues, I include the entire Joseph Kraft column and the last portion of the Lippmann column at the conclusion of these remarks.

Mr. Speaker, in these tragic times when no sane man can claim final answers to the problems which confront us, one sometimes fears to speak out at all. Yet this fear has brought us to where we are today. Now is the time to speak out.

WE CAN'T WIN IN VIETNAM—UNITED STATES MUST NEGOTIATE A WAY OUT AND IT WON'T HELP TO PERSONALIZE THE ISSUE AGAINST L. B. J.

(By Joseph Kraft)

Returning to this country after two months in Vietnam and elsewhere, I find one striking change. There has been a dramatic hardening of temper against the President on Vietnam.

What useful purpose this shift of mood can serve is not clear to me. Not that I think the war is going well. On the contrary, I am more than ever convinced that the United States cannot achieve a military victory in Vietnam.

One measure of the outlook is the situation around Danang. For more than two years, that city and its environs have been a base for about 10,000 American Marines. The Marines have been active in the area not only militarily, but equally in civic action programs designed to assert control over the local population.

Still, hardly a night goes by without some small-scale enemy assault on the Marine positions. The attacks generally come from close in—sometimes a mere 1000 yards away. The attackers can come that close only because they have the support of the local population.

This means that our best troops operating in force in not unfavorable terrain over a period of two years have not been able to break up the enemy's local support. At that rate, I do not think the United States will force the other side to fade away for years and years. And thus it seems to me imperative that we negotiate our way out of Vietnam.

But negotiating out, while perhaps possible, is surely not easy. For openers, there has to be a halt in the bombing of North Vietnam. Without it, there will be no talks with the other side.

But would there be talks if the bombing stopped? The President is certain there would not be. Some well-informed officials around the world disagree. But even they acknowledge that to yield talks, a stop in the bombing would have to be managed with great skill—particularly as to timing.

The more so because Hanoi would probably use any bombing pause to rush new supplies to its forces. That would increase the vulnerability of American troops, and cause American commanders, not unnaturally, to demand resumption of bombing.

To forestall these demands, American troops would have to be insulated against whatever advantage the other side might take of a bombing halt. They would have to be less exposed—which, at a minimum, means pulling back from the belly-to-belly encounter along the Demilitarized Zone. But deliberately relinquishing territory is not easy either.

Then there is the matter of political objectives. Since the President has never spelled these out in detail, the field has been dominated by men in Washington and Saigon who give the impression that the American aim is an anti-Communist South Vietnamese state.

But the other side will negotiate only if there is some prospect that at some time in some way its political objectives can be obtained. Thus, as a further prelude to talks, Washington and Saigon will have to lower their political objectives. They will have to open a channel whereby the insurgents on the other side can re-enter South Vietnamese political life, and maybe even come to power.

These are the minimal arrangements which have to be made for negotiations to have a chance. No President would find the course easy to follow; a beleaguered one least of all.

And so, while I think President Johnson has made mistakes, while I think he has been led to exaggerate the strategic importance of Vietnam out of all proportion, it does not seem to me to be helpful to personalize the issue.

The sad truth is that for those of us who favor a political settlement the best hope lies in support of that part of the President's instinct which also seeks to resolve the war by negotiations.

UNLIKELY PAIR BOTH PLAY LOSING GAME

(By Walter Lippmann)

The Gallup polls recently have been bad reading both in the Elysee and in the White House. They are showing that popular confidence cannot be won by actions abroad.

By the traditional standards of power politics, President Johnson has all the material resources needed for a successful diplomatic policy. But, unhappily for us all, he has landed this country in the most serious trouble it has had to face for at least a hundred years. And Gen. de Gaulle, the most prophetic and experienced of living statesmen, has somehow entangled himself in costly and dangerous miscalculations both in Europe and in the Middle East.

One is tempted to say that the traditional game of power politics has become unplayable. For not only in Washington and Paris but also in Moscow, Peking and London, the Foreign Offices and the diplomatists are in trouble. The Soviet Union finds itself vulnerable on its long Asian frontier with China and it has made a humiliating hash of its opportunities and its interests in the Middle East.

Britain is in full retreat from what remains of its empire and also from its pretensions and obligations as a world power. Yet Britain has a long travail ahead of it before it will be able to play a satisfying part in Europe.

The powers who feel that they have duties and ambitions to fulfill abroad seem unable to prevail abroad. The United States has to put up with Castro's Cuba and it is unable to carve an independent South Vietnam out of Indochina. The Soviet Union has to put up with Israel. And Britain and West Germany have to put up with the Russians and the Americans.

A FRIGHTENING REVOLUTION

The frustrations of power politics are reflected everywhere in what is a strong tide of isolationist sentiment. To speak of isolationism in this connection, however, is not to say very much that is illuminating. I venture to think that we can begin to say a little more only when we start with the idea that the people everywhere are very preoccupied with the problems, with the pains and the pleasures, which confront them because they are living in the midst of the most radical revolution in the history of mankind.

This revolution is a transformation of the human environment and of man himself by technological progress which, beginning about two centuries ago, has now acquired enormous momentum. It is changing the way men live, not only their work and their houses, their food and their communications and their pleasures but it is changing also the structure of the human family and the chemistry of the human personality.

These changes are bewildering. They are frightening, and it is no wonder that the masses of mankind are too much absorbed in their own lives to care very much about what happens in some other country.

This experience accounts, I think, for the unpopularity of activity abroad. It is also a cause, perhaps the main cause, for the ineffectiveness and the failures of foreign activity. Nations cannot now be ordered around by coercing their governments or cajoling their governments or bribing their governments. For the masses of the people are too much preoccupied with the problem of living in the modern world to respond to and to think about the abstractions, about foreign ideologies and even of distant national interests.

The game of power politics may again become playable some day if mankind can come to terms with the technological revolution. But this will not be in our time, and what we all have to realize—President Johnson and President de Gaulle and Chairman Kosygin and the rest of us is that the solution of the internal problems of modern living must have priority over foreign affairs.

France cannot remake Europe and President Johnson cannot remake Asia. They have to remake France and America.

And if this be isolationism, so be it. It is nevertheless an almost universal human sentiment in the world today.

INCREASE ASSISTANCE TO HOSPITAL DIPLOMA SCHOOLS OF NURSING

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. TIERNAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce today along with Mr. CORBETT of Pennsylvania an amendment of the Nurses Training Act of 1964, which provides for increased assistance to hospital diploma schools of nursing.

There is no doubt in my mind that with the great shortage of nurses today, we must find a way to assist those schools who are carrying the burden of educating our nurses. With the rising costs of hospital care, and with no relief seen in the near future from even higher costs, I believe we must make this assistance available to our hospital diploma schools of nursing.

It is with great interest and concern that I join Representative FRED ROONEY, Representative CORBETT and many other sponsors of this measure in urging speedy passage of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, without objection, I include as part of my remarks a copy of this legislation:

A bill to amend the Nurse Training Act of 1964 to provide for increased assistance to hospital diploma schools of nursing

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 806 of the Public Helath Service Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 806. (a) In order to prevent further attrition and promote the development of public and nonprofit private diploma schools of nursing, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for the four succeeding years to defray a portion of the cost of training students of nursing.

"(b) From the amounts appropriated pursuant to subsection (a), the Surgeon General shall pay to each public or nonprofit diploma school of nursing for each fiscal year in the five-year period beginning July 1, 1967, an annual grant of $12,000 for a full-time student enrollment of fifty or fewer, $15,000 for a full-time student enrollment of fifty-one to one hundred, $18,000 for a full-time student enrollment of one hundred and one to one hundred and fifty, $21,000 for a full-time student enrollment of one hundred and fifty-one to two hundred, and $24,000 for a full-time student enrollment of two hundred and one or more; an annual grant not to exceed $6,000 on a 50 per centum-50 per centum matching basis for library resources, and an annual grant of $400 per full-time student. The Surgeon General shall make such amounts available to those diploma schools of nursing as approved by the appropriate State agency.

"(c) For the purposes of this section, a diploma school of nursing shall be deemed accredited upon approval by the appropriate State agency recognized by the Surgeon General.

"(d) That an annual grant of such sums as may be necessary on a 75 per centum-25 per centum Federal-State matching basis be made toward the establishment and operation of a State comprehensive planning committee for nursing education. Such committee shall be appointed by the appropriate officer of each State and its membership shall include equal representation from baccalaureate associate degree and diploma schools of nursing. Such committee should develop a State master plan for nursing education which includes consideration of the following objectives:

"1. avoid costly duplication of programs;

"2. insure strategic location of new, expanding programs;

"3. create and maintain balance among various kinds of educational programs;

"4. provide a balanced supply of all kinds of nurses needed;

"5. determine statewide needs for nursing personnel of all kind on a succession of target dates;

"6. plan an educational system which will provide the needed personnel, with specific recommendations about individual institutions and their capacities;

"7. recommend the means of attracting students and sources of financial support for capital and operating expenses of programs;

"8. maintain continued planning and evaluation of progress.

"(e) For the purpose of this section, the full-time enrollment in any school shall be determined as of February 15 of each fiscal year."

WAR ON POVERTY

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. TIERNAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, added evidence of the growing support for the war on poverty was expressed last week in an editorial of the Westerly Sun of Westerly, R.I.

Two statements in this editorial from a conservative, Republican-oriented newspaper stand out significantly. I quote from the first sentence of the editorial:

Despite the blasts of critics, the War on Poverty must be doing something right.

The second comment in the editorial that drew my attention is—

There is also negative evidence encouraging to the War on Poverty. In the 32 cities that did experience riots, only 16 of the more than 30,000 CAA employees in those cities were arrested for taking part in it.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is telling evidence of the merit and worth of OEO and all of the many community action programs. I do not think we in the House of Representatives can afford to discourage or to disappoint those people who are to benefit by these programs. I also think we cannot afford to deny the many local officials this valuable right hand.

Without objection, I ask for inclusion of this editorial in the RECORD:

[From the Westerly (R.I.) Sun, Sept. 28, 1967]

GAINS IN WAR ON POVERTY

Despite the blasts of critics, the War on Poverty must be doing something right.

In 32 cities in which there were no riots or civil disorders this summer, most of the local authorities credited the summer programs of the Office of Economic Opportunity for helping to prevent violence.

This is what they told the OEO in a nationwide survey in which OEO inspectors talked to mayors, police chiefs, juvenile judges, heads of local Chambers of Commerce and other leading citizens.

Not one police chief or mayor blamed War on Poverty programs for heightening tensions, and in 15 cities, local Community Action Agencies were praised for calming down bad situations in specific instances.

In 14 cities, municipal police departments and CAAs had joint programs to prevent riots. In eight cities, the juvenile arrest rate went down this summer as a result, it is believed, of increased availability of summer jobs.

There is also negative evidence encouraging to the War on Poverty:

In the 32 cities that did experience riots, only 16 of the more than 30,000 CAA employes in those cities were arrested for taking part in them.

More than $300 million worth of property damage was done in riot cities, says the OEO, yet not one of its 244 buildings in the riot areas was burned or destroyed.

Total damage to Community Action buildings was $1,840 for seven sets of broken windows.

URBAN POVERTY

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. TIERNAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, last Monday, September 25, Mayor Joseph A. Doorley, Jr., of Providence, R.I., in a prepared statement pinpointed the failure of the Republican Party to act constructively in the matter of urban poverty.

I have wondered for some time as to the reason why Republican Governors who favor such urban programs as model cities, rent supplements, and the war on poverty, do not make an extra effort to influence some of the Republican Members of the House who represent their States. I am beginning to feel that, in truth, the Republican Governors are more interested in making political hay at the expense of worthwhile Federal programs rather than undertake an effort to persuade their fellow Republicans in the House to see beyond the 1968 elections:

Mayor Doorley says, and I quote:

It is ironic that Republican Governors have so little influence over their congressional representatives. It is also ironic the Republican Party, which only last August called for more aid to eliminate urban poverty, now one month later is about to destroy the hope and aspiration of all the nation's ghetto dwellers.

Mr. Speaker, Mayor Doorley's comments are well timed and speak eloquently of the hypocrisy that is involved in this situation.

Without objection, I include this editorial from the Providence Evening Bulletin in the RECORD:

DOORLEY SLAPS CONGRESS GOP ON POVERTY

Mayor Joseph A. Doorley Jr. sharply criticized congressional Republicans today for their opposition to antipoverty legislation now before Congress.

The mayor said in a prepared statement news reports indicated the administration-sponsored bill now in the House is in trouble because of the Republican opposition.

He said this is "ironic" in the light of a recent statement by the policy committee of the Republican Governors' Conference that the federal government had failed to allot sufficient funds for its programs dealing with urban poverty.

"It is ironic the Republican governors have so little influence over their congressional representatives," the mayor's statement said. "It is also ironic the Republican Party, which

only last August called for more aid to eliminate urban poverty, now one month later is about to destroy the hope and aspiration of all the nation's ghetto dwellers.

"The politically motivated utterances of the governors' policy committee show clearly the Republicans are more interested in developing a national candidate than they are in helping the impoverished people of the nation's cities.

Mr. Doorley said Providence has one of the most comprehensive poverty programs in the country. He called on the residents of this and other cities to "marshal their resources" against the Republicans.

The Doorley statement came in response to a report from Washington which said an effort in the House education and labor committee to reach bipartisan agreement on a bill had failed, jeopardizing the bill's chances of passage in the House.

"If we can't go on the floor with a bipartisan support, we can't pass a bill," one of the Democratic members said. Actually, observers believe Republican opposition to the bill is so intense the GOP may not support the bill even if Republican members of the committee do.

FORMER U.S. SENATOR CLARENCE C. DILL

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. FOLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to a recent speech by a very distinguished citizen of the State of Washington, former U.S. Senator Clarence C. Dill.

The occasion of his remarks was the 40th anniversary of a luncheon at Saddle Mountain in the Columbia Basin, where pioneers of another era made the plans which later resulted in development of the mighty Columbia River for power and irrigation.

Senator Dill is truly an amazing man and he played a key role in the efforts to launch the development of the Pacific Northwest's water resources.

A native of Ohio, he received his law degree at Ohio Wesleyan University in 1907. After working briefly as a newspaper reporter in Cleveland and as a teacher in Dubuque, Iowa, he came to Spokane, Wash., in 1909 and began the practice of law there in 1910.

His long career in public service began in the following year when he became a deputy prosecuting attorney for Spokane County. He then served in 1913 as private secretary to Gov. Ernest Lister, of Washington, but resigned after a few months to return to Spokane to run for Congress.

When he was elected in 1914 he was the first Congressman to represent the Fifth District which had just been created and he was the first Democrat to be elected to the House from the State of Washington. He served in the 64th and 65th Congresses. He was the youngest Member of the House at the time.

Mr. Speaker, it was more than 50 years ago that this outstanding American represented the same district that I now have the honor to represent.

When his second term expired, he returned to the practice of law. He was elected to the Senate in 1922 and served with distinction for two terms.

Senator Dill served on a special committee which in 1924 investigated the leasing of naval oil reserves.

The Senator was the coauthor of the Dill-White Act, passed in 1927, which established Federal regulation of the radio industry. He also sponsored a 1934 law which established the Federal Communications Commission.

In his Senate career, he ranks in stature with such progressives as Robert LaFollette and Burton K. Wheeler.

Senator Dill's greatest achievement, in the memories of the people of the Pacific Northwest, was his effort in personally persuading President Franklin D. Roosevelt to have the Public Works Administration allocate $63 million to build Grand Coulee Dam on the Columbia River.

Low cost power from Grand Coulee and Bonneville Dam, downstream on the Columbia, made it possible to develop the aluminum and atomic products industries in the Pacific Northwest during World War II.

Grand Coulee Dam, for which Senator Dill did so much to get started, is now being enlarged with the addition of a third powerhouse that will boost its generating capability from the present 2 million kilowatts to 9.2 million kilowatts. It was my privilege to sponsor legislation in the 89th Congress to authorize the third powerhouse.

Senator Dill has continued his active role in public affairs since his retirement from the Senate. He served on the Washington State Columbia Basin Commission from 1945 to 1948 and was a special assistant to the U.S. Attorney General from 1946 to 1953.

He is widely acclaimed for his abilities as an orator and he regularly receives more invitations to speak than he is able to accept.

Senator Dill continues in the active practice of law in Spokane. His keen mind, vigor, and enthusiasm surpasses that of men half his age.

Mr. Speaker, with this preface I include in the RECORD the text of Senator Dill's address at the Saddle Mountain Luncheon on September 23, 1967:

THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF SADDLE MOUNTAIN LUNCHEON, SADDLE MOUNTAIN, SEPTEMBER 23, 1967

(By Clarence C. Dill)

A nation or a community without an anniversary is a nation or a community without a history or a heart. The people of the Columbia Basin area have both a history and a heart, and we meet today to celebrate the results of the struggle which this anniversary commemorates.

It is a historic fact also that a nation or a community advances as it develops and uses the resources with which Providence has endowed it. Providence blessed the Pacific Northwest and especially this Columbia Basin area, with oceans of sunshine, vast areas of level land whose soil is super rich and most of all, with the great Columbia River carrying an abundance of clear, unpolluted water from the ice fields of Canada and Glacier National Park, over a rock bottom for nearly all its course.

Those are the resources which Nature provided. The white settlers, and especially their children and grandchildren, with the immigrants from the East and South, who came during the first years of the 20th century, were dreamers and planners. They conceived plans to bring an abundance of water to those vast areas of level dry lands. They planned to change the literally millions of acres of sage brush and sand into God's own gardens with flourishing fruits and unbelievably large production of grains and vegetables. They also dreamed of the great Grand Coulee dam, not only to furnish the necessary water, but also to provide the lowest cost electric power in the world which would bring a great industrial empire along with the agricultural production to the whole Northwest. Those were the people who greeted the 24-man delegation of Congressmen and Senators from Washington, D.C. to inspect the proposed project forty years ago.

It is not my purpose today to review the struggle of forty years ago of the supporters of the so-called gravity plan to bring water from the Pend Oreille Lake, 140 miles away, and the supporters of the pumping plan to build a dam at Grand Coulee which would furnish both unlimited amounts of water and millions of kilowatts of the lowest cost power in the nation.

I was the prime target in public life in this state forty years ago of the Spokesman-Review, the Washington Water Power Company, and allied chambers of commerce and private power companies, but I am thankful I learned long ago never to burden myself with the memories of abuse and misrepresentation in political contests. Hate is a greater burden to the consignor than to the consignee. A man who fights must carry scars and those scars may serve as momentoes of contests lost or won. In this contest they can remind me of the great victory we all won.

Time gives perspective and looking backward I have often thought that probably the fierce opposition of those who opposed the building of Grand Coulee dam was in fact a blessing in disguise because it made the supporters of Grand Coulee work the harder to win. Suffice it to say that the Spokesman-Review, the Chambers of Commerce and those allied with them not only joined in supporting the final drive to have the dam built under Mr. Roosevelt's leadership, but they, private power companies most of all, have profited rather than lost by the miraculous development of the Columbia River.

Returning now to those who provided the luncheon in 1927, they set a table with food and drink here on Saddle Mountain so the Congressional delegation would see thousands of arid acres from this point. Had our dreams of those days not come true, we would not celebrate here today. Men do not celebrate failures. But we did not fail. We persisted and persisted until we found a Moses in the person of Franklin D. Roosevelt, the president who dared to start the great Grand Coulee dam as a work project with WPA money, without waiting for specific authorization by Congress.

As I listen to this program today describing and depicting the way of life in this region before the water came, we enjoy being reminded of the good old days, but should all realize that the best thing about them is, they're gone. Now my memory recalls the leaders who contributed their time, energy and real money to carry forward the struggle that brought Grand Coulee dam the use of which already amazes the nation and best of all opens the door to the unlimited possibilities of the future.

If those who have gone before can look back and know what happens after they are gone, I'm sure the spirits of Rufus Woods, Billy Clapp, Gale Mathews, Nat Washington, Sr. and the thousands of others they induced to help carry on the fight are looking down upon this scene and rejoicing in the skies. They not only celebrate with us, but are no doubt urging us on to enlarge and improve

the way of life for all the people of the Pacific Northwest.

We still have with us one of that galaxy of leaders, Frank T. Bell, who is here today. He was my secretary in Washington, D.C. He always urged me on to fight continuously for Grand Coulee dam. He defied its opponents and enthused its supporters. I say to you, he did more to help originate and agitate for this great project than any man still living in the Columbia Basin today.

Forty years ago two plans were proposed to bring water to these dry lands. One by gravity and one by pumping. The gravity plan was to bring water by 140 miles of canals from Pend Oreille lake in northern Idaho. We all know now the gravity plan could not have supplied the water needed for this vast project. The dam at Albeni Falls would have impounded only one million acre feet of water. Today, with only 420,000 acres of land under irrigation, the Columbia River is furnishing 2,150,000 acre feet. Each acre of dry land requires five acre feet of water. Thus the gravity plan to bring only one million acre feet would have supplied a total of two hundred thousand acres. How puny and insufficient that seems now. It would have irrigated only one-tenth of the two million acres that will some day be furnished with water from the Columbia River. That two million acres will require at least ten million acre feet for irrigation.

Yet we should not be too scornful of those who worked for the gravity plan simply because they had no conception of the amount of water that would be needed. None of us who then supported the Grand Coulee plan, had even the faintest conception of what the furnishing of low cost power would mean to this region. The use of atomic energy had not even been imagined then. Nobody could foresee a president who would dare to start the great dam without specific authorization by Congress. By so doing, Roosevelt saved at least three or four years in starting the dam Congress would probably have consumed arguing over its authorization. Saving that amount of time enabled the government to provide power for the atomic plant at Hanford in time to produce plutonium, the explosive part of the bomb that was dropped on Hiroshima and ended the war. Nowhere else on earth could plutonium have been produced then. Not only that, but it made available large amounts of low cost electricity soon enough to bring the great aluminum plants to the Northwest to produce the aluminum for one third of the airplanes used in the war. When the war was over, private corporations bought and enlarged them and other aluminum plants were built. We could not foresee that this low cost power would bring the great Boeing airplane factories, the largest in the world, and many other manufacturing plants. This low cost power has made possible the distribution of electricity by REAs and PUDs, so that 98% of the farm population of the Northwest is using power furnished by the Bonneville Power Administration.

Our people and our business organizations of every kind have become extremely power minded. Although we have built ten more dams on the Columbia River since Grand Coulee and are storing the flood waters of Canada, the Bonneville Power Administration is now planning five immense atomic energy plants to supply the power that will be needed five to ten years from now. This increased demand for power in the Pacific Northwest has no counterpart in any similar sized area in the world.

It was a rare privilege for me to have had a part in helping to start this great development. I am forever indebted to the people of the state of Washington that they sent me to the United States Senate at the time when the door of opportunity opened and I walked through it, as it were, to present the proposal to Franklin D. Roosevelt, the greatest builder the world has ever known. The Grand Coulee dam is only one of the great material projects he caused to be constructed in all parts of the United States. He did even greater service by the laws he led Congress to enact that created a new world for the plain people of the nation. The guarantee of bank deposits, social security, and old age pension, are institutions which he induced Congress to establish and which revolutionized not only the lives of those then living, but of generations yet unborn.

Those of us who were here forty years ago at the luncheon that marked the high point of the struggle to win Grand Coulee dam, can proudly say, "We were there."

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S INITIATIVE TO INVOLVE PRIVATE INDUSTRY IN JOB RETRAINING IS TO BE COMMENDED

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, today President Johnson has taken another important step to involve private enterprise in the work of helping to cure the Nation's stubborn domestic problems.

The White House has announced a major test program to mobilize the resources of private industry and the Federal Government to help find jobs and provide training for thousands of unemployed Americans.

This new program, using existing resources and available funds, will provide new job training opportunities for the unemployed in plants that will be established in or near areas of concentrated unemployment. The program will also encourage new enterprises combining the resources of large and small businesses working together to provide jobs and jobs training opportunities for the disadvantaged.

To coordinate the efforts of the Federal Government the Secretary of Labor has appointed an outstanding American businessman, Mr. William E. Zisch of Aerojet Corp.

The Federal involvement in this program will include SBA loan guarantees for leases by small business; EDA funds for planning and technical assistance; maximum use of surplus lands, factories, and equipment; HEW health and education funds; and Transportation demonstration projects like the pioneering program in Watts.

This test program will involve five cities and two or three rural areas, to be named later.

I believe private industry's willingness to participate in this program stems from the recognition that full employment means a stronger more dynamic economy.

We have growing evidence that American business wants an opportunity to share in building the Nation. Last month, the American insurance industry agreed to commit $1 billion of their funds to invest in jobs and housing in the cities.

A project now underway to use Government surplus lands to fill housing needs will be planned and managed by private developers.

These are very hopeful signs, indeed. For the fact is that Washington cannot go it alone in the massive job of rebuilding American cities or in ridding the Nation of long-term unemployment.

This must be a partnership effort between Government and business. And the record will show that the Johnson administration is doing everything it can to make this partnership bloom and prosper.

Mr. Speaker, under the unanimous-consent request I include a memorandum from President Johnson to the heads of various Federal agencies announcing this new program:

MEMORANDUM, OCTOBER 2, 1967

To: the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, the Administrator of General Services Administration, the Director of Office of Economic Opportunity, the Administrator of Small Business Administration.

We are launching today a major test program to mobilize the resources of private industry and the Federal Government to help find jobs and provide training for thousands of America's hard-core unemployed.

The heart of this new effort is to reach the forgotten, and the neglected—those citizens handicapped by poor health, hampered by inadequate education, hindered by years of discrimination, and by-passed by conventional training programs.

To succeed in this venture will take more than promises or good intentions. It will require—on an unprecedented scale—the concerted action and involvement of the private sector, working closely with the Federal Government.

As we embark on this new course, let us be clear about what is involved: our purpose is not to hand out but to help up, to help provide every American the opportunity for a good job at a good wage.

Our goal is to replace the waste and failure of unemployment with the productivity of meaningful work.

We call upon private industry to join us in tackling one of America's most urgent domestic problems. I have no doubt that the private sector will respond. For we have witnessed in the past few months a remarkable series of events which attests to the dedication of American business in meeting the needs of the society in which it flourishes:

On September 12, 1967, the insurance companies in this country agreed to commit $1 billion of their funds for investments in city core areas to improve housing conditions and to finance job creating enterprises. Some of these resources are already financing promising housing projects and insurance company executives and officials of this Administration are working together to develop other projects.

A project has been launched to use surplus Federal lands to meet the housing needs of our cities in which the efforts of private developers will be the most important single element.

A Committee, headed by Edgar F. Kaiser and composed of distinguished industrialists, bankers, labor leaders and specialists in urban affairs is examining every possible means of encouraging the development of a large-scale efficient construction and rehabilitation industry to reclaim the corroded core of the American city.

Upon the recommendation of the Kaiser

Committee we have begun the "Turnkey Plus" project to encourage private industry not only to develop and build, but also to *manage* public housing.

In this effort, we will again attempt to bring the great resources of the private sector to bear on a critical national problem. Through the great talents and energies of private industry, with full support from the Federal Government, we hope to:

Bring new job training opportunities in existing plants to the hard core unemployed.

Create new jobs and new training opportunities for the seriously disadvantaged in plants which will be established in or near areas of concentrated unemployment.

Encourage new enterprises combining the resources of big and small businesses to provide jobs and job training opportunities for the disadvantaged.

To initiate this effort, the resources of the Departments of Commerce, Defense, Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare, and Housing and Urban Development, the Office of Economic Opportunity, the General Services Administration and the Small Business Administration will be combined to provide maximum assistance and to minimize the added cost of those in private industry willing to assume responsibility for providing training and work opportunities for the seriously disadvantaged.

Initially, nearly $40 million from a wide variety of existing programs will be made available, as will millions of dollars worth of surplus Federal property and excess Federal equipment.

We will offer to private industry:

A full spectrum of aid to assist them in recruiting, counselling, training, and providing health and other needed services to the disadvantaged.

Aid which will enable them to experiment with new ways to overcome the transportation barriers now separating men and women from jobs.

Surplus Federal land, technical assistance and funds to facilitate the construction of new plants in or near areas of concentrated unemployment.

Excess Federal equipment to enable them to train more disadvantaged people.

Assistance to joint enterprises combining the resources of big and small businesses to bring jobs and training opportunities to the disadvantaged.

I have asked the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Labor to direct this test program and insure that all available Federal resources are utilized. The Secretary of Commerce will designate a full-time Special Representative as the single point of contact for private employers participating in this project. The Special Representative will provide employers with one-stop service for the entire Federal Government and will make whatever arrangements are appropriate with the various Federal agencies for all forms of Federal assistance.

The Secretary of Labor will designate a full-time officer in the Manpower Administration to work with the Special Representative of the Secretary of Commerce in connection with the training and employment elements of these projects.

I have also asked the Secretaries of Defense, Health, Education and Welfare, and Housing and Urban Development, the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Administrators of the General Services Administration and the Small Business Administration to assist the Secretaries of Commerce and Labor in this test program and to assign a single official in their agencies who will coordinate their efforts in support of this program.

Provision will be made for continuing liaison with local projects and for careful research and evaluation to crystallize field experience into guidelines for future action.

I have asked the Secretary of Commerce to invite corporations throughout the country to join this new effort to bring meaningful employment to disadvantaged citizens both in existing plants and, where feasible, in new locations near areas of concentrated unemployment.

I have directed each Department and Agency of this Government to give top priority to all phases of this important effort.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

JOB CORPS

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KAZEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, there are still some people in this country who think that the members of the Job Corps are nothing but a bunch of thugs and roughnecks. The slightest wrongdoing on the part of a Job Corps man is cited as absolute proof that the entire program should be abolished. The tremendous good that the Job Corps has done is often ignored. Mr. Speaker, can you imagine the headlines we would see if a Job Corps man was killed at one of the centers in a violent struggle? Well, there have been eight of these young men killed in a violent struggle and I think it is time that the Congress and the people are aware of it. These young men were killed in action in Vietnam. There have been several more wounded. They are among the 346 former Job Corps men who have served their country in that distant land.

The Laredo Times recently carried an article about one of these brave young men, Mr. Donald Morris of Plains, Tex., who was killed in June. Donald Morris had been turned down for military service because he was not qualified. He joined the Job Corps and as a result of the training he received, he was able to enlist in the Armed Forces. More than 6,600 of his colleagues have done the same.

Mr. Speaker, in a time when we are presented with the tragic spectacle of young men burning their draft cards and refusing to fight for their country, the knowledge that there are other young men who are willing to work for the privilege to serve their country fills me with pride. It is time we took note of the many Job Corps men who make good instead of the few that do not. At this point I insert the article in the RECORD:

JOB CORPS DORM NAMED FOR CORPSMAN

HUNTSVILLE.—Agriculture Secretary Orville L. Freeman Friday helped dedicate a new Waverly Job Corps dormitory named for a former corpsman who was killed in action in Vietnam.

The dormitory was named for Donald Morris, who was at the Waverly center from November, 1965, to August, 1966.

He was killed last June in Vietnam while attempting to disarm a faulty hand grenade. He was buried in his hometown of Plains, Tex.

"We are here to do the best we can in our small way to recognize his (Morris') courage, patriotism and unselfish devotion to his country," Freeman said.

Morris was originally turned down for military service, so he joined the Job Corps.

Freeman said after his work with the corps, Morris had no difficulty enlisting in the Army.

Freeman told a group of 200 corpsmen the work the Job Corps is doing is not busy work, "but constructive work which will give future enjoyment to hundreds of thousands of Americans."

UNDERSTANDING OF RENT SUPPLEMENTS

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ROONEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the rent supplement program is unique as it proposes to bind private enterprise and the Federal Government in a dynamic partnership to provide housing for low-income families. Private enterprise has responded with enthusiasm to this partnership. Recently, the life insurance industry committed $1 billion to attack the problems of urban slums, most of which will be used in the rent supplement program. When making this announcement Mr. Gilbert Fitzhugh said:

Existing programs offer many opportunities for constructive action. For example, the rent supplement program is probably the area into which we will move most rapidly.

Mr. Speaker, too long we have neglected to provide incentives for private enterprise to invest in solving urban problems. The rent supplement program is designed to provide such incentives. It will reduce Government control over housing construction and management. It will stimulate private investment. And, most important, it will greatly increase our supply of decent housing for low-income families.

Despite these benefits, the House of Representatives failed to support rent supplements. Many people have been unable to comprehend this lack of support. For example, a recent editorial in the Coatesville, Pa., Record noted:

There are times when Congressional economizing leaves us puzzled and disturbed. The action of the House in refusing to approve any funds for the rent supplement program for fiscal year 1968 is a good example. One can only conclude that the legislators didn't understand the program, or that they didn't think through the alternatives to it.

Since I believe that the Coatesville Record editorial clearly and concisely sets forth the benefits of the rent supplement program, I would like to share it with my colleagues by placing it in the RECORD at this point:

COSTLY ECONOMIZING

There are times when Congressional economizing leaves us puzzled and disturbed. The action of the House in refusing to approve any funds for the rent supplement program for fiscal year 1968 is a good example. One can only conclude that the legislators didn't understand the program, or that they didn't think through the alternatives to it.

Decent housing for low-income families is

an urgent need in nearly every city in the nation. If business can't fill that need, then it logically follows that government will do so, sooner or later.

The fact is that the business community—builders, bankers and brokers—support the rent supplement program. So do mayors, city managers, labor, churches and other organizations. The program has this wide-based support because it represents a working partnership between government and private enterprise. The features of the program are:

It is available for new or rehabilitated housing, privately financed, and privately managed. The property stays on the local tax rolls.

Only the really poor are eligible. Income limits are the same as for public housing, but tenants are not required to move if income rises. The supplement is simply reduced or eliminated.

It tends to reduce government control over housing construction and management.

It stimulates private investment. To date some $500 million in private financing has been triggered by the $32 million of federal funds approved for rent supplement payments.

In short, the program joins public and private resources in a common attack on the program of developing the housing which low-income Americans in cities large and small so badly need.

The Senate should approve the proposed $40 million for the rent supplement program in 1968, and thus give the House a chance to reconsider its earlier action.

Both local and federal tax burdens will benefit in the long run.

RED SOX WIN PENNANT

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, we in this body lead a busy life, caught up with the problems of our country and the world. We do not often take time out to contemplate the truly beautiful and wonderful things in life. I would like now to share with you one of the most delightful things to have happened in many years. It concerns a great American tradition.

The tradition of which I speak is the pennant race, and lest any of the Members of this body were in some isolated area of Antarctica during the past weekend and have not heard the news, let me inform you that the Boston Red Sox won the American League pennant and will play the National League champions in the World Series.

This pennant race was the closest one in the history of the American League. Many of you, especially those who have the honor of representing Detroit, Chicago, and Minnesota, will understand the tension and anxiety that accompanied this close race.

It was so close for so long with only one game in the loss column separating four teams. Three of these teams went to the wire and it was only the last game that decided the whole contest.

And, of course, the reason I am standing here now is that the Boston Red Sox won that game. Now, the competition was fierce this year and all the teams were in fine shape, but I must insist that the best team won.

The last time the Sox had the pennant was in 1946. Last year they finished in ninth place and I am told that the Las Vegas odds were against them 100 to 1. Well, that only served to spur them on to greater heights. In the past two weeks, they vacillated between 1st and 4th place, but they could not be counted out.

But I am not going to go on and tell you things you can read in the sports pages—about 12 and 22 inning games, about 44 home runs or records in RBI's. I would prefer to tell you something about the greater Boston area's reaction to this victory. It was fantastic.

The people in Boston were completely behind this team. They broke the all-time attendance record. There were sell-out crowds with more people than seats and, it seemed, more voices than people.

On Sunday a 12-year-old boy climbed to the top of the time clock. Now those of you who do not know Fenway Park will not understand, but let me assure you, it is incredible—and before Sunday it was impossible. But he did not have a ticket, and like everyone else around, he wanted to see the game.

And what a game to see. It was everybody's hour. Dick Williams did a splendid job, bringing the team from ninth place to the pennant in 1 year. Tom Yawkey—who stood behind the Red Sox through the years—finally had his dreams come true. So did the coaches who put time, energy, lots of hard work and good advice into everything they did. But when you come down to it, there are only nine men out there—and these are the nine best. They put everything they had into it, and they brought home the pennant.

And the people of the Boston area, of all of Massachusetts, were justly appreciative. Fenway Park was covered with people; the team could not get back to the locker room. When I left Boston this morning there was a smile on everyone's face and, more often than not, a piece of Fenway Park in his hand.

There are hundreds of stories about these games and about the men that won yesterday. I will not repeat them. The names of the Red Sox are household words by now—they should be. But this whole season was a team effort: great pitching, great batting, great fielding. The statistics show what a wonderful season it was. There was nothing lacking in this team. They had every component and worked together and worked smoothly.

I am afraid no one less than a poet could describe the beauty of Sunday's game. The score was 5 to 3 and for once in our busy lives there was true beauty and happiness.

But now, Mr. Speaker and colleagues, we must get back to work, to serious business, as we all ceaselessly endeavor to get tickets to the Series.

I would like to share one more part of the Red Sox and their wonderful victory with you. The newest of the great stars of baseball, the greatest major leaguer of today is a young man who sounds and looks like a baseball player should. I would like to include in the RECORD the well-written article in today's Boston Globe, by Harold Kaese. It illustrates one of the reasons the Sox won the pennant!

YAZ CLUTCH STREAK HAS NO PARALLEL

(By Harold Kaese)

Like a rocket that starts from a spark, traces a fiery path into the night until it explodes in a shower of light, the Red Sox have dazzled a nation by winning the American League pennant.

Whoever thought that so modest a vehicle as this team guided by Dick Williams would climb into the baseball sky to deliver streamers of excitement and the incandescent confetti of inspired effort?

"I thought we would finish about 10 games over .500 and in fourth or fifth place," said Tom Yawkey seriously, as his players drenched each other with beer after the climatic 5-to-3 victory over the Minnesota Twins.

But Williams, his manager, quipped, "I said all along we'd finish over .500."

And now for the great anti-climax—the World Series.

No known Red Sox hitter ever had a final two weeks to compare with those the Yaz delivered in the hottest stretch of the American League's hottest pennant race.

The Series can do a lot for Boston, for the Red Sox, for still unidentified heroes who may be lurking in the wings, but what can it do for Jim Lonborg, for Carl Yastrzemski?

Tris Speaker may have done it, or Duffy Lewis, Chick Stahl or some other Red Sox giant of long ago, but Ted Williams didn't, nor Jimmy Foxx, nor Vern Stephens.

As the Sox won eight out of the last 12 games for their eighth pennant, Yaz made 23 hits in 44 times at bat for an average of .523, hit safetly in 11 of the games, drove in 16 runs, scored 14 and hit five homers.

In the two all-or-nothing games against the Twins, he made seven hits in eight times up.

If any player in baseball history—Babe Ruth, Rogers Hornsby, Ty Cobb, Lou Gehrig—ever had a two-week clutch production to equal Yastrzemski's, let the historians bring him forth.

Certainly no other Globe writer has done anything comparable on the athletic field, even though Leonard Fowle and John Ahern have won boat races and Bud Collins owns some tennis trophies.

Of Yastrzemski, Dick Williams said, "I never saw a player have a season like it."

And Rico Petrocelli said, "You'll never know how much he meant to us. We just knew he was going to hit."

And Tom Yawkey said, "At no time has this club ever been close to trading Yastrzemski.

In the Red Sox clubhouse, Yastrzemski wept from joy; in the visiting clubhouse, the Twins wept from Yastrzemski.

On Yawkey's 35 Red Sox teams, he has had few inspirational players. Joe Cronin, Ted Williams, Dom DiMaggio. These men wore the capes of baseball greatness—but none approached Yastrzemski for combining the qualities of baseball proficiency and on-the-field leadership. Baseball is a game in which individual players seldom fire up a lot of other players, but Yastrzemski did it this season.

He did it with his arms, legs and sharp eyes, with his desire, with his optimism and determination. And even though a ball rolled through him for an unearned run Sunday, how fitting it was for him to cut down Bob Allison trying to advance the tying run to second on what looked like a double into the left field corner.

The Red Sox put it together this season, which is why they won, but nobody put it together the way Yaz did, and not many in the annals of baseball ever have.

Strategically, the games with the Twins revolved around that fact that the Red Sox pitched around Harmon Killebrew, whereas the Twins did not pitch around Yastrzemski.

Killebrew got three walks and four hits; Yaz got no walks and seven hits. The Red Sox were careful; the Twins took chances. So today the Red Sox are champions of the American League, as they also were in 1903, 1904, 1912, 1915, 1916, 1918 and 1946.

Now they have a chance to even the score with the Cardinals for the only World Series they have ever lost, and while the Cardinals look like the better team on paper, I would no more bet against Yastrzemski, Lonborg and the Red Sox than I would bet against the United States Marines.

BUREAU OF FEDERAL CREDIT UNIONS CLEARS UP OFFICER BORROWING QUESTION

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, shortly after Public Law 90–44, the so-called Officer Borrowing Act, was signed by President Johnson, the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions issued two interpretations that have been strongly questioned by a number of credit unions.

The act was designed to ease the restrictions placed on the borrowing powers of directors of the supervisory and credit committees of Federal credit unions. Prior to enactment of this law, these individuals could borrow only up to the amount of their unencumbered shares or shares pledged on their behalf. The new law allows these individuals to borrow up to $5,000 without the necessity of pledging their own shares, provided that the other elements of the law, such as adequate collateral, are met.

The Bureau, in analyzing the law, determined that all loans made by officer-borrowers would have to be approved by the board of directors of the credit union. While it is true that it was the intent of the Banking and Currency Committee of the House that Board approval be obtained on most loans, it was never the intention that loans fully secured by the officer-borrower's shares be subject to Board approval, unless the individual credit union felt such approval was necessary. It was felt that such loans could be approved by the normal approval standards of most credit unions. Under this arrangement, a loan is approved by the credit committee or the credit committee may delegate certain lending authority to a loan officer. Such an arrangement would in no way jeopardize the safeguards contained in the officer borrowing legislation since these loans are fully secured by the shares of the borrower. Thus, they are backed by the best possible collateral, and in the event that the borrower defaults, the shares may be impressed for payment of the loan.

The Bureau also determined that any loan made by an officer-borrower in excess of the $5,000 limitation contained in Public Law 90–44 must be fully secured in its entirety by the shares of the borrower or shares pledged on his behalf. This was not the intent of the Banking and Currency Committee and the report on the legislation correctly reflects this intent. Under present law, any loan in excess of $750 must be fully collateralized. However, the law does not require that collateral be only in the form of pledged shares. It may be in the form of stocks and bonds, a chattel mortgage or other acceptable collateral. It was the intention of the committee that loans in excess of $5,000 made by officer-borrowers be collateralized by pledged shares for that amount in excess of $5,000. Thus, a loan for $5,500 to an officer-borrower could be made on the following basis, provided the credit union agreed to such terms: $750 on an unsecured basis—the amount from $750 to $5,000 fully secured by collateral acceptable to the credit union and approved by law and the $500 in excess of $5,000 secured by the unencumbered shares of the officer-borrower on shares pledged on his behalf.

Thus, the law is intended to require that only the amount above $5,000 be secured by the shares of the officer-borrower.

Because of the problems that the Bureau's interpretations have caused, I consulted with the ranking majority member of the Banking Committee, Mr. MULTER, and the ranking minority member Mr. WIDNALL, and on September 19, 1967, I wrote to Mr. J. Deane Gannon, Director of the Board of Federal Credit Unions asking that he restudy the situation. A copy of that letter follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY,
Washington, D.C., September 19, 1967.

Mr. J. DEANE GANNON,
Director, Board of Federal Credit Unions, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GANNON: It has come to my attention that the Bureau, following enactment of the recent credit union officer borrowing legislation, has issued the following regulations in connection with this new law:

1. Officers, directors and members of the supervisory and credit committees must file detailed financial statements and receive Board approval before obtaining a loan if that loan is secured by the shares of the officer-borrower or unencumbered shares pledged on behalf of the officer-borrower.

2. Loans in excess of $5,000 to officer borrowers must be secured in the entire amount of the loan by unencumbered shares of the officer-borrower or shares pledged in his behalf.

Because of the hardship that these two rules would work on credit union officers, and the fact that officer borrowing legislation was designed to ease borrowing provisions for credit union officers, I have consulted with Mr. Multer, the ranking Majority member of the Banking Committee and Mr. Widnall, the ranking Minority member of the Banking Committee, to ascertain their feelings on the Bureau's rulings as they relate to the law.

Both Mr. Multer and Mr. Widnall, as well as myself, are of the belief that the law as amended by the officer borrowing legislation does not provide a basis for the Bureau's rulings. This position is further backed up on Page 3 of the Banking and Currency Committee's report on H.R. 9682 which reads in part:

("H.R. 9682 would continue the present credit union officer borrowing requirements contained in the Federal Credit Union Act. But in addition, H.R. 9682 would allow Federal credit union directors and members of the supervisory and credit union committees to borrow up to $5,000 without the requirement of pledging shares. The requirement that any loan which exceeds $750 shall be fully secured for that portion of the loan in excess of $750 remains unchanged. Such security might be in the form of pledged shares or in other collateral authorized by the Act and the regulations of the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions.")

Thus, the Act is intended to liberalize the borrowing provisions for credit union officers and in no way is designed to make the borrowing provisions more restrictive. In addition, the report makes it clear that collateral for officer borrowing loans may be in the form of pledged shares but this is not a mandatory requirement.

Since Mr. Multer offered the amendments to the bill contained in the credit union officer borrowing section, I have withheld writing this letter until I had an opportunity to discuss the matter in depth with him. He confirms the belief of both Mr. Widnall and myself that his amendments, and the resulting legislation, have been misinterpreted by the Bureau in promulgating the regulations for the legislation.

In light of this, it would be appreciated if the Bureau would restudy its regulations so that they may conform to the spirit of the legislation.

With kindest personal regards,

Sincerely yours,

WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman.

Today I have learned that Mr. Gannon has restudied the Bureau's position and has determined that with regard to officer-borrowing loans that are fully secured by pledged shares, the board of directors of the credit union may, if it desires, delegate the authority to approve such loans to the credit committee of the credit union and the credit union, in turn, may further delegate the authority to approve such loans to a loan officer. It must be remembered that this delegation is only for loans that are fully secured by shares of the officer-borrower or shares pledged on his behalf.

At the same time, Mr. Gannon assures me that he is carefully looking into the other problem, the loans in excess of $5,000. It is my hope that the Bureau will find a solution to this problem in the near future.

I want to commend Mr. Gannon for the expeditious treatment that he gave this important matter, one that affects the officers of every Federal credit union.

WORDS OF PRAISE FOR NORMAN S. PAUL

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, from this floor many words of praise have been spoken. The deeds and accomplishments of great men have been recognized, and their names have been called before the Nation for acclaim.

Today, I would add the name of Norman S. Paul, Under Secretary of the Air Force, who soon will be leaving the Defense Department to return to private life.

Mr. Speaker, Norman Paul has spent more than 20 years in the service of his country. As a Navy officer in World War II, he took part in combat operations in the southwest Pacific. In April 1948, only 2 years out of the University of Virginia Law School, he joined the legal staff of the Economic Cooperation Administration. The Marshall plan was then just beginning to get underway.

In the ECA and in its successor agencies he functioned in a number of administrative positions dealing with military and economic assistance matters in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

Next in the Foreign Operations Administration from 1953 to 1955, he was first the Regional Director for the Near East, Africa, and South Asia and later Deputy Director for Congressional Relations. It was at this time that many of us here in Congress began to know and appreciate this dedicated and able gentleman. And it was in 1955 that he received the William A. Jump Memorial Award presented annually to an employee of the executive branch, 36 years of age or younger, for "exemplary service in public administration."

Recognized as an outstanding manager he was marked for greater responsibilities. For 5 years, from 1955 to 1960, Norman Paul served the Central Intelligence Agency as Legislative Counsel and in other capacities.

Then in January 1961 Secretary of Defense McNamara appointed him Assistant to the Secretary of Defense for Legislative Affairs. Subsequently, he was appointed by President Kennedy in July 1962 to be Assistant Secretary of Defense—Manpower. That position he held until October 1, 1965, the date he became Under Secretary of the Air Force.

Military men and civilians alike in the Air Force are quick to say that the Air Force was indeed fortunate in 1965 to have a man of Mr. Paul's talents and experience appointed as its No. 2 leader backing up Secretary Harold Brown. The years during which they have teamed together have been years of strengthening and improving the Air Force. I know from personal observation and by confirmation from a large number of people in the Pentagon that the combination of Brown and Paul has been one of the best ever to head the Department of the Air Force. Their individual talents complemented and blended to give the Air Force invaluable leadership.

Norman Paul's wise counsel, his astute judgment, his perceptiveness, objectivity, and understanding will be missed by the Air Force staff and his associates in the Office of the Secretary. Those officers and airmen who felt something deeper and more profound about the Air Force after they had met him in Europe, in the United States, and in Vietnam—all over the world—will miss him too. Surely this is one of the greatest rewards of a true public servant—and Norman S. Paul, a man dedicated to the service of his country and his countrymen—is a great and true public servant.

I take this opportunity to wish him well in his future endeavors. I thank him on behalf of the Congress, the people and the Nation for his contributions to U.S. security.

THE UNIVERSITY AND THE COMMUNITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE of Illinois). Under previous order of the House the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, representing, as I do, a district which contains a major university, the University of California at Berkeley, I am deeply interested in the problems of education and the role of the university in the community.

Thus, it was with special interest that I read a recent article in the Berkeley Gazette that deals with the contribution a major university can make to its home city. As Dr. Neil Sullivan, the respected Berkeley superintendent of schools points out, university resources are often not fully drawn upon by the local school systems.

We have been fortunate in Berkeley that the University of California has contributed to university demonstration schools and to the school resource volunteer program. These projects serve both the university and the community.

The vast resources, the manpower and facilities of the universities of our country are, in the main, untapped by surrounding communities. We can no longer assume that the university is removed from the problems of its community environment. We have, in fact, received strong indications from the universities themselves that they reject this insular role.

Dr. Sullivan points out that he feels—

No university in the country has fully utilized its potential for aiding surrounding communities and their schools.

I, therefore, wish to insert Dr. Sullivan's article at this point and urge attention to the specific suggestions he makes for involving universities in the community:

THE ROLE OF A UNIVERSITY IN LOCAL SCHOOL PLANS

(By Neil Sullivan)

A major university in a city can be a major benefit to that city's school system. But there are wide variations in the degree to which universities accept their responsibilities and involve themselves in the life of the surrounding community Since its property is tax exempt, Harvard University, for example, takes its responsibility so seriously that it voluntarily makes a contribution to the city treasury of Cambridge, Massachusetts. Another example is a major midwestern university, standing aloof as the school system of the suburban community in which it is located, wrestled with a major problem in human relationships. In most places the helpfulness of the university in the community and its local school system falls somewhere between these extremes. I know of no case, however, where a university and its surrounding public schools are taking advantage of their potential helpfulness to each other.

Here in Berkeley we have been relatively fortunate in the help our school district has received from the University of California. The presence of that institution in our city has been a distinct and valuable asset to our school district's program. Chancellor Heyns has clearly demonstrated his support for public education and his willingness to help us. Other offices and departments as well as individual members of the university community have likewise made palpable contributions to the public schools of this city. These contributions cover a wide range.

The program of three of our elementary schools is greatly enriched by their designation as "University Demonstration Schools." Each year approximately 155 student teachers from the University (in addition to 57 from other teacher training institutions in the area) participate in our schools. Many members of the University faculty live in Berkeley and have given generously of their time on citizens' committees, and in individual consultation. Some have made valuable contributions as members of the Board of Education. Many special projects sponsored by the University are operated within our schools. Various classes and activities at the University are made available to our high school students who can profit from them.

In addition to the help we receive from faculty members of the University, hundreds of U.C. students donate their time each year to our School Resource Volunteer program. Their volunteer services provide a genuine help to our classroom teachers in enriching the educational opportunity of the boys and girls in our schools.

This description of some of the ways in which our local University assists the public schools serves to indicate that my following remarks are not directed specifically at the University of California. However, I feel that no university in the county has fully utilized its potential for aiding surrounding communities and their schools.

Dr. Harold Howe, Commissioner of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, has taken a strong position in urging universities to become more involved in their surrounding communities. I concur and feel that there are several areas in which this kind of help needs to be expanded.

1. Every major university contains on its staff an unusually high concentration of brains and experience in virtually every field. This brain power should be brought more fully to bear upon the problems faced in local communities. Even in times of no crisis, local community officials can profit by the expertise of the typical university faculty in developing goals and plans for community life.

2. Every major university contains extensive facilities for public meetings. These facilities range from rooms for small, informal discussion groups to space for massive public forums. These facilities, when not being used by University classes, should be made available for conferences and meetings dealing with community problems.

3. The massive research facilities, both human and material, should be used more fully in studying the important questions facing surrounding communities and their schools. In some instances research projects might be carried out by University staff members; in other cases the facilities could be made available to surrounding school districts and other community agencies for use

in research developed by the agency involved.

4. Universities frequently have access to sources of funds that can be used for the benefit of the surrounding communities and schools. This applies both to the research projects and action projects that could be sponsored by the University and operated within the schools. We have several projects of joint sponsorship currently in operation. However, this field should be explored more fully.

5. One of the most vital aids the universities could give to surrounding schools is the training and retraining of teachers. University schools of education regularly turn out teachers who are technically competent in imparting academic subject matter. But much more is required to prepare teachers for their vital role in a racial, intercultural urban center. New teachers need a better understanding of the varied backgrounds of the children they teach.

I wonder how many potentially good teachers have been lost to the profession because their initial baptism into teaching came in an environment for which they were totally unprepared? It is neither fair to the teacher nor to the children to send eager but unsophisticated young teachers into difficult situations before giving them the kind of background necessary to cope with such difficulties. And the problem is not limited to new teachers.

Our profession is so dynamic that methods, skills and attitudes common in one era can be totally inappropriate in another. Even the best of school staffs frequently need retraining.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. MILLER of California (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, on account of official business.

To Mr. CABELL (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, on account of official business.

To Mr. ECKHARDT (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, on account of official business.

To Mr. KUYKENDALL (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for today, on account of illness.

To Mr. PETTIS (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for today, on account of official business.

To Mr. FLYNT (at the request of Mr. BRASCO), for today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mrs. SULLIVAN, for 10 minutes, today; to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. GROSS, for 30 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona, for 45 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. GRAY, for 30 minutes, on October 3.

Mr. FINDLEY (at the request of Mr. POLLOCK), for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. COHELAN (at the request of Mr. UDALL), for 10 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. HOLIFIELD.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. POLLOCK) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ZWACH.

Mr. HUNT.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. UDALL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PUCINSKI.

Mr. JONES of Alabama.

Mr. DANIELS.

Mr. LONG of Maryland.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 602. An act to revise and extend the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, and to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965; and

S.J. Res. 109. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation commemorating 50 years of service to the Nation by the Langley Research Center.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on September 29, 1967, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 13026. An act 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. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, October 3, 1967, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1119. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the District of Columbia Public School Food Services Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1120. A letter from the Secretary, Export-Import Bank of Washington, transmitting a report on the amount of Export-Import Bank insurance and guarantees issued in connection with U.S. exports to Yugoslavia for the month of August 1967, pursuant to title III of the Foreign Assistance and Related Agencies Appropriation Act of 1967, and to the Presidential Determination of February 4, 1964; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1121. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of opportunities for improvement in administration of the contract for operation of the National Center for Atmospheric Research, Boulder, Colo., National Science Foundation; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1122. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of review of inventory accounting systems for aeronautical equipment, Department of the Navy; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1123. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of need for procedures to preclude more than just compensation in acquiring oil interests, Corps of Engineers (Civil Functions), Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1124. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of review of the examination function of the small business investment company program, Small Business Administration; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1125. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 127 of title 28, United States Code, to define more precisely the territory included in the two judicial districts of Virginia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1126. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Richard C. Meckler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1127. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting reports concerning visa petitions approved, according beneficiaries of petitions third preference and sixth preference classification, pursuant to the provisions of section 204(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1128. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966, as amended, to extend the period of time within which the Commission on Marine Science, Engineering, and Resources is to submit its final report and to provide for a fixed expiration date for the National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1129. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report of operations by Federal departments and establishments in connection with the bonding of officers and employees, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1967, pursuant to the provision of 6 U.S.C. 14; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1130. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated August 11, 1967, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a letter report on Pensacola

Bay and Bayou Texar, Pensacola, Fla., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved May 17, 1950, no authorization by Congress recommended as the desired improvements have been accomplished by other interests; to the Committee on Public Works.

1131. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated July 21, 1967, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a letter report on Silver Lake Harbor, N.C., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted June 13, 1956, no authorization by Congress is recommended as the desired improvement has been approved for accomplishment by the Chief of Engineers under the provisions of section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 306. An act to increase the amounts authorized for Indian adult vocational education (Rept. No. 725). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RIVERS: Committee of conference. H.R. 11722. An act to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 726). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 938. Resolution providing for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 853, joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1968, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 727.) Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DENNEY:

H.R. 13249. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to include a definition of food supplements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FOLEY (for himself, Mr. PELLY, Mrs. MAY, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. HICKS, and Mr. MEEDS):

H.R. 13250. A bill to provide for the appointment of additional circuit judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHEN:

H.R. 13251. A bill to authorize the Commissioner of the District of Columbia to enter into and renew reciprocal agreements for police mutual aid on behalf of the District of Columbia with the local governments in the Washington metropolitan area; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 13252. A bill to amend section 8332, title 5, United States Code, to provide for the inclusion in the computation of accredited services of certain periods of service rendered States or instrumentalities of States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 13253. A bill to amend the Nurse Training Act of 1964 to provide for increased assistance to hospital diploma schools of nursing; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 13254. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H.R. 13255. A bill to allow a limited credit against Federal income tax for certain deposits in restricted educational accounts and for expenses of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 13256. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOB WILSON (for himself, Mr. REINECKE, Mr. LIPSCOMB, Mr. GUBSER, Mr. SMITH of California, Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia, and Mr. RHODES of Arizona):

H.R. 13257. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to include a definition of food supplements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 13258. A bill to authorize the Commissioner of the District of Columbia to enter into and renew reciprocal agreements for police mutual aid on behalf of the District of Columbia with the local governments in the Washington metropolitan area; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 13259. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to make it unlawful to assault or kill any member of the armed services engaged in the performance of his official duties while on duty under orders of the President under chapter 15 of title 10 of the United States Code or paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 3500 of title 10 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUDE:

H.R. 13260. A bill to authorize the Commissioner of the District of Columbia to enter into and renew reciprocal agreements for police mutual aid on behalf of the District of Columbia with the local governments in the Washington metropolitan area; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H.R. 13261. A bill to provide for financing the acquisition, construction, alteration, maintenance, operation, and protection of public buildings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 13262. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States to provide that the amount of groundfish imported into the United States shall not exceed the average annual amount thereof imported during 1963 and 1964; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHIPLEY:

H.R. 13263. A bill 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; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TIERNAN (for himself and Mr. CORBETT):

H.R. 13264. A bill to amend the Nurse Training Act of 1964 to provide for increased assistance to hospital diploma schools of nursing; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H.J. Res. 861. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as National School Safety Patrol Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.J. Res. 862. Joint resolution to call upon the President of the United States to promote voluntary neighborhood action crusades by communities to rally law-abiding urban slum dwellers in preventing riots; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina:

H.J. Res. 863. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as National School Safety Patrol Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENNEY:

H. Con. Res. 516. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to certain proposed regulations of the Food and Drug Administration relating to the labeling and content of diet foods and diet supplements; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts:

H. Con. Res. 517. Concurrent resolution requiring appropriate committees of the Congress to consider and report whether further congressional action is desirable in respect to United States policies in Southeast Asia; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 13265. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Orecchia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.R. 13266. A bill for the relief of Mohammad Z. Assadi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 13267. A bill for the relief of Agostino Maggiore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 13268. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Allegra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 13269. A bill for the relief of Byung Il Chang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

165. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Junior Order United American Mechanics, Louisville, Ky., relative to efforts to settle the Vietnamese war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

166. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., relative to distribution of introduced bills; to the Committee on House Administration.

167. Also, petition of the City Council of Orange, Calif., relative to governmental tax sharing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

168. Also, petition of the City Council of Whittier, Calif., relative to a Federal tax-sharing program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

169. Also, petition of City Council of Gardena, Calif., relative to governmental tax sharing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The 100,000th License Issued for Business Radio Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT E. JONES
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 2, 1967

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, a resident of the district I represent has received the 100,000th license in the Business Radio Service and is in Washington today with his wife for appropriate honors. I refer to Mr. Horace W. Hooie, of Rogersville, Ala.

Just a few weeks ago Mr. Hooie became the 100,000th licensee in the Business Radio Service. This means that he is now able to bring the benefits of two-way radio communication to the people that his company, the Hooie Plumbing Co., serves. No longer will a person who calls in for some plumbing work to be done have to wait until the truck comes back to the office in order to be dispatched to his job. Through the use of his two-way radio, Mr. Hooie can now get that message about the new job directly to his truck, wherever it may be, and just as soon as the job it is on is finished, the truck can go on to the next job without making the time-consuming trip back to the office.

This is going to be a great boon to the people in the Rogersville area.

It is also a tribute to Mr. Hooie's acumen as a businessman because the use of two-way radio communication is going to lower his cost of doing business. By being able to be in constant contact with a truck, he will be able to make one truck do the work of two trucks because he will be able to cut down on expensive and unproductive travel time and on the time that the truck is not actually out on a job.

Alabama is a forward-looking State. It is made up of forward-looking businessmen like Mr. Hooie, and I am determined to do everything in my power to help this type of progress. We must not let anything hinder the increased benefits which the growing use of two-way radio communication is bringing to the people of this country.

We must make room for this type of development. The FCC has described this as one of its thorniest problems, because the rapid growth in the use of two-way radio communication has caused a congestion which is bringing this form of communication almost to a standstill in many places and the applications for new transmitters are pouring in at an estimated rate of about 20,000 per month.

We cannot let this type of communication suffer or its advantages be denied to the people of this country. If some form of relief is needed so that forward-looking businessmen will be able to make the greatest possible use of their two-way radios, then the necessary relief must be found. I shall certainly do my best to see that no Federal Government agency is responsible for any delay in finding such a solution.

Again I congratulate Mr. Hooie, in the name of the people of Alabama and the people I represent here in the Congress, on being the 100,000th licensee in the Business Radio Service and on the contribution he will be making to the welfare of the people he serves through use of two-way radio communication.

I do not want to let this occasion pass without also taking the opportunity to congratulate NABER, the National Association of Business and Educational Radio, on the fine work which it has been doing on behalf of two-way radio users throughout this country under the direction of Mr. Val J. Williams, the executive director of NABER. At hearings held by the Select Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives last year, the testimony NABER presented dramatically and vividly showed the need for additional frequency spectrum for two-way radio users. A fine member of that committee who is an outstanding Member of this Congress and of committees on which I serve, Representative JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI, has recalled these hearings on a number of occasions and has forcefully and effectively stated the need of the small businessmen of this country who are two-way radio users for relief in the form of additional frequency spectrum in order that they can better serve their customers who are the people of this country.

NABER has also worked effectively with the FCC and with other radio user organizations toward the solution of this difficult and important problem and I am delighted that this forward looking, active, and productive organization exists to take such an effective role in the work toward this goal.

Textile Trade Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. ZWACH
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 2, 1967

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday of last week, I introduced a bill as a companion measure to H.R. 11578, introduced by the Honorable WILBUR MILLS, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. This bill is known as the Textile Trade Act of 1967.

The bill has the support of both the cotton and the woolen industries as near catastrophe faces both of these basic industries.

While the Sixth Congressional District does not produce any cotton, we do produce a large amount of wool from our farm flocks, and we feed hundreds of thousands of lambs annually. The present wool price, hanging at less than 50 percent of parity, only partially tells the story of the price problems that our producers face.

Most of these lack-of-income problems can be laid at the door of unbridled imports. It is unconscionable that we are asking our farmers to permit and live with higher guaranteed labor costs, higher feed costs, and higher fixed costs all around, and then still ask them to compete equitably with the world with their level of production costs.

I am enclosing a table of the hourly wage rates paid to weavers of some of these countries whose exports are coming into the United States. This table is compiled by the U.S. Department of Commerce, and I believe shows the great unbalance that exists:

Country	*Hourly wage rate*
United States	$2.02
West Germany	.96
Belgium	.80
France	.63
Italy	.55
Spain	.44
Portugal	.19
Netherlands	.75
Colombia	.21
Mexico	.55
Japan	.39
Hong Kong	.29
Singapore	.17
Taiwan	.14

Mr. Speaker, this bill would authorize the President to carry out the intent of the textile program of 1961, which really has never been fully implemented.

I am informed that the woolen textile imports in 1966 into the United States displaced or cost us the loss of 20 million man-days of domestic labor.

In view of the conditions cited above, plus the fact that the conditions generally agreed to by the U.S. representatives at the Kennedy round tariff conference at Geneva, whereby wool and woolen textiles face additional tariff reductions, I believe the passage of this bill to be urgent.

Brothers Decorated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE D. LONG
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 2, 1967

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Capt. Alan L. Caldwell and Sp5c. Terry Caldwell, sons of Mr. and Mrs. Leo J. Caldwell, of Catonsville, Md., have both been decorated for service in Vietnam. Alan, pilot of a C–130 transport plane, was awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross for rescuing a civil engineering team from a Vietcong-held position. Terry, who served with a 1st Infantry Division intelligence unit, was awarded

the Bronze Star Medal for "meritorious achievement" in operations against the Vietcong. I commend these young men on their courage and congratulate their parents for having two outstanding sons.

Tide May Be Turning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. HUNT
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 2, 1967

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, I take the opportunity today to call to the attention of the American people and to the Members of this House a situation that has pervaded this distinguished body over the years until today the voice of Congress has become but a cry in the wilderness. The will of the people has been supplanted by the will of an administration. But Mr. Speaker, I believe that the signs of strain and stress are beginning to show through the maze, the voice of the people is starting to be heard, and this Congress is commencing to regain the responsibilities for its rightful duties.

The following excerpts may serve to emphasize this point and let us hope that we shall be deserving of the people's trust.

Mr. Allan C. Brownfeld, writing in the September 28, 1967, issue of the "Roll Call," observes:

> Power is the essence of politics. Where power lies, is where decisions are made, funds distributed, programs initiated, and important directions set forth. Political men devote their lives to gaining power, and give it up only when compelled to do so either by the force of events or the appearance of an even more persuasive seeker after that same commodity.
>
> To prevent any one man, or group of men, from dominating the United States by acquisition of such power the Constitution made it clear that power was to be diffused and divided. The Founding Fathers did not want to substitute an all powerful executive or all powerful legislature for a despotic king. Thus, the legislature was given certain functions, and the executive was given others.

The Constitution is explicit in its intent of the division of powers, where in article I, section 1 it states:

> All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which consists of a Senate and House of Representatives.

Among those power enumerated in section 8 are the power to lay and collect taxes, regulate commerce with foreign nations, coin money and regulate the value thereof, declare war, and to raise and support armies. In addition, Congress has the exclusive powers to make rules for the Government and regulation of the land and naval forces, provide for calling the militia to execute the laws, and others.

Of particular note in section 8, Congress is entrusted with the power "To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or officer thereof."

Then in article II, section 1, "The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America." In section 3 it is pointed out that "He shall from time to time give to the Congress information of the state of the Union, and recommend to their consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient; (and) he shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed."

As a further measure to insure the balance of power, the President may veto any legislation passed by Congress, but Congress may override this veto by a two-thirds vote of both Houses. The judicial branch, of course, acts to compliment the balance among the three branches.

Mr. Brownfeld continues in his observation that:

> It was a carefully devised system, and as long as the various poles of power remained divided, it worked well. During the course of history we have had weak presidents and strong ones. Andrew Jackson assumed more authority, William Henry Harrison less. Still, the Congress maintained effective control over the areas within its jurisdiction, at least most of the time. In the long run, Congress' will was done.
>
> Today Congress' will is not done. The Congress passes a law, set forths a policy goal, appropriates a sum of money, and is then effectively ignored by the executive and the bureaucracy, which has become a most effective and virtually autonomous fourth branch of government. The Congress is, in fact, scorned by both the executive and the bureaucracy.

To cite the rather effective "management" of Congress and usurpation of Congress legislative initiative by the President, Congress enacted almost two-thirds of the more than 1,000 measures proposed by the administration during its first 3 years in the White House through calendar year 1966. The majority of these not only created new spending authority, but paved the way for programs that Congress will most certainly be asked and influenced to expand by countless billions of dollars annually.

The challenge to Congress could not be more plainly stated than in Mr. Brownfeld's words that:

> If the will of Congress is ignored, this means simply that the will of the people, for whom the Congress speaks, is being effectively thwarted. This is, in no sense, the kind of representative government set forth in the Constitution.

Of course, Congress itself shares in the responsibility for the creation of this situation. As stated by Prof. Hans Morganthau, commenting in particular on the role of Congress in relation to the President in foreign affairs:

> In former times I tried to admonish a number of Presidents to use their enormous power against an obstructionist Congress in order to put American foreign policy on the right course. Today it is necessary to admonish a subservient Congress to make use of its power of criticism, delay, and if necessary even obstruction, in order to prevent pernicious tendencies in American foreign policy to come to fruition. But the Congress today is subservient, to an unprecedented degree, to the power of the Executive.—From Conference Papers, "The Role of the Public in the Formation of American Foreign Policy," University of Illinois, December 3–4, 1965, page 32.

It appears, Mr. Speaker, that the tide may be turning in view of recent actions by this body, and it may just be due to the fact that the voice of the people is making itself heard.

In Praise of Lyndon Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 2, 1967

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, on September 21, 1967, my esteemed colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT], delivered a short but meaningful speech in the House of Representatives.

The speech can be found on page 26378 of the RECORD dated September 21.

Excerpts from Mr. WRIGHT'S speech were printed in the New York Times of Sunday, October 1.

In this time of stress in regard to our foreign policy in Vietnam and in this time of vague and ambiguous criticism of our policy in Vietnam, it is refreshing to have a calm and clear analysis of the unfair and sometimes vicious criticism from the extreme right leveled against the President.

In my opinion, Mr. WRIGHT'S analysis answers the critics in a most appropriate manner.

Under unanimous consent I insert herewith in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the newspaper article entitled "Another Opinion: In Praise of Lyndon Johnson":

ANOTHER OPINION: IN PRAISE OF LYNDON JOHNSON

(The following are excerpts from a speech in the House of Representatives last week by Congressman Jim Wright, Democrat of Texas.)

"Today I want to say a few kind words for the President of the United States—both for the awesome office which has been so aptly described as the world's most 'splendid misery,' and for the extraordinarily hard-working human being who occupies that office.

"Alexander Hamilton once warned of the paramount importance in a republic to guard not only against the government's oppression of its people, but also against the people's abuse of their leaders.

"Just as our elected leadership was never to become lordly and officious, neither was it to be cowering, servile and obsequious. The nation's highest public office was not intended to become a public footmat. And the sacred right to criticize was not a license to vilify.

"History shows that, as a people, we have often taken Hamilton's advice rather badly. It seems, in fact, that our strongest and best Presidents are precisely those for whom we have reserved our bitterest hostility and our rankest abuse. . . .

"Now the hounds of the hunt are baying again. The pack is in full cry. Our quadrennial silly season of organistic overstatement is approaching, and like some weird maso-

chistic cult we find among us those who would turn upon our leader and devour him. . . .

"Let me make it clear that I am not speaking of those people who criticize American policy responsibly and constructively. I am not talking of those who honestly and honorably disagree with the President on matters of opinion.

"I am speaking of those who are forever assailing the President's motives, those who trade on fear and traffic in hatred. I am speaking of those who wallow in the gutter of personal abuse. I am speaking of those who superciliously set themselves above the President and sneer at his works, mistrust his words, belittle his deeds and question his honor.

"I am speaking of some urbane sophisticates who think they have discovered a safe and clever way to abuse the President's personal integrity by inventing a term they call a 'credibility gap' and chattering about it incessantly in the hope that they thus can create a climate of disbelief between the American public and its elected leadership.

"I am speaking of those who gleefully try to embarrass our President internationally by thwarting fulfillment of his international commitments, in the making of which he acted under the Constitution for all of us.

"BEST TRAINED

"Never has a man come to the Presidency better grounded by experience in the intricacies of our Government than Lyndon B. Johnson. Never has a man devoted himself more dutifully to the office or at greater sacrifice of his personal repose. Never has a President worked longer hours or been more deeply dedicated to the fulfillment of his promises. And never has a President kept more of his promises to the people.

"For more than a generation, every American President has spoken hopefully of medical care for the aged, of equalizing educational opportunity, of fairer treatment for the minorities and of preserving our natural heritage. It remained for Lyndon Johnson to transform those dreams into realities.

"And for these efforts, he is rewarded with abuse.

"The white supremacists abuse him for doing more for civil rights than any President in history; and the black power militants castigate him for not having done the impossible, immediately.

"The reactionaries flay him for producing the greatest volume of social legislation in history; and the so-called 'New Left' ridicules him for preserving and honoring the very institutions and processes of our constitutional system which he is sworn to defend.

"FROM ALL SIDES

"The bloodthirsty hawks scorn him for not having completely devastated North Vietnam and risked the outbreak of World War III; while the timid doves abuse him for not having cravenly abandoned an ally in its mortal struggle for freedom.

"One extreme flails at the President for spending too much on Vietnam and too little on domestic programs; and another attacks him for devoting too much to domestic spending and too little to Vietnam. Surely they cannot both be right. Each is too eager to criticize and too reluctant to analyze.

"Any President—and certainly this President—deserves better than this. The very least we owe to any President is a modicum of understanding and an assumption of his good faith. At the very least, our propensities for partisanship and personal abuse should stop at the water's edge. In the counsels of the world, he is our spokesman. If we cannot uphold him, surely we should not undermine him.

"There are, in all of this, two saving graces: while Americans historically have mercilessly abused our strongest and greatest Presidents throughout their terms in office, we seldom fail to reelect them.

"And those whom partisan contemporaries most bitterly vilify, history most firmly vindicates.

"And so it will be, my friends, with Lyndon Baines Johnson."

Federal Meat Inspection Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 2, 1967

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, meat inspection legislation now before Congress seeks to further improve the programs which have helped build meatpacking and processing into an industry with nearly $16 billion in annual gross sales, and which, in turn, provides nearly $13 billion in yearly sales of livestock by American farmers.

The availability of these markets for American livestock, as well as the prosperity and potential for the American food industry, rests on one basic fact—the continued confidence of today's homemaker in the integrity of our meat supply.

To assure that every effort is made to provide the homemaker with the full assurance that the meat she buys for her family is safe and wholesome, a Federal-State partnership must be forged through which the consumer is fully protected, the packing industry continues to prosper, and the producer is assured of an expanding market for his livestock.

H.R. 12144 accomplishes this by two means:

First. It recognizes the role of the States as a vital link in this essential program, and seeks to provide a positive means by which the States can integrate their efforts into a stronger, more unified system of meat inspection.

Second. It proposes much-needed reforms in the present Federal meat inspection system, to close existing loopholes in the 60-year-old Meat Inspection Act, and make it more responsive in the years ahead.

The most serious flaw in the existing Meat Inspection Act is an absence of any provisions for coordinating Federal and State meat inspection efforts. The role of the States is a vital one, since the Federal law applies only to products produced in plants dealing in interstate and foreign commerce. This leaves the States with sole responsibility for meat products in intrastate commerce.

The volume of nonfederally inspected products is significant—approximately 15 percent of commercially slaughtered animals, and about one-fourth of commercially processed meat products. Significant amounts of these meats are sold without any form of Government inspection. The remaining amounts are subject to inspection by State or local governments. Inspection under these programs is generally well below Federal standards, but these products may be intermingled in retail stores with federally inspected products for sale to the public.

Not all States have meat inspection statutes, and the degree of authority, implementation, and effectiveness of State inspection programs vary from State to State in those that do have meat inspection laws. Even greater variation is found between State and local inspection programs, where local inspection exists.

Administrators of State meat inspection programs generally admit that they have had neither the money nor manpower to conduct an intensive, continuous inspection service for both slaughtering and processing operations. State legislators, veterinary associations, industry groups and others have tried repeatedly to obtain meaningful legislation and enforcement.

Nevertheless, the need for stronger, more effective, and more uniform State inspection programs is of critical importance. In the past couple of years, there has been increasing interest among the States to initiate or improve existing programs.

The efforts by the States must be fostered and encouraged by the Federal program if this Nation is to achieve adequate, overall protection of the consumer's meat supply with resulting prosperity for the industry and the producer. By providing legislative authority for meaningful Federal-State cooperation, a uniform framework can be constructed which will provide this essential consumer protection for all citizens regardless of where their meat originates.

The proposed legislation would also update the existing Meat Inspection Act to bring it more in line with the massive technological advancements in the meat industry. The meat inspection program is dealing with problems not conceived by those who drafted the original legislation 60 years ago.

The original Meat Inspection Act is becoming increasingly outmoded in its ability to regulate the modern, aggressive industry as it is today and envisioned in the future. The role of the States is not sufficiently recognized in the existing legislation to encourage their effective contributions to a viable network of coordinated programs. The legislation is urgently needed to close serious loopholes in the Federal meat inspection program.

Yet, the consumer continues to buy her meat with presumed confidence in its wholesomeness. The prosperity of the meatpacking industry and our Nation's livestock producers is greatly dependent upon her continued confidence.

Our responsibility, therefore, is to insure that both Federal and State Governments are provided with the necessary tools and resources to fulfill their responsibilities to protect the consumer in the manner she expects and demands. This proposed legislation will accomplish this purpose.

Congressman Daniels Hails Freedoms Foundation Winner, George Toripow, of Kearny, N.J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 2, 1967

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, last week winners of a special contest sponsored by the Freedoms Foundation, of Valley Forge, Pa., were taken as guests of that organization on a trip to historic sites connected with the establishment of this Nation.

Two members of the student-faculty group were residents of the 14th Congressional District of New Jersey, Mrs. Grace Kelaher, a member of the teaching staff of the Kearny, N.J., school system and a very outstanding eighth grade student at the Lincoln School in Kearny named George Toripow, who lives at 51 Johnston Avenue in Kearny. George, by the way, is a young man who was born in Poland and was selected as a result of both his academic background, leadership, and citizenship. Clearly, he is an example for all young people to emulate.

Mr. Speaker, it is a great source of regret that the press of business here in the House prevented me from being able to have lunch with this fine teacher and this very exemplary young man. However, my legislative assistant, who was with them, reported to me that they were recipients of every courtesy from several Members of the other body, notably the beloved senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], with whom Mrs. Kelaher and George had lunch, the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], as well as the chaplain of the Senate, the Reverend Doctor Frederick Brown Harris. To all of these fine men I would like to extend my personal thanks.

Mr. Speaker, Freedoms Foundation deserves the thanks of this House for this very fine program and, speaking for my constituents involved, I can report that it was a great success.

SENATE

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 3, 1967

(Legislative day of Monday, October 2, 1967)

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

Dr. Ralph John, president, Simpson College, Indianola, Iowa, offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, Thou in whose providence we find the time and substance of life, and before whom the nations rise and fall: Prompted by those who have gone before, and compelled by our own needs, we look to Thee for wisdom and strength sufficient for the demands of this place and age.

Frequently frustrated by the complexities of a world which recurrently defies simplification, and with hearts burdened by the errant impulses of a humanity which has not caught the vision of its common ground in Thy love, we ask Thy guidance for the living of these days. Make us perceptive in appraisal, courageous in advocacy, and above all, committed to Thy will and way. So may we claim our destiny as a nation, and Thy Kingdom, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, October 2, 1967, be approved.

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

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2388) to provide and improve the 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. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, how does the time stand?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time is divided between the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. DIRKSEN. And how much time remains?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. An hour on each side.

The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Missouri on a nongermane subject.

A PROPOSAL LOOKING TOWARD PEACE IN VIETNAM

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, yesterday, for some hours, there was discussion on the Senate floor about the war in Vietnam, with many Senators on both sides of the aisle recommending that the United States cease the part of the war in which this country has definite superiority; but no recommendations with respect to that part in which our superiority is clearly more in question.

In the Washington Post this morning, an editorial entitled "The Lesson of Con Thien" is especially interesting to me because I was in the Con Thien area a few days ago.

The editorial illustrates only too well "the perils and pitfalls and hard disciplines of limited war," now limited to the point where the already heavy casualties to U.S. forces are increasing; limited to the point where the prestige of this country is being affected, all over the world.

Nevertheless, as evidenced yesterday, some are now demanding that the war be still more limited.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. SYMINGTON. I have just returned from a trip to the Far East, Middle East, and Europe, having visited Japan, Hong Kong, South Vietnam, Laos, Thailand, Israel, Greece, Italy, and Great Britain.

A report of findings and conclusions will be made shortly to the chairmen of the Senate Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees. In the meantime, however, one can only view with increased apprehension both the nature and the extent of the current worldwide commitments of the United States.

In Vietnam the pot has boiled over. In other countries where we have binding commitments, however, the water also is becoming very warm indeed.

In this connection, one notes the strange paradox of the brilliant military victory recently achieved by Israel against sophisticated Soviet weaponry nevertheless resulting in a much improved Soviet position in the Middle East; because both the United Arab Republic and Syria were left so weak militarily they can only hope to be rearmed by the Soviet on the latter's terms—said rearmament is proceeding rapidly, to the point where 70 percent of their air equipment losses have now been replaced.

The Soviet position is also improving steadily in the western Mediterranean. Today Algeria is probably the strongest Arab country in their orbit; and if there is any truth in the rumor that General de Gaulle plans to turn over to Algeria the great naval base of Mers el Kebir, the Soviets will obtain further significant leverage in that part of the Mediterranean.

Such a development would, in effect, turn the southern flank of SHAPE; and the original concept of NATO, already heavily damaged in the center by the withdrawal of France, would be weakened still further.

The resources of any country, even those of the United States, are not inexhaustible; and therefore these developments in the Middle East and Europe should also be considered as we in turn consider future policies incident to Vietnam.