Power Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.R. 13344. A bill to insure that public buildings financed with Federal funds are so designed and constructed as to be accessible to the physically handicapped; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HARSHA:

H.R. 13345. A bill arranging for orderly marketing of certain imported articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LLOYD:

H.R. 13346. 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. MINSHALL:

H.R. 13347. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on whole skins of mink, whether or not dressed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 13348. A bill 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; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.J. Res. 875. Joint resolution creating a Federal Committee on Nuclear Development to review and reevaluate the existing civilian nuclear program of the United States; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.J. Res. 876. Joint resolution expressing opposition to vesting title to the ocean floor in the United Nations at this time; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MacGREGOR:

H. Res. 940. Resolution relating to rescission of appropriations for civil supersonic aircraft development; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 13349. A bill for the relief of certain individuals employed by the Department of the Interior as members of the U.S. Park Park Police; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 13350. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jacques Sauvage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 13351. A bill for the relief of Ana Yap-Diangco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 13352. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Albertina Mejia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 13353. A bill for the relief of Dr. Isaac Cohen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13354. A bill for the relief of Capt. Bruce E. Wiita, U.S Air Force; to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr. VAN DEERLIN:

H.R. 13355. A bill for the relief of Aristeo Rodriguez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13356. A bill for the relief of J. Jesus Vasquez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 5, 1967

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m., and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

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

Let us pray:

O God of grace and glory, in whose love and wisdom lies all our help and hope, in these hectic and explosive days may we be strengthened with might and our jaded souls refreshed as Thou dost lead us into green pastures and beside still waters.

By Thine enabling grace may the ruling passions and the deepest desires of those who here are called to serve the entire Nation be worthy for the facing of this hour.

Spirit of purity and grace,
Our weakness pitying see,
O make our hearts Thy dwelling place,
And worthier of Thee.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, October 4, 1967, be dispensed with.

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

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a brief morning hour and that there be a time limitation of 3 minutes on statements.

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

TRANSPORTATION OF MAIL BY SEA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 51, H.R. 3979.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 3979) to amend section 6409(b)(1) of title 39, United States Code, which relates to transportation compensation paid by the Postmaster General.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 578), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

This legislation would remove the statutory ceiling on rates payable ocean vessels of U.S. registry for the transportation of mail. The present legal limit is 80 cents per pound for letters and cards and 8 cents for other mail. Very little letter mail is carried by ship, and since 1954 the Postmaster General has paid on the basis of 8 cents per pound for all mail.

Rates paid are determined, subject to the ceiling, by the Postmaster General. Prior to this year, the maximum rate was greater than the international rate established by the Universal Postal Union Convention. In 1966, the convention established a new rate schedule, the maximum of which is greater than the legal ceiling paid by the Federal Government to U.S. vessels.

The rates now in effect are as follows:

COMPARISON OF RATES PAID BY POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT FOR OCEAN TRANSPORTATION OF INTERNATIONAL MAILS WITH RATES ADOPTED JAN. 1, 1966, BY UPU COUNTRIES FOR SETTLEMENT OF ACCOUNTS IN OCEAN TRANSPORTATION OF INTERNATIONAL MAILS

Miles	Post Office Department rates in cents per pound [39 CFR 94.5(a)]	
	U.S.-flag vessels	Universal Postal Union settlement rate
Up to 300	3.6	2.8
301 to 600	3.6	4.0
601 to 1,000	3.6	4.9
1,001 to 1,500	4.1	5.6
1,501 to 2,000	5.4	6.4
2,001 to 2,500	5.4	7.0
2,501 to 3,000	5.4	7.4
3,001 to 3,500	5.8	7.9
3,501 to 4,000	6.1	8.3
4,001 to 5,000	6.4	8.9
5,001 to 6,000	7.0	9.5
6,001 to 7,000	7.5	10.2
7,001 to 8,000	7.8	10.7
Over 8,000	8.0	11.3

The legal ceiling results in some American ships being paid a lower rate by our Government for mail transportation than they are paid by foreign governments.

Because the maximum rate has been reached for certain long-haul services, no further increase can be made regardless of the justification for such increases.

H.R. 3979 will permit such adjustments by the Postmaster General when evidence indicates that increases are justified.

COST

There is no cost directly attributable to the enactment of this legislation. The Post Office Department has paid an average of $10,867,000 each year for the past 9 years for ocean mail transportation, and the figure for any year has not changed appreciably despite the periodic adjustment of individual haul rates. No increase in cost will occur until rates of compensation are actually adjusted upward by the Postmaster General.

About 76 percent of all payments are made to ships of U.S. registry. There is a legal requirement that the Post Office Department utilize U.S. ships when possible (39 U.S.C. 6104).

Public hearings were held before the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service in the House of Representatives on April 11, 1967.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

PRESERVATION OF SAFETY AND ORDER WITHIN THE U.S. CAPITOL BUILDINGS AND CAPITOL GROUNDS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 558, S. 2310.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2310) to provide more effectively for the regulation of the use of, and for the preservation of safety and order within the U.S. Capitol buildings and the U.S. Capitol Grounds.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. METCALF). Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert:

That (a) the first section of the Act entitled "An Act to define the area of the United States Capitol Grounds, to regulate the use thereof, and for other purposes", approved July 31, 1946 (60 Stat. 718; 40 U.S.C. 193a; D.C. Code 9–118), is amended by—

(1) inserting therein, immediately after the words "book 127, page 8,", the words "including all additions added thereto by law subsequent to June 25, 1946,"; and

(2) striking out the words "as defined on the aforementioned map".

(b) Section 6 of that Act (40 U.S.C. 193f; D.C. Code 9–123) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 6. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person or group of persons—

"(1) Except as authorized by regulations which shall be promulgated by the Capitol Police Board:

"(A) to carry on or have readily accessible to the person of any individual upon the United States Capitol Grounds or within any of the Capitol Buildings any firearm, dangerous weapon, explosive, or incendiary device;

"(B) to discharge any firearm or explosive, to use any dangerous weapon, or to ignite any incendiary device, upon the United States Capitol Grounds or within any of the Capitol Buildings; or

"(C) to transport by any means upon the United States Capitol Grounds or within any of the Capitol Buildings any explosive or incendiary device; or

"(2) Knowingly, with force and violence, to enter or to remain upon the floor of either House of the Congress.

"(b) It shall be unlawful for any person or group of persons willfully—

"(1) to enter or to remain upon the floor of either House of the Congress, to enter or to remain in any cloakroom or lobby adjacent to such floor, or to enter or to remain in the Marble Room of the Senate, unless such person is authorized, pursuant to rules adopted by that House or pursuant to authorization given by that House, to enter or to remain upon such floor or in such cloakroom, lobby, or room;

"(2) to enter or to remain in the gallery of either House of the Congress in violation of rules governing admission to such gallery adopted by that House or pursuant to authorization given by that House;

"(3) to enter or to remain in any room within any of the Capitol Buildings set aside or designated for the use of either House of the Congress or any Member, committee, subcommittee, officer, or employee of the Congress or either House thereof with intent to disrupt the orderly conduct of official business;

"(4) to utter loud, threatening, or abusive language, or to engage in any disorderly or disruptive conduct, at any place upon the United States Capitol Grounds or within any of the Capitol Buildings with intent to impede, disrupt, or disturb the orderly conduct of any session of the Congress or either House thereof, or the orderly conduct within any such building of any hearing before, or any deliberations of, any committee or subcommittee of the Congress or either House thereof;

"(5) to obstruct, or to impede passage through or within, the United States Capitol Grounds or any of the Capitol Buildings; or

"(6) to engage in any act of physical violence upon the United States Capitol Grounds or within any of the Capitol Buildings; or

"(7) to parade, demonstrate, or picket within any of the Capitol Buildings."

"(c) Nothing contained in this section shall forbid any act of any Member of the Congress, or any employee of a Member of the Congress, any officer or employee of the Congress or any committee or subcommittee thereof, or any officer or employee of either House of the Congress or any committee or subcommittee thereof, which is performed in the lawful discharge of his official duties."

(c) Section 8 of that Act (40 U.S.C. 193h; D.C. Code 9–125) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 8. (a) Any violation of section 6(a) of this Act, and any attempt to commit any such violation, shall be a felony punishable by a fine not exceeding $5,000, or imprisonment not exceeding five years, or both.

"(b) Any violation of section 2, 3, 4, 5, 6(b), or (7) of this Act, and any attempt to commit any such violation, shall be a misdemeanor punishable by a fine not exceeding $500, or imprisonment not exceeding six months, or both.

"(c) Violations of this Act, including attempts and conspiracies to commit such violations, shall be prosecuted by the United States Attorney or his assistants in the name of the United States. None of the general laws of the United States and none of the laws of the District of Columbia shall be superseded by any provision of this Act. Where the conduct violating this Act also violates the general laws of the United States or the laws of the District of Columbia, both violations may be joined in a single prosecution. Prosecution for any violation of section 6(a) or for conduct which constitutes a felony under the general laws of the United States or the laws of the District of Columbia shall be in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. All other prosecutions for violations of this Act shall be in the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions. Whenever any person is convicted of a violation of this Act and of the general laws of the United States or the laws of the District of Columbia, in a prosecution under this subsection, the penalty which may be imposed for such violation is the highest penalty authorized by any of the laws for violation of which the defendant is convicted."

(d) Section 16(a) of that Act (40 U.S.C. 193m; D.C. Code 9–132) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 16. (a) As used in this Act—

"(1) The term 'Capitol Buildings' shall be construed to include all buildings or other structures situated upon or located within the boundaries of the United States Capitol Grounds and all subways and enclosed passages connecting two or more of those buildings.

"(2) The term 'firearm' shall have the same meaning as when used in section 1(3) of the Federal Firearms Act (52 Stat. 1252, as amended; 15 U.S.C. 901(3)).

"(3) The term 'dangerous weapon' includes all articles enumerated in section 14(a) of the Act of July 8, 1932 (47 Stat. 654, as amended; D.C. Code 22–3214(a)) and also daggers, dirks, stilettoes, and knives having blades over three inches in length.

"(4) The term 'explosive' shall have the same meaning as when used in section 1(1) of the Act of October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 385, as amended; 50 U.S.C. 121).

(5) The term 'act of physical violence' means any act involving (1) an assault or any other infliction or threat of infliction of death or bodily harm upon any individual, or (2) damage to or destruction of any real property or personal property."

SEC. 2. Section 15 of the Act of July 29, 1892 (27 Stat. 325; 40 U.S.C. 101; D.C. Code 4–120, 22–3111) is amended by deleting "shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $50", and inserting in lieu thereof: "shall be fined not more than $500, or imprisoned not more than six months, or both."

SEC. 3. Prosecutions for violations of the Act of July 31, 1946 (60 Stat. 718; 40 U.S.C. 193a et seq.; D.C. Code 9–118 et seq.) and of section 15 of the Act of July 29, 1892 (27 Stat. 325; D.C. Code 4–120, 22–3111) occurring prior to the enactment of these amendments shall not be affected by these amendments or abated by reason thereof. The provisions of this Act shall be applicable to violations occurring after its enactment.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I call up S. 2310, a bill to amend the present laws on security of the Capitol buildings and Grounds.

Mr. President, in 1892 the Congress passed the law pertaining to the conduct of persons in public buildings and on public grounds within the District of Columbia and in 1946 the Congress passed another law pertaining to the conduct of persons on the Capitol Grounds.

There has been considerable confusion in the courts in recent years as to whether the 1946 law actually applied to the Capitol Building and other buildings on the Capitol Grounds or applied specifically to Capitol Grounds.

In recent months there has been an increasing number of instances in the Capitol Building and in the other Capitol buildings which I thought should be dealt with much more severely than in the past. The old law provides that a simple misdemeanor carry a fine not to exceed $50.

S. 2310 amends the act of 1946 by thoroughly revising section 6 of that act and by making it clear that the offenses enumerated and prohibited therein apply with equal force in the Capitol buildings as well as on the Capitol Grounds.

This bill does not change section 7 of the 1946 act as the witnesses who testified before the committee stated that while no arrests and convictions had ever been made under this act, at the same time it had served a good purpose in deterring mobs and unruly groups before they arrived at or in the Capitol buildings, and I would like to further point out that no peaceful gathering or parade has ever been questioned nor will it be, but that this bill is designed entirely to enforce law and order in the Capitol buildings as well as on the Capitol Grounds.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I send

to the desk a technical amendment to the committee amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the amendment, as follows:

On page 11, strike out line 3 through line 8 and insert in lieu thereof:

"SEC. 2. Section 15 of the Act of July 29, 1892 (27 Stat. 325; 40 U.S.C. 101; D.C. Code 22–3111), is amended by deleting 'shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $50', and inserting in lieu thereof: 'shall be punished according to the laws and regulations within the District of Columbia, or shall be fined not more than $500, or imprisoned not more than six months, or both, whichever is greater.' "

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, section 2 is intended to eliminate the artificial limitation contained in existing law—40 U.S.C. 101; D.C. Code 22–3111—on the penalties for disorderly conduct and injuries to property in public buildings and on public grounds belonging to the United States in the District of Columbia. In many cases involving misdemeanors, the new penalty under amended 40 U.S.C. 101 will be substantially greater than the applicable penalty under other provisions of law. For example, the maximum penalty for disorderly conduct is a fine of $250 or imprisonment for 90 days. D.C. Code 22–1107, 1121. In some cases, however, especially those involving injury to property, the unlawful conduct may constitute a felony under existing law. In such cases, penalties more severe than those under 40 U.S.C. 101, even as amended by H.R. 13178, should be applicable. The amendment proposed herein would make clear that 40 U.S.C. 101 is not intended to limit the imposition of heavier penalties under other laws of the District of Columbia.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, S. 2310, as reported by the Senate Committee on Public Works, under the able leadership of the Senator from North Carolina, Senator JORDAN, is intended to provide proper protection for the legislative process of the Congress and for orderly conduct within the Capitol and the buildings and offices used by the Congress.

The bill, in my view—and I must say that the committee, under the leadership of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], gave very careful attention to this point—protects and secures the constitutional right of the people under the first amendment of the Constitution "peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

The bill also provides penalties for those who willfully or with force and violence obstruct the legislative process. This is necessary and constitutional. The first amendment does not protect anarchy.

The provisions of the bill are directed to the Capitol and the buildings used by the Congress. It does not deal specifically with the Capitol Grounds. I thought it would be well to provide legislation for protection of the Capitol Grounds, because some of the present statutes seem to be inadequate and also constitutionally doubtful. But we dealt with the buildings.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point my separate views which are printed in the report accompanying S. 2310. I hope that these matters will later be considered by our committee.

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

SEPARATE VIEWS OF MR. COOPER

The overwhelming number of the people of our country who visit the Congress with the purpose of making their views known on legislation and other matters within the jurisdiction of the Congress, do so in the spirit of the first amendment to the Constitution. They have the unquestioned right to do so under the first amendment, and under the principle of a free and democratic government. If there are groups whose purpose in coming to the Capitol is to disrupt or attempt to stop the very legislative process required by the Constitution, appropriate and constitutional protection must be provided, as S. 2310 proposes, against such an assertion of anarchy.

Senate bill 2310 directs attention to two principal considerations: It involves the right, at the Capitol of the United States, of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition their Government. And, it deals with the preservation of safety and order upon the U.S. Capitol Grounds and within the Capitol Buildings, including the protection of the proceedings of the Congress from interference and disruption.

With respect to the second issue, the committee bill prohibits upon the Capitol Grounds and within the Capitol Buildings specific acts done with the intent, or which could have the effect, of interfering with or disrupting the legislative process. Such provisions are legal and constitutional, are necessary for the orderly dispatch of the business of Congress, and I strongly support their purpose.

With respect to the first issue, the first amendment to the Constitution states:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

The act of July 31, 1946 (60 Stat. 718), which Senate bill 2310 otherwise amends, contains a section 7 (40 USC 193g), which states:

"SEC. 7. It is forbidden to parade, *stand, or move* in processions or *assemblages* in said United States Capitol Grounds, or to display therein any flag, banner, or device designed or adapted to bring into public notice any party, organization, or movement, except as hereinafter provided in sections 11 and 12 of this Act." [Emphasis supplied.]

Being an absolute prohibition against parades and assemblages on the Capitol Grounds, section 7 negates that mode of exercising the rights of peaceable assembly and petition, and contradicts the guarantee of the first amendment. However, the committee bill as reported contains no reference to section 7 of existing law.

At the public hearing held by the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds, testimony was directed to section 7. In the committee, it was variously proposed that section 7 be repealed, that notice of the intention to parade, demonstrate or picket be required, or that a system of regulation be established—all in my view appropriate and constitutional means of dealing with the issue.

Section 6 of the same act forbids, among other things, the making of any harangue or oration on the Capitol Grounds. In amending section 6, the committee bill properly omits that prohibition and thus repeals it. Despite the fact the committee bill in new section 6 provides for the prohibition of acts which could go beyond the proper limits of first amendment rights, S. 2310 as reported fails to deal with the problems obvious on the face of section 7.

The U.S. district attorney testified that, so far as he knew, no prosecution had ever been brought under section 7. There has never been a final test of section 7 in the courts. Mr. David G. Bress, U.S. district attorney, also stated that he foresaw no problem of enforcement, given the new provisions of the committee bill, if section 7 were repealed or amended.

It is improper in my view for the Congress to rely on a general provision of doubtful constitutionality as a means of preserving order upon the Capitol Grounds, or to give the appearance of doing so. The committee bill itself contains specific and effective prohibitions which are consonant with the rights of assembly and petition.

We have the right and the duty to protect and maintain the ability of Congress to act. We expect that the rights of freedom of speech, of peaceable assembly, and of petition be exercised responsibly and within constitutional limits. But there is no more appropriate place to petition the Government than at the seat of the Federal Government. I do not believe the Congress wants to fence away the first amendment from its front door.

In the committee, I voted to repeal section 7 (40 U.S.C. 193g). I believe it appropriate to repeal or amend the section, especially in view of the much more specific provisions which S. 2310 would make available for the security of the Capitol buildings and Grounds.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, in the Public Works Subcommittee and then in committee, I expressed my views in opposition to this bill S. 2310. Mr. President, I filed individual views. My judgment is the same now as then. I voice no objection whatever to a unanimous-consent request to bring this bill before the Senate for consideration. However, as I am now just as much opposed to the enactment of this amended bill into law as I was in committee, my voice and vote is against its passage.

Mr. President, in opposition to this legislative proposal I maintain it is neither necessary nor desirable. There are already ample laws in the Federal Criminal Code on this subject matter. Frankly, I am of the opinion that enacting new statutes wherein fines up to $5,000 or imprisonment up to 5 years, or both, are provided as penalties is the wrong approach. Personally I believe that punishment, like a shadow, should follow the commission of offenses against our laws. However, we now have ample laws. We do not always have judges with sufficient backbone to enforce them. It seems that when a legislative body has nothing better to do, it creates additional crimes.

I was particularly disappointed that the Senate Committee on Public Works did not repeal section 7 of Public Law 570, the statute which now regulates the

use of the U.S. Capitol Building and Grounds. Section 7 provides:

It is forbidden to parade, stand, or move in processions or assemblages in said United States Capitol Grounds, or to display therein any flag, banner, or device designed or adapted to bring into public notice any party, organization, or movement, except as hereinafter provided in sections 11 and 12 of this Act.

The exceptions set forth in sections 11 and 12 relate to "suitable ceremonies" celebrating occasions of national interest.

As the distinguished junior Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], and I stated in our separate views embodied in the committee report, this provision is clearly in violation of the first amendment to the U.S. Constitution. The first amendment to the Constitution of our country was written on the demand of the men who won the Revolutionary War. Of the first 10 amendments to the Constitution, which we affectionately term the Bill of Rights, certainly the first is the most sacrosanct. It reads as follows:

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble; and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

Under any reasonable interpretation, section 7 runs afoul of the interpretation of the first amendment by the Supreme Court in *Edwards v. South Carolina,* 372 U.S. 229 (1963). Until the Supreme Court spoke in the Edwards case, it was constitutionally permissible for Congress to quarantine itself from the people by forbidding any kind of demonstrations or assemblage on the Capitol Grounds. That is no longer true.

In Edwards against South Carolina, eight members of the U.S. Supreme Court recognized that a demonstration on the driveway in front of the South Carolina statehouse while the legislature was in session was protected by the first amendment. Even though the demonstrators sang songs, cheered, clapped, and stomped, there was no showing there was any interference with the legislature's duties. The Court stated:

The circumstances in this case reflect an exercise of basic constitutional rights in their most pristine and classic form. . . . They peaceably assembled at the site of the State Government and there peaceably expressed their grievances to the citizens of South Carolina, along with the legislative bodies of South Carolina.

The Court went on to say:

We do not review in this case criminal convictions resulting from the even-handed application of a precise and narrowly drawn regulatory statute evincing a legislative judgment that certain specific conduct be limited or proscribed.

It is clear that section 7 of the act of July 31, 1946, does not meet the criteria laid down by the Court. The people do have the right, under the first amendment, to stage peaceful demonstrations on the Capitol Grounds. This is precisely the place where citizens would be expected to petition for a redress of grievances.

The Congress of the United States must not have its work interfered with or unduly disturbed. Therefore, it is proper for Congress to prohibit demonstrations within the Capitol Building itself. On the other hand, Congress should not quarantine itself from contact with the public, so that the people's right to petition is limited to the quiet, sedate channels of congressional mail and committee hearings.

Of course, a narrowly drawn regulatory statute, evincing legislative judgment that certain specific conduct be limited or proscribed, is permissible. It could, for example, reasonably limit the periods during which the Capitol Grounds are open to the public. It could place controls on where people are to march, so they do not unduly burden traffic or access or egress to the Capitol. However, such statutes would be a far cry from the present flat ban against demonstration, picketing, or parades on the Capitol Grounds.

For the Congress to fail to recognize its duty in repealing section 7 would be to follow the example of many State legislatures which have refused to acknowledge Supreme Court decisions declaring various forms of segregation as unconstitutional. For the Congress of the United States to follow such examples by refusing to repeal section 7 is, or should be, unthinkable.

The provisions contained in the pending bill are more than adequate to quell riotous or disorderly behavior or actions which, in fact, interfere with the work of the Congress. I approved of those provisions and so voted in committee.

In addition, I spoke out in the Public Works Committee in favor of striking from this bill the language which included "conspiracies to commit such violations" as punishable under the proposed act. Unfortunately, in conspiracy cases evidence not admissible in other criminal cases by reason of its hearsay character becomes admissible. In my view it is evil to permit the conviction of persons accused of crime on the basis of hearsay evidence.

In his autobiography, a great American trial lawyer, Clarence Darrow, stated his views in the following language:

If there are still any citizens interested in protecting human liberty, let them study the conspiracy laws of the United States. They have grown apace in the last forty years until today no ones liberty is safe. The conspiracy laws magnify misdeameanors into serious felonies. If a boy should steal a dime a small fine should cover the offense—he could not be sent to the penitentiary. But if two boys by agreement should steal a dime both of them could be sent to the penitentiary as conspirators. Not only could they be, but boys are constantly being sent under similar circumstances.

If A is indicted and a conspiracy charged, or even if it is not charged, the State's attorney is allowed to prove what A said to B and what B said to C while the defendant was not present. Then he can prove what C said to D and what D said to E and so on, to the end of the alphabet, and after the letters are used up the State's attorney can resort to figures for so long a stretch as he cares to continue. To make this hearsay or gossip competent, the State's attorney informs the Court that later he will connect it up by showing that the defendant was informed of the various conversations, or that he otherwise had acknowledge of them. Thereupon, the complaisant judge holds that the evidence is admissable, but if it is not connected up it will be stricken out. A week or month may pass by and then a motion is made to strike it out. By that time it is of no consequence whether it is stricken out or not, it had entered the jurors' consciousness with a mess of other matter, and altogether it has made an impression on his mind. What particular thing made the impression, neither the juror or anyone else can know.

He also included the following definition of conspiracy:

Conspiracy—the modern and ancient dragnet for compassing the imprisonment and death whom the ruling class does not like.

Mr. President, while I feel that additional legislation in this area is not really necessary, I can support the bill provided that section 7 of Public Law 570 is repealed. Otherwise, I cannot in good conscience vote for legislation which allows a patently unconstitutional provision to remain on the statute books.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, S. 2310 is a measure that I believe will substantially increase the security of the Capitol buildings and Grounds and, at the same time, provide additional assurance that the work of the Congress can proceed with dignity and order.

We have recently witnessed two disgraceful episodes affecting the work of the Senate. One occurred in this Chamber itself when demonstrators in the gallery dropped leaflets, opposing the war in Vietnam, to the Senate floor. The other took place in a Senate committee room when relief recipients demonstrated against legislative proposals before the committee.

If these occurrences had been allowed to pass without notice or action, more violent demonstrations might well have followed them, for, as I have stated before, I believe these things to be part of a pattern of disorder deliberately calculated to create a crisis in the operations of our Government.

The bill we are about to pass today corrects a serious omission in the previously existing Capitol Grounds Act, which prohibited disorderly, disruptive, or dangerous conduct on the Capitol Grounds but did not prohibit such conduct within the buildings themselves. This situation had been further confused by the fact that the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia had held that the general laws applicable to disorderly conduct in the District did not apply with equal force to the Capitol buildings or Grounds. I am happy to say that that anomaly should now be removed. I am also glad that the penalties for conduct aimed at hampering the work of the Congress will be substantially increased.

Mr. President, breaches of the peace have occurred within the Capitol and adjacent buildings from time to time over the years. But it is the recent increase of such incidents that makes this legislation so necessary.

I congratulate the distinguished majority and minority leaders of this body for their expeditious action in introduc-

ing and bringing this measure to speedy enactment, and I commend the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN] and the Committee on Public Works, of which my esteemed colleague from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] is chairman, for the dispatch with which this matter was handled.

There is no question, of course, of the right of all Americans to give public expression to their views, whatever those views may be. The right to dissent is a legitimate and cherished right. I feel that the committee took this principle into full account, and that this legislation in no way interferes with or infringes upon the guarantees of free speech and expression provided in the Constitution. There are innumerable channels and avenues open to all for expression and for dissent.

What this bill does, in the excellent phrase of the committee report, is to erect new safeguards for "the integrity of the legislative process." It is as important to the future of this Nation to safeguard that right as it is to protect the rights of individuals and groups in their peaceful actions and expressions.

What we have to guard against—and what this legislation is aimed at—is violent action and expression and unlawful interruption of the legislative machinery, by incipient revolutionaries. I believe, Mr. President, that this measure, if properly implemented, will prove an effective deterrent to those who would impede, harrass, or disrupt the Federal legislative processes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill to provide more effectively for the regulation of the use of, and for the preservation of safety and order within, the U.S. Capitol buildings and the U.S. Capitol Grounds, and for other purposes."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

CARROLL BURKS AND THE SHORT LINE ASSOCIATION

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, this *month will* mark the 54th annual meeting of the American Short Line Railroad Association, and the third anniversary in office of its president, Carroll P. Burks.

Short line railroads are an often overlooked but vital part of our rail system. They employ over 32,000, represent an investment estimated to be $1.6 billion, and earned in 1965 over $65 million. These rail lines can only be said to be short in terms of their main line trackage.

Carroll Burks, president of the Short Line Railroad Association, came to that association from my own Pacific Northwest, where he spent 8 years as general superintendent of the Tacoma Municipal Belt Line Railroad. Congratulations are due Carroll for his 3 years of able leadership of the 245-member railroads of the Short Line Association.

I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks an article which appeared on Carroll Burks and the Short Line Association in the September 26, 1966, issue of Railway Age.

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

WHY SHORT LINES ARE AN IMPORTANT SEGMENT OF NATION'S RAIL NETWORK—ASSOCIATION'S PRESIDENT BURKS WILL PRESIDE OVER GROUP'S 53D ANNUAL MEETING IN DENVER THIS WEEK

One place where a roll-call can be entertaining is at a meeting of short line railroads. The names of the companies at such meetings are not well-known, even in railroad circles. But they are, often in the phrase of a trainmaster who has just seen a Camas Prairie gondola, "a glory."

When Carroll P. Burks, president of the American Short Line Railroad Association, calls the group's 53rd annual meeting to order in Denver this week there will be a few old names missing. But there will be present a few new lines with intriguing names, almost enough to offset the short lines that were absorbed by Class I roads, abandoned or shut down in 1965.

MANY DIFFERENT TYPES

Short lines constitute a substantial part of the U.S. railroad plant. But they are little known except to professional short line operators and an occasional railfan with a taste for reading the fine type in Interstate Commerce Commission reports. Short lines include railroads that, literally, exist only on paper, properties that have operated in the red for 50 years and also lines whose operating ratios make some blue chip trunk lines look inefficient.

There are short lines that pay $35 dividends and there are short lines that somehow exist on a cash trickle that wouldn't keep a moderately-sized supermarket solvent. Few short lines would know what to do with a computer if they had one, but they provide direct, personal and efficient railroad service to thousands of shippers Some operate at a 19th-century pace, but they haul bricks, potash, coal, pulpwood, sugar beets, sand and even trainloads of railfans with aplomb—mostly at a profit. They are, in short, an important segment of the nation's rail network

THE PROBLEMS GET KNOTTIER

Short Line Association President Burks will be presiding over a meeting this week that will grapple with many of the same problems that a gathering of Class I roads would attempt to unravel. Despite the colorful-labeled membership, the group's 245 member lines, like the trunk roads, reflect the economic and competitive wringer through which the entire industry has gone since the depression. The 245 short lines represent 13,042 miles of main line railroad.

Not that the short lines are in any danger of becoming moribund. Far from it. There are several short lines under construction. The first new interstate railroad built in more than a quarter century (the Corinth & Counce in southwestern Tennessee) was completed just a few years ago. An even bigger road, the Sabine River & Northern, a $40-million, 35-mile road is being built from Echo, Tex., to an interchange point with the Missouri Pacific and the Kansas City Southern.

Short line fans, in fact, say that a new golden age of short lines might even be in the cards—should Congress relent and moderate the Commodities Clause in the Interstate Commerce Act that prohibits railroads from hauling traffic in which they have an interest.

But, still new problems are increasing and old problems are more pressing. Many short lines are being bought up by larger roads. Some are being abandoned. Some are caught between rising equipment-hire costs and diminishing revenues. Others are feeling the threat of trunk line competition via piggyback.

ASLRA's 245 member roads manage to perform an astonishing variety of work. The short lines may have operated only 13,042 miles of main line, but they paid more than $269 million in wages to their 32,284 employees in 1965. ASLRA President Burks notes that his member roads represent an investment of $1.6 billion and that they chalked up $528.5 million in gross operating revenues last year. More impressively, they managed to get $65,085,000 of that down to the net column—a performance that draws envious sighs from many Class I rail officers. And '66 will probably be better. Says Burks: "Short lines generally are sharing in the high rate of present general business activity."

AFTER 1966?

There are dark spots in the short lines' future however, Burks says many lines are experiencing trouble because of the increased cost of car-hire and the absolute decrease in average ton-mile revenue that has come in recent years as the trunk lines have made competion to win back traffic from the highways. "Our costs are increasing, but our revenues, to a large extent, are controlled by the Class I carriers," he says.

Some short lines, too, are not able to handle the larger cars that are pouring into the nation's carfleet. "Short lines are spending increasing sums on upgrading fixed plant, bridges, power and other things to stay alive," notes an experienced short line officer, "but it's a race trying to keep up with all the changes being effected by the large railroads." Another short line officer gloomily points out the disastrous potential for small roads if trunk lines continue to invade their territory with TOFC. Short lines everywhere are countering by entering the piggyback business themselves.

PEOPLE PROBLEMS TOO

Like the giants in railroading short lines find personnel problems bothersome. Some make extensive use of college and high school students on vacation. Wage scales, while comparable over-all to scales in national contracts (the short line wage bill amounted to about 55% of gross revenues), vary from property to property. Some short lines have no unions. Some short lines employees have better contracts than do workers on large roads. Many short lines operate on stand-by agreements, whereby workers get whatever national settlements provide.

There is a bright side to the situation. The jack-of-all-trades demands upon short line officers does tend to produce versatile, experienced officers whose knowledge of railroading is instinctive, wide and intimate. Says one knowledgeable personnel officer, "I have always wondered why big roads haven't raided short lines for management recruits. I would think the small roads would have some top-notch prospects."

PASSENGERS NO PROBLEM

Unlike the large roads, short lines have no passenger problems. Here and there, short lines are in the passenger business, though only seasonally and only for devoted train-

lovers. The California Western, the Reader, the Strassburg Junction, the Arcadia, the New Hope & Ivy Land and others run passenger trains for railfans—and profit.

Both the short lines and the ASLRA have some long-range things going for them. While longer line-hauls are not likely they do have high percentages of originating and terminating traffic. Short lines, traditionally not equipment-owning roads, are able to concentrate their capital expenditures into projects that will directly benefit their shippers and communities.

Short lines are not likely to buy much equipment, despite growing shortages. "We're not going to get into the scramble for equipment," notes one veteran short line railroader, "unless Rule 1 of the Car Service Rules is amended to make the short line car-owner position the same as that of the trunk line car-owner."

Another short line man points out that many short lines own and lease cars, but that high per diem rates are beginning to destroy many old and valid traffic relationships. He puts it this way: "If you can make money leasing cars, the per diem rates are too high. Short lines feel car-hire charges should be a break-even proposition all-around."

Another plus for the short lines could come from repeal or amendment of the Commodities Clause which ASLRA feels has had a dampening effect upon entry into the short line field. A decision described as "too-close-for-comfort" in a 5-to-4 Supreme Court case involving a short line's traffic has probably kept some short lines from being built.

Still another plus is the financial solidity of the short lines. Many of them are owned by prosperous companies. Many are municipally owned, though a majority of short lines are either publicly or privately held. One is owned by an orphange. An oil-rich Osage Indian gave the Sand Springs Railroad in Oklahoma to the Sand Springs Orphanage. The road's three diesels handled $620,000 in business (with a net of $49,807) in 1965, with an operating ratio that trunk line men dream about.

INVOLVED IN LOCAL AFFAIRS

Roads like the Sand Springs, in fact, are the backbone of the group meeting in Denver this week. They very much tend to be intimately involved in the affairs of the towns and communities they serve. Newcomers at the ASLRA session will include the Livonia, Avon & Lakeville, the New Hope & Ivyland and the Narranganset Pier railroads. They'll lend their musical names to the short lines' hustings and probably have some of their versatile executives in attendance.

ALL OVER THE COUNTRY

Old ASLRA lines in every corner of the country, however, can match names with any companies in the country. In the East, for example, are the Moshassuck Valley and the Steelton & Highspire railroads. The South can boast of the Cape Fear Railroad, the Aberdeen & Rockfish Railroad and the Brimstone Railroad. The West and Southwest need feel no shame, not with the Marinette, Tomahawk & Western, the Advance & Puxico and other such gracing the roster of the region's short lines. The Pacific region can point with pride to the Yreka & Western, the Apache Railroad and the Condon, Kinzua & Southern.

As one astonished (and delighted) traffic officer of a major railroad said upon going through a short line roster. "It's almost enough to make one want to join 'em—to be listed with such railroads as the Boyne City Railroad and the Apalachicola Northern." Had he done his homework, he could have added that both the Boyne City and the Apalachicola Northern would rather stylishly improve the averages of any group to which they belonged—especially in net income and operating efficiency. Boyne City, with an operating ratio below 50%, and Apalachicola Northern, with a $379,888 net on a gross of $2.3 million, seem able to railroad with the best in the field.

WHO JOINS ASLRA—AND WHY?

About 40 Class I roads belong to the Short Line association. Denver & Rio Grande Western, Delaware & Ohio, Boston & Maine and other trunk lines pay ASLRA's maximum fee of $1,980. The minimum fee is $264. There are various reasons for joining the association. Traffic is important and the short lines do have traffic offices and connections for traffic that rolls in interchange.

One short line veteran points to the personal friendships many short line officers have with politicians high and low. Yet another observer notes that short lines are able to lobby and press for legislation at local, state and national levels—when some trunk lines are unable or unwilling to do so. "We can sometimes get a consensus when the ARR cannot."

Short lines, of course, find their organization valuable for direct and obvious reasons. Short line officers, often men with a half-dozen hats hanging in their offices, desperately need the expertise that an industry-wide association can provide. The short line executive is often president, traffic solicitor, general manager, purchasing agent, accountant, treasurer and chief engineer—all rolled into one. He is sometimes also locomotive engineer, section foreman and labor relations officer.

ASLRA, with a 14-man staff in Washington and other major cities, provides short line officers with legal counsel, traffic organization, and other important aid on an industry-wide basis. An important part of the association's work is advising members negotiating labor contracts. Notes an association officer, "One bad contract agreed to by an inexperienced operator can create a real mess in the short line part of the railroad business—and perhaps beyond. The typical short line operator is an innocent dealing with the experienced negotiators unions have on the other side of the table."

Association President Burks explains the short lines' vitality this way: "Short lines are often captive lines, originating and terminating traffic—often at less cost than could the parent company. Over-all, the continued existence of the short lines is fairly good evidence for their being able to railroad at less cost than the trunk lines. We expect to be in business for a long time to come."

RICHARD H. AMBERG

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, on September 3, Richard Hillery Amberg, publisher of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat and nationally-known newspaperman and community leader, died unexpectedly at New York City Hospital from a heart attack. He had been in the East on a combined business and personal trip with his family.

Dick Amberg's energy and tireless devotion to the Globe-Democrat, the city of St. Louis, the State of Missouri, and the country will be sorely missed. The causes he supported effectively for the public good are legion.

He is survived by his wife, Janet; his mother, Mrs. M. W. Amberg of Scarsdale, N.Y.; a daughter, Katharine, 21, a senior at Drury College in Springfield, Mo.; two sons, Richard Jr., 24, an employee of the Staten Island, N.Y., Advance, and Thomas, 19; and two sisters, Mrs. Thomas Moore and Mrs. George Franham, both of Scarsdale.

Dick Amberg was a dynamic crusader. It was my privilege to know him as a true friend; and on that friendship, I placed high value. His death leaves my wife and me with a sense of deep personal loss.

Richard Amberg took over as Globe-Democrat publisher 12 years ago, coming from the Post-Standard of Syracuse, N.Y., where he had served as publisher for some 3½ years. When he first became publisher of the Globe-Democrat in 1955, he told me that he was determined to improve the civic and economic spirit of St. Louis. Assigning reporters to research the field by interviewing civic, business, and labor leaders, he determined that of top priority was putting life into the national memorial on the city's historic riverfront. The project had been struggling along for 20 years without interest or funds from the Federal Government. Dick worked arduously for local and national support for the project; and soon thereafter the first Federal funds were forthcoming for the 630-foot Gateway Arch.

One of his many additional achievements was the establishment of the Herbert Hoover Boys' Club of St. Louis on the site of the old Busch Stadium in North St. Louis. In 1966 he raised approximately $1 million for this project, and named it after his close friend who he often commented had a compassion for the underprivileged which influenced him throughout his life.

Dick Amberg also organized the Backstoppers which supports the St. Louis Police and Firemen's Fund, Inc. In addition, he was general chairman of the 1961 Brotherhood Week sponsored by the National Conference of Christians and Jews, and executive vice chairman of the drive for the Winston Churchill Memorial Library at Fulton, Mo.

The city which he served so well expressed its appreciation last December with the highest tribute possible to one dedicated to community improvement by bestowing upon him the coveted St. Louis Award. In addition, he had the great honor of being elected to the Missouri Squires.

Dick Amberg also played a vital role in State government. In 1958, he instituted the Globe-Democrat awards for legislators, which are given to nine or 10 outstanding lawmakers every 2 years. He worked relentlessly for State conflict of interest statutes. Having served on a commission which drew up a successful conflict of interest bill for the State of New York in 1954, he began urging enactment of similar legislation in Missouri. In 1961, he testified for such legislation before a legislative committee. It was defeated in 1961 and 1963. Continuing to work for its enactment, however, he was rewarded in 1965 when the State legislature approved a strong conflicts bill.

Other legislation to which he devoted much of his efforts included tougher laws for unsafe drivers, legislation requiring chemical tests for drunk driving suspects, and establishment of a point system to take repeated offenders off the roads. He urged higher gasoline taxes to build better roads, and was a strong backer of the recent improvement of Missouri's mental health program.

The University of Missouri's Honor Award for Distinguished Service in Journalism was presented to the Globe-Democrat in May 1967.

Last April Dick Amberg was one of three new Associated Press directors elected at the worldwide news-gathering organization's annual meeting in New York.

When Dick came to St. Louis, he brought with him a record of achievement and hard work. He graduated from Harvard in 1933 magna cum laude in history and literature; and he was also a graduate of the U.S. Naval War College.

Dick rose from ensign to commander during World War II, serving as flag secretary to Adm. R. K. Turner, commander of the amphibious forces in the Pacific. He was also naval adviser on the staff of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur. He was awarded the Legion of Merit by General MacArthur, and had seven battle stars on his Pacific ribbon.

Dick was a great admirer of General MacArthur. He served as trustee of the foundation which maintains the Old Soldier's tomb.

Wednesday, prior to his death, Dick had received the American Legion's annual Fourth Estate Award for distinguished public service in the field of communications. He was to have had lunch with President Johnson the following Wednesday.

Dick was born June 5, 1912, in New York City, the son of Mr. and Mrs. Max W. Amberg. On June 18, 1938, he married the former Janet Katharine Law, as well respected and loved as any woman in Missouri. He began his career in journalism in 1933. Four years later he became the youngest publisher of a daily newspaper in the United States, the Oil City, Pa., Blizzard.

Following the war, Dick became director of public relations for the American Transit Co., general manager of a Long Island, N.Y., newspaper; and administrative assistant at the New York Herald Tribune before going to Syracuse in 1950 as vice president and general manager. He was named publisher of the Post-Standard on January 1, 1952.

In 1954 the former New York Gov. Thomas E. Dewey named him to a Commission on Ethics and Integrity in Government. In 1966 he was appointed by Secretary of Defense McNamara to the Board of the National War College.

Dick was a member of the board of directors of nine national organizations including the Boy Scouts, Boys Clubs, and the American Cancer Society. He held memberships on 18 local and State boards including Scottish Rite Foundation, Central Institute for the Deaf, and the Missouri Public Expenditure Survey.

The day Richard Amberg left us was a sad day for St. Louis and the Nation. He was an American patriot, one who held his head high in the sincerity of his convictions. To us who loved and respected him he brings to mind the words of Ralph Waldo Emerson: "A friend may well be reckoned the masterpiece of nature."

In closing, Mr. President, the Globe-Democrat of September 5 contained a most moving tribute to its publisher. The eulogy delivered by the Rev. Dr. J. Layton Mauze, Jr. at the funeral of Richard Amberg expresses the thought of many who knew him. KMOX radio had an editorial which also expresses this thinking. I ask unanimous consent that the Globe-Democrat article, "A Giant Has Passed Our Way;" the KMOX editorial "The Living Legacy of Richard Amberg;" and the text of the eulogy be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, September 5, 1967]

A GIANT HAS PASSED OUR WAY

When he came to St. Louis from his home in the East a dozen years ago hardly a soul knew him here. He was new to the Midwest and when he walked along the streets he received only rarely a greeting or a nod of recognition from a passerby. But seldom has a stranger become so quickly a vital part of his new community, and seldom has he contributed so much to its progress and welfare or left such an impress on its people and its spirit in so short a span of years.

Now he is gone from the community as suddenly as he came. And there is a deep sadness, an empty feeling of great loss among those men and women on The Globe-Democrat who worked intimately with and for Richard H. Amberg, who was publisher of this newspaper for the past 12 years. His untimely and unexpected death occurred in New York Sunday a few hours after he was stricken by a heart attack.

But there is equally a feeling of deep sadness and irrepairable loss among the people of the St. Louis community, where he labored courageously and tirelessly for the right and for the public welfare.

They say—many of these people—that his like will not soon be found again, that he will be sorely missed because he gave the community an inspiring and a dynamic leadership that did much to move it forward from its former lethargy and put it among the cities of the nation which are in the forefront of progress.

They speak of his courage to fight indomitably for what he believed was right, and of his zeal for good and just causes, and of his abiding compassion for his fellow man and his selfless expenditure of time and energy in behalf of the public welfare.

They say he was a catalyst who stimulated many constructive civic programs in this community, who brought a new driving force which has done much to inspire the amazing renaissance which has given the downtown business section new life. He helped transform the eyesore riverfront now dominated by the incomparable Gateway Arc of world renown, encouraged the new downtown stadium, helped effect the miracle of the Mill Creek Valley renewal and brought to imminent completion the vital new Poplar street free bridge which will span the Mississippi.

They speak, too, of the dynamism he gave The Globe-Democrat, changing it from a lackadaisical newspaper into a vigorous and beneficial force locally and nationally, causing it to be ranked among the nation's top dailies. And whether they agreed with him or not, they speak of his pungent, incisive and eloquent editorials which gave crystalline clarity to the issues of the day.

And they speak of his many humanitarian campaigns to raise funds for those who needed help of some kind.

There are, indeed, those who say it may have been these relentless efforts through his newspaper and personally in behalf of the public weal that hastened his death.

He was at the apex of a brilliant newspaper career which had spread his name far beyond St. Louis and the Midwest and had made him one of the best known publishers and editors in America. He was consulted by Governors and even Presidents, and was the subject of occasional articles in national magazines and other publications.

The most recent of the giant community projects on which he worked long and assiduously was the establishment of the new Herbert Hoover Boys' Club of St. Louis on the historic old baseball field where Busch Stadium stood on North Grand boulevard. He was the prime mover of this project from the beginning and headed a campaign which raised approximately $1,000,000 to build the club, the finest of its kind in America.

There, 3300 boys from 6 to 16 years can get off the streets, find recreation, entertainment, instruction and a practical application of ideals that will make them good and responsible citizens. It was a project close to Mr. Amberg's heart, and one that will remain as a living monument to his deep concern for the youth of the community and the nation and to his devotion and admiration for the late Herbert Hoover—in whose honor he asked that the club be named.

Mr. Amberg was an enduring patriot, and he manifested it in his daily life as well as his editorials. Transplanted from the Eastern seaboard to the Middle West, he soon came to love St. Louis and its people. He will be buried here among those he came to know so fondly. But his devotion to his country was not more than that to his community.

During World War II he served with the Navy and saw enough active duty in the Pacific to receive seven battle stars and 13 medals and citations. Among them was the Legion of Merit, given him by General Douglas MacArthur whose naval advisor he had been. A comradeship developed between the two which continued until the General's death.

And Mr. Amberg came to regard General MacArthur as one of the great Americans, and he shared the old warrior's resolute conviction that there is no substitute for victory. Hence, with a strong clear voice he unceasingly advocated editorially that the United States should not dally with Communist aggression in Vietnam, but should strike the enemy with the full and devastating force of America's military might to bring the war to a complete and decisive victory in the shortest possible time.

Indeed, it was partly his courageous editorials for sterner measures against North Vietnamese and the Viet Cong—in the face of a great outcry from some quarters for soft measures and compromise—together with other manifestations of selfless patriotism that took him to Boston three days before his death to receive from the American Legion its highest honor to newspapers—the Fourth Estate Award for distinguished public service in the field of communications.

Richard H. Amberg was born in New York City 55 years ago. He was educated at Harvard where he was graduated in 1933 magna cum laude. He started his newspaper career shortly thereafter and his first position of prominence was as publisher and editor of the Oil City (Pa.) Blizzard. He was 25, and the youngest publisher of a daily in the United States.

World War II interrupted his career and afterward he caught the eye of Samuel I. Newhouse, who was building a giant newspaper empire. He became publisher of the Syracuse (N.Y.) Post-Standard. He was a refreshingly new kind of publisher and editor. He was also a speaker and writer with a fluent, trenchant style who projected a lot of positive opinions from his editorial page.

Mr. Newhouse bought the sluggish St. Louis Globe-Democrat in 1955. "Dick" Amberg, as he was commonly known to his friends, was made publisher.

To the people of St. Louis and to his staff he introduced himself by announcing, "We

are going to be a fighter for the right. We are going to take sides on every issue. . . . The Globe-Democrat will never run away from a battle. . . . We may not always be right, but we will take an honest cut at the ball."

He set the new pace and spirit of the newspaper. Editorials acquired a new zing.

A rousing Globe-Democrat campaign, together with effective personal maneuvering by Mr. Amberg among railroads and politicians, did much to break the riverfront log jam. Today the result is the beautiful new Jefferson National Expansion Memorial and its towering Gateway Arch. This inspiring success brought an exciting chain reaction of new developments in the area which has rejuvenated the entire downtown area.

The equally revitalized Globe-Democrat became a crusading newspaper, with the publisher himself as the dynamo in nearly all crusades. He used the hard-hitting newspaper campaign to get things done. He fought for better public health, better public safety, better government, greater civic growth, more prosperity. He detested and castigated crime and corruption in any form and attacked them with stinging articles and editorials.

He believed newspapers had lost the capacity for indignation. Certainly he hadn't.

He did more than that. He moved out among the people. He went to luncheons and dinners and other gatherings. He served on a plethora of boards and committees. He talked to the people individually and collectively. He talked to them from the speaker's platform—his extemporaneous addresses sounded as though they had been meticulously prepared and rehearsed.

In his prodigious participation in the affairs of the community—the people's problems became those of his newspaper—he belonged to a great list of civic, welfare, business, educational, fraternal and other organizations. He served on the boards of 19 local and state associations, on nine national boards. He was trustee of a half dozen colleges.

His honors and awards for his selfless services added up to the dozens. One of them was the coveted St. Louis Award of 1966.

A giant has passed our way. His courage and good works will long be remembered.

[An editorial of KMOX radio, Sept. 4, 1967]

THE LIVING LEGACY OF RICHARD AMBERG

Richard Amberg is gone . . . suddenly, shockingly, tragically. It's difficult to imagine St. Louis without him.

Richard Amberg was a big man . . . big in mind, in heart, in spirit. And his passing leaves a big void.

Richard Amberg was a great publisher. His newspaper's energetic devotion to our city . . . its growth and its future . . . were vital factors in the rebirth of our metropolitan area.

Richard Amberg was a great humanitarian. His concern for the less fortunate was a driving force for action. The Herbert Hoover Boys' Club, the Old Newsboys campaign for children's charity will bring our city a harvest of good citizenship in the generations to come.

Richard Amberg was a great patriot . . . not "my country right or wrong". . . but a thoughtful dedication to the ideals of individualism, personal responsibility, self-discipline, initiative that made our country grow . . . and will keep it growing.

[An editorial of KMOX radio, Sept. 4, 1967]

TRIBUTE TO PUBLISHER OF ST. LOUIS GLOBE-DEMOCRAT ON THE OCCASION OF HIS SUDDEN DEATH

Richard Amberg was a great St. Louisian . . . concerned with a broad spectrum of civic problems and potentials, working tirelessly . . . and often without personal credit . . . for the good of the community as a whole.

Richard Amberg was a great human being. His devoted family life . . . his example to the young people in his own family and the entire community . . . his application of great spiritual principles in his every effort. These contributions cannot be forgotten.

Richard Amberg is gone. But the achievements he leaves behind him will continue to be guideposts for all of us. When perplexing problems challenge our minds and our hearts in the future, we will ask ourselves . . . "What would Dick Amberg have done?" This reliance on his principles and his precedents will be his living legacy to all of us.

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, Sept. 7, 1967]

A FINAL TRIBUTE

(Text of the eulogy delivered by the Rev. Dr. J. Layton Mauze, Jr., at the funeral of Richard H. Amberg)

It is quite difficult for me to crowd the reflections of 12 years of intimate association with Dick Amberg into a rather brief statement. Indeed a volume could be written of his worth and works, his true nobility and power, his good sense, his absolute integrity, his lovely companionableness, his goodness and his greatness.

The practice of the law of human service is, in the eyes of all truly native members of an acquisitive society, the most drab and unattractive of pursuits. Such an observer must have been puzzled and incredulous when he saw the air with which this great friend of ours, Dick Amberg, trudged from an office interview to an important meeting, to a large dinner or some speaking engagement. For he did it all with a persistent gusto of enjoyment that makes me think of Francis of Assissi at the edge of a forest drawing one twig over another to make music for God and his living creatures.

"Heard melodies are sweet—but those unheard are sweeter."

Dick could give himself so constantly and so usefully because he was endowed with so many gifts of mind and heart. He had at once a deep love for men and a very shrewd understanding of their foibles as well as of their virtues. His sagacity in determining a course of action rested solely on his insight. A man who had been associated with him in various endeavors once said to me, "The only man whose judgment I would accept in preference to my own is Dick Amberg."

Dick loved and admired the simple worth of steadfast lives, whether in humble places or in high. But he counted it right to be helpful to all men. I personally know that he helped many, without harshness, who might be numbered among the unworthy. But he was never taken in by them. And I think it must have been a salutary experience for some of this sort to receive his generosity, while they had to bear at the same the glance of those tolerant but penetrating eyes.

Dick's intellect was such that few men dreamed of matching it, but the erring, the humblest, the poorest, and the most illiterate, never felt uncomfortable or unhappy in his presence. His kindliness, his understanding, his sympathy, his broad outlook on life, his lack of thought of himself and what he had accomplished, somehow closed the barrier and made him kin with his less privileged brother.

With Dick there was never any waste of motion or effort. He did all that was to be done without friction, or delay or haste. He spoke no unnecessary words and he wasted no time. He was the soul of promptitude and accuracy and honor. His spirit was all kindness and goodness, but it was also direct and quick and intense. He made no concealment of his approvals or disapprovals when it was his duty to speak or act. In a day when multitudes think it's wrong to be right, Dick was mostly right, and he courageously stood for it.

One of Dick's favorite passages from literature was when Joan of Arc was being hounded by her inquisitors: "Why was it your Standard had place at the crowning of the King in the Cathedral of Rheims, rather than those of other captains?"

Then soft and low, came this touching speech which will live as long as language lives, and pass into all tongues, and move all gentle hearts wheresoever it shall come, down to the latest day. Says Joan, "It had borne the burden; it had earned the honor."

Well, Dick also bore the burden and justly earned the multiplicity of honors conferred upon him, but he wore them all very lightly, there were no balloons under his armpits, and he forgot them entirely in his daily contacts with men and women.

Men trusted Dick because he was wise; they loved him because he was good. They confided in him because he had the large charity that covers a multitude of sins and the human sympathy that makes men kind. They sought his friendship because they knew that he himself followed his divine Master and Savior Jesus Christ, in loving mercy, doing justly and walking humbly with his God.

He was a devoted and loyal member of this church and for many years served on the Session. Never a Sunday passed when Dick and his lovely family were absent from worship on Sunday morning except for illness or unless they were out of the city. He loved his Lord and he wasn't ashamed to say so. His faith was deep. You ask the secret of such a worthy life? It can only be one thing—it's a life hid with Christ in God. His life has been a great inspiration to all who have known and loved him, and somehow we have been better men because we have known him.

Now that he no longer walks with us in the flesh, we are the more keenly aware of his magnanimous spirit, and while we mourn our personal loss, we are eternally thankful to God that we were vouchsafed to know and love His worthy servant. Truly through him, there was ever manifested the Grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Love of God our Father, and the fellowship of the Holy Spirit.

I can see him now accepting the joys of Heaven with the same quick gladness, and heaven's honors with the same humble and slightly deprecating geniality with which he accepted, as they came, the joys and honors of earth, now that he has heard the summons, "Come up higher." Even then, we may surmise that he had to be led, or perhaps gently pushed by a smiling angel into the place God had prepared for one who loved Him.

To be sure, others will carry on Dick's work, but his place will always remain vacant.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the Committee on Banking and Currency, the Committee on Public Works, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Committee on Commerce be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate today.

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

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask

unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON REAPPORTIONMENT OF AN APPROPRIATION

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the Department of the Interior for "Management and protection," National Park Service, for the fiscal year 1968, had been reapportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the name of Don Ho Yee from a report relating to aliens whose deportation has been suspended, transmitted to the Senate on February 1, 1967; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITION

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a letter, in the nature of a petition, praying for a redress of grievances, with accompanying papers, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. CANNON, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Alfred B. Fitt, of Michigan, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

By Mr. STENNIS, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Price Daniel, of Texas, to be Director of the Office of Emergency Planning.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably the nomination of Maj. Gen. Winston P. Wilson, Air National Guard, for reappointment as Chief, National Guard Bureau for 4 years; and the nomination of Adm. Noel A. M. Gaylor, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral in connection with his assignment as Deputy Director, Strategic Target Planning. I ask that these nominations be placed on the Executive Calendar.

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

The nominations, ordered to be placed on the calendar, are as follows:

Maj. Gen. Winston P. Wilson, Air National Guard, to be reappointed as Chief, National Guard Bureau; and

Rear Adm. Noel A. M. Gayler, U.S. Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, in addition, I report favorably 509 promotions to the grade of captain in the Navy, 237 appointments in the Marine Corps in grade of colonel and below, and 983 appointments in the Air Force in the grade of lieutenant colonel and below. Since these names have already been printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in order to save the expense of printing on the Executive Calendar I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Secretary's desk for the information of any Senator.

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

The nominations, ordered to lie on the desk, are as follows:

Roy J. Casteel, and sundry other officers, for appointment and reappointment in the Marine Corps;

William C. Airheart, and sundry other officers, for promotion in the Marine Corps;

Frank M. Adams, and sundry other officers, for promotion in the U.S. Navy;

William B. Duty, for reappointment to the active list of the Regular Air Force, from the temporary disability retired list;

Eugene J. Birkemeyer, and sundry other persons, for appointment in the Regular Air Force;

Franklin G. Abel, and sundry other officers, for promotion in the Regular Air Force; and

Elmer L. Alderfer, and sundry other distinguished graduates of the Air Force Officer Training School, for appointment in the Regular Air Force.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 2507. A bill relating to dealings between parties to franchise agreements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

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

S. 2508. A bill to authorize direct home loans by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development in certain cases where private financing on reasonable terms and conditions is not available; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

By Mr. COOPER:

S. 2509. A bill for the relief of William H. T. Carney; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTION

PROMOTION OF ALLIED COOPERATION TO BRING AN END TO THE WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. PERCY (for himself, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CLARK, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. JORDAN of Idaho, Mr. MORTON, Mr. PEARSON, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. RIBICOFF, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. TALMADGE, Mr. THURMOND, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 173) to promote Allied cooperation to bring an end to the war in Vietnam, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

THE FRANCHISE DISTRIBUTION ACT OF 1967

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, today I introduce the Franchise Distribution Act of 1967.

This legislation is long overdue.

In the past decade there has been an enormous growth in the franchise system of distributing goods and services in this country. It is presently estimated that the franchise system accounts for 10 percent of this Nation's gross national product and 25 percent of all retail sales. Thus, the welfare of these franchisees as such is a matter of direct public concern.

With the growth in the franchise system there has been a rising ground swell of complaints of unfair practices by franchisors. To many, the franchisee seems to be losing his stature as an independent businessman. In a number of industries franchisees have become simply the tools of the franchisors even though the franchisee is supplying the capital and effort to market the goods and products of the franchisor. Unfair and inequitable practices by franchisors are widespread. In short, the balance of power in the franchisor-franchisee relationship is now heavily weighed in favor of the franchisor.

The bill, which I introduced herewith, tends to correct this imbalance of power between franchisors and franchisees. It is a simple and direct bill relating to the franchise system as a whole whether the franchisor distributes goods or commodities or renders services. The term "franchise" is broadly defined to include almost every type of franchise arrangement.

This bill first requires that, notwithstanding the terms of any franchise agreement, that the franchisor must deal in a fair and equitable manner with its franchisees and must also deal in accordance with reasonable standards of fair dealing. The franchisor is also required to deal honestly and to avoid coercing and intimidating its franchise.

The bill further provides that the franchisor must not compete unfairly with its franchisee in selling goods or rendering services and provides that a franchisee must be on an equal basis with any other person in buying goods or commodities from its franchisor. This latter provision simply requires that the franchisor sell its goods or commodities at the same price to its franchisee as to any other person.

This bill also relates to termination or cancellation of franchisees. When a franchisee desires to sell its business, it is permitted to do so under this bill without unreasonable interference by the franchisor. Further, in the event the franchisor terminates the franchisee without the consent of the franchisee, the franchisor is required to buy the facilities of the franchisee at fair market value.

The statute provides improved remedies for the franchisees' protection. The franchisee may recover twofold damages for violation of the act. In addition, the franchisee may obtain an injunction to prevent continuation of violations of the act injurious to the franchisee.

Gentlemen, remedial legislation in this

area is long overdue and I urge your serious consideration and support of this bill.

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

The bill (S. 2507) relating to dealings between parties to franchise agreements, introduced by Mr. EASTLAND, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DIRECT HOUSING LOANS

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I am pleased to introduce today, with Senator MONDALE as cosponsor, a bill authorizing direct home loans by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development in certain cases where private financing on reasonable terms and conditions is not available.

I am particularly pleased to have Senator MONDALE, who is so well known for his able work on the Housing Subcommittee, as a cosponsor of this bill. The bill itself is in many respects identical to S. 2280 on which I testified before the subcommittee recently.

The bill is aimed to deal with the problem of those who, having found a home they desire to purchase, are unable to find private financing for the mortgage in spite of meeting all the normal requirements of a borrower for this purpose. In such a case, having been unable to secure mortgage funds, this bill would make it possible for the prospective borrower to secure them directly from a $50 million revolving fund administered by the Department. Having met the criteria, the mortgage would then be purchased by the Federal National Mortgage Association just as though this were any other kind of FHA arrangement, and the purchase price would revert to the fund, thus making it available for others.

The $50 million fund is a revolving fund, replenished as the mortgages it finances are "turned over," so that its potential is much greater than its face sum. While more might be desirable, probably the new sum is more realistic in the current atmosphere of cost cutting than was the $100 million in S. 2280, even though a loan fund is not an ultimate expense.

It is my hope, Mr. President, that in view of the consideration of S. 2280 in the hearings and the revisions made in the bill that I offer for myself and Senator MONDALE, that the bill will be adopted by the Banking and Currency Committee in its deliberations now being carried on.

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

The bill (S. 2508) to authorize direct home loans by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development in certain cases where private financing on reasonable terms and conditions is not available, introduced by Mr. HARTKE (for himself and Mr. MONDALE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AMENDMENT OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

AMENDMENT NO. 382

A FAIR METHOD OF REIMBURSEMENT FOR HOSPITAL AND EXTENDED CARE SERVICES

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I submit an amendment to H.R. 12080 and ask that it be printed in the RECORD, and printed and appropriately referred.

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. 382) was referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

On page 69, between lines 2 and 3, insert the following:

"METHOD OF DETERMINING REASONABLE COST FOR PROVIDERS OF SERVICES

"SEC. 142. (a) (1) Strike out the third sentence of section 1861 (v) (1) of the Social Security Act and insert in lieu thereof the following: 'Such regulations (A) shall provide for the determination of costs of services on a per diem basis in all cases where the circumstances under which the services provided so permit, and, in cases where such circumstances do not so permit, may provide for the determination of costs of services on a per unit, per capita, or other basis, (B) may provide for the use of estimates of costs of particular items or services, and (C) may provide for the use of charges or a percentage of charges where this method reasonably reflects the costs. With a view to not encouraging inefficiency, in determining a per diem basis for cost of services there shall be taken into account the per diem costs prevailing in a community for comparable quality and levels of services. Such regulations shall include provision for specific recognition of a reasonable return on fair market value of the facility (determined in accordance with periodic Federal Housing Administration or similar appraisals); but the rate of return so recognized shall not exceed one and one-half times the average of the rates of interest, for each of the months any part of which is included in such fiscal period, on obligations issued for purchase by the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund. Where such return is allowed, there shall not be allowed interest on capital indebtedness or depreciation on the facility in determining reimbursable costs.'

"(2) The fourth sentence of such section 1861(v)(1) is amended by inserting '(except as might happen by reason of the provisions of clause (A) of the preceding sentence)' immediately after 'will not'.

"(3) The last sentence of such section 1861(v)(1) is hereby repealed.

"(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) shall be applicable to services provided under title XVIII of the Social Security Act on and after July 1, 1968."

On page 160, between lines 6 and 7, insert the following:

"METHOD OF DETERMINING REASONABLE COST UNDER TITLE XIX FOR INPATIENT HOSPITAL SERVICES, SKILLED NURSING HOME SERVICES, AND HOME HEALTH CARE SERVICES

"SEC. 232. (a) Section 1902(a)(13)(B) of the Social Security Act is amended to read as follows: '(B) for payment of the reasonable cost (as determined in accordance with the regulations promulgated by the Secretary for determining reasonable cost under title XVIII) of inpatient hospital services, skilled nursing home services, and home health care services, provided under the plan;'.

"(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect July 1, 1969."

On page 187, strike out lines 18 through 20, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "(as determined in accordance with the regulations promulgated by the Secretary for determining reasonable cost under title XVIII) of inpatient hospital services, skilled nursing home services, and home health care services, provided under the plan;".

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, many of our colleagues are aware that our hospitals and extended-care facilities around the Nation are very dissatisfied with the reimbursement which they are receiving under the medicare program. In particular, hospitals are very dissatisfied, and I believe rightfully so, with the so-called RCCAC method which the regulations of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare now require. This method is very complicated and deliberately reflects one conclusion about the difference in hospital costs for different age groups. It takes advantage of the fact that aged people use less hospital ancillary services per patient day than younger patients but does not reflect the likelihood that aged people use more nursing services and other components of the room and board category of hospital expenses.

I am aware that the position of some administration officials is to take a "wait-and-see" attitude toward this important problem. They seem to want to "wait and see" if hospitals and extended-care facilities can survive their shortsighted policies. Mr. President, we just cannot take the risks the administration would have us take. We cannot risk that the present policies and procedures of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will result in widespread financial havoc among our health facilities, which responsible people in the field assure us will happen.

Mr. President, we cannot run the risk of having hospitals and extended-care facilities denied those entitled to them because these facilities cannot afford to seek certification under our Federal programs.

We must have reimbursement policies in these Government programs which support our hospitals and extended care facilities in their efforts to maintain and improve the quality of services, and we need them now.

Mr. President, I offer what I believe is an equitable, sound, and acceptable solution to this problem. My amendment to the House-passed social security bill, H.R. 12080, would require the Government to use the per diem method of reimbursing hospitals and extended care facilities under all of the programs in the Social Security Act, not just medicare. We must remember that title XIX, the medicaid program, and title V, the maternal and infant care and crippled children's program, also pay for these services.

Title XIX covers a wide segment of the population, those who are medically indigent, ranging in age from the very young to the very old. The maternal and infant care and crippled children's programs meet the hospital expenses of many mothers and children. What I propose, Mr. President, is to pay for services for all of the patients under these titles through one single, easy-to-administer,

easy-to-understand method. This method, the per diem method, is in widespread use by Blue Cross plans around the country and Blue Cross plans and hospitals are accustomed to the method and satisfied with it. Moreover, Mr. President, my proposal for using the per diem method for all of these programs avoids the problems which the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare says that it sees with using the per diem method for title XVIII alone. Since the per diem method would apply to patients of all ages there would no longer be any supposed need to try to use a complicated method like the RCCAC method to separate one group's costs from all the rest.

Mr. President, my amendment also provides for a fair rate of return on the fair market value of the facility. The Senate passed this portion of the amendment last year insofar as extended care facilities are concerned, but the conference report changed it to apply to "net equity" rather than fair market value. This is not a fair basis, and has resulted in much dissatisfaction. The fairest approach is to use fair market value, based on an FHA appraisal. This, of course, should not permit a doubling up by allowing reimbursable costs to include interest on capital investment and depreciation, and my amendment so provides.

Mr. President, my proposal is simple, it is just. It is fair to the hospitals, and extended care facilities, it is fair to patients, it is fair to the Government. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, which will assure that those entitled to quality services will be able to receive them.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION APPROPRIATION BILL, 1968—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 383

Mr. PROXMIRE submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 12474) making appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 915) to provide for the establishment of a Federal Judicial Center.

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], I also ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 2349) to provide for the appointment of additional circuit judges.

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

EMPLOYMENT OF INDIVIDUALS DISADVANTAGED BY LACK OF EDUCATION OR JOB TRAINING

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, last Thursday my friend, the distinguished junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] addressed the national meeting of the Institute of Temporary Services, Inc., in Washington.

Senator PROUTY offered important challenges to the organization for making significant contributions toward the employment of individuals who are disadvantaged by age or lack of education or job training. I ask unanimous consent that his remarks be printed in the RECORD.

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

Please accept my apologies for not having been able to lunch with you, much as I would have desired to do so. As you probably know, the 1967 amendments, to the Poverty Program are now being debated in the Senate, and, as ranking minority member of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare's Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower and Poverty, it is necessary for me to be on the Floor most of the time.

I intend to talk to you generally about the need for and types of training programs required in our national commitment to fight poverty.

It is impossible for me to get into this subject, however, without a few preliminary remarks bearing on the over-all concepts and policies of the War on Poverty. I think we can accept as a basic premise the fact that the objectives sought to be obtained by the Poverty Program are accepted by a vast majority of our citizens. This is so because the results we seek are consistent with the American Dream on which this nation has been built—the concept that any boy can grow up to be President, the rags-to-riches stories by such writers as Horatio Alger which I am sure that most of us read in our childhood, and the American's traditional sympathy for the underdog.

The inevitable question which then arises is, why is the Poverty Program the most controversial program in our country today? Why is it being criticized by rank and file citizens more than any other Federally financed program? I do not like the answer I will give you. Yet I am convinced that this is true because there is growing skepticism as to the integrity and efficiency of administration, and a wide conclusion that political influence and interference with these programs is increasing.

We are now starting our fourth year of our formal and federally contrived effort known as the War on Poverty. We must face up to the fact that we have so far failed in substantial measure to accomplish the goals set by the initial Economic Opportunity Act passed by the Congress in 1964.

We must acknowledge that we have failed because we have not produced. Catchy slogans which instill hope in those who have no hope and lilting promises which bring the first sparks of motivation to the hearts of those who have known only failure and despair during their lives may help win elections for a while, but frustration and bitter disillusionment replace these feelings when the passage of time reveals that the slogans have been repudiated and that the promises have not been fulfilled. Events of the past summer amply illustrate the fact that the bitterness engendered among our disadvantaged people by this failure may be leading us rapidly down the road to anarchy.

I have characterized our failure in the War on Poverty as the Performance Gap between promises and results. Failure here, however, is crueler than if we had never declared war on poverty in the first place.

I submit that we cannot intelligently consider the elimination of poverty without considering how the major roadblocks to massive training and retraining of substantial segments of this nation's labor force can be resolved.

When I speak of training, I include the need to educate, as both these elements are indispensable in making our unemployed employable.

In the not too distant past, most untrained workers could procure unskilled or semi-skilled jobs and many boys grew up working on the family farm or on a farm "just outside of town". When our economy was oriented to a predominantly rural society, the demand for unskilled labor increased almost as rapidly as the available work force expanded.

Today, the situation is entirely different. Not only is our society now urban-oriented, but employment opportunities regardless of their location have tremendously increased their demands for skilled and technical training and education, and it is obvious that this trend will increase at an accelerated pace.

At a time when our labor force is annually being flooded with the entry of new job seekers, positions for unskilled and semi-skilled employees are declining at an ever-increasing rate. At a time when we are entering the age of automation, the major factors that have sustained our high employment rate have been the great demand for skilled personnel in service industries, the need for technically trained individuals in all sectors of private enterprise, and the increase in requirements for educated employees in the various fields of personal services.

Today, training and education have become conditions precedent to most meaningful employment capable of lifting a family out of the poverty classification. I venture to say that a survey would reveal sufficient job vacancies to put all our nation's unemployed to work if they possessed the required education, skill or technical know-how, and would also provide upgrading for substantial numbers of our people who are employed at minimum wage rates if they met the required qualifications.

Here, then is the challenge. Although the scope and dimensions of the problems are huge, they are not insurmountable. We must take whatever action is necessary to insure that never again shall we be faced with the paradox of increasing numbers of our citizens on welfare roles at a time when good jobs are going begging because our unemployed do not meet the qualifications to fill them.

Tragically, the Great Society's poverty programs during the last three years have shown a considerable lack of foresight and an even greater degree of ineptitude.

Let me say at this point that I am convinced that the only real answer to reducing poverty is to provide real and meaning jobs in the private sector of our economy. Supportive services in many other areas are certainly necessary in the short run, as are "make work" programs for those who today are incapable of being educated and trained for productive jobs. In the long run, however—for any permanent and lasting solution—"make work" programs aggravate rather than remedy the problems which face us. In the long run, the only answer is education and training leading to meaningful and productive employment.

This is where the work and training programs of the War on Poverty have failed. Three years after its inception, the results show that the Job Corps program has not produced. Literally, it has merely taken some of our disadvantaged youths off the streets for periods ranging from a few months to one or two years, but by and large it has then returned them to the streets completely unprepared and unequipped to obtain jobs in the competitive job market. The results from

the Job Corps Conservation Camps run by the Departments of Agriculture and Interior are even more appalling.

I probably should note here that, because of a series of amendments which I offered to the Job Corps provisions in the bill now before the Senate which were accepted, I shall support giving the Job Corps an additional two-year lease on life. However, as I have informed the Job Corps Director, he had better produce some tangible results or I will not be this charitable the next time.

The results of the Neighborhood Youth Corps program are equally distressing. Secretary of Labor Wirtz's top staff member, his Manpower Administrator, sat in my office last month and conceded that the Neighborhood Youth Corps had engaged in little else but "make work" programs, and that enrollees who left this program were generally unqualified to compete for available job vacancies.

The Work Training and Experience Program under Title V of the Economic Opportunity Act, administered through the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, is another program which should have caught the imagination of the American people. This program was designed to recruit trainees off public welfare rolls and, through training and placement in jobs with private businesses, reduce welfare costs at the same time as it trained unskilled unemployables for productive jobs. Yet a survey conducted at Princeton University establishes, and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare admits, that this program has been more or less of a failure, and that most of the "jobs" found for welfare recipients have been "make work" jobs primarily, such as custodial and janitorial positions for local or state governments.

Another reason why these programs have failed is because of bureaucratic ineptitude in duplicating programs and in overlap of functions.

For example, in a recent report, the Upjohn Institute noted that there are at least 79 different training programs and education programs administered under the auspices of 15 different Federal bureaus and agencies. Did you know that funds for job recruiting can be obtained from nine different manpower program sources, or that funds for adult basic education—in addition to general education sources—can be obtained from ten different places? Are you aware that on-the-job training programs can be subsidized under five programs, or that supportive services are available from nine sources, or that income maintenance is available to participants under nine different programs? Of course, the eligibility rules, application procedures, allocation formulas, expiration dates and contracting arrangements vary for each as widely as the funding sources.

To summarize, then, there are two major areas where drastic changes in policy and direction must be made if the War on Poverty is to succeed.

The first area involves administration, and requires the Congress to take immediate action to avoid inefficiency, duplication and overlap in the implementation of education and work training programs. Unfortunately, our Subcommittee has been unable to develop sufficient factual data during the course of its study this year to warrant my telling you that we now have all the answers to these intricate problems.

However, I am offering an amendment to the pending poverty bill which will require that the Comptroller General conduct an in-depth investigation of these issues during the next fifteen months and to submit a detailed report of his findings and recommendations in these areas to the Congress by February 1, 1969.

The present poverty bill extend existing programs for two years, so that the next time that the Poverty Program will be subject to review and scrutiny by the Congress will be by the 91st Congress in 1969. If my amendment is adopted, we will then be able to cut through the red tape and straighten out the bureaucratic fumbling and mismanagement in the administration of these programs.

The second major area in which we must change our thinking relates to the objectives we are seeking in the War on Poverty. As I have already stated, satisfactory long term results can be obtained only through education and training programs which equip the unemployed and unskilled with the required qualifications to compete for necessary and available jobs in our free enterprise economy. "Make work" employment is a temporary panacea which is in reality an extension of public welfare assistance, and provides no real solution either for the government or for illiterate and untrained families presently living in poverty.

Data now available reveals that 280,000 training slots were authorized for 1966–67 programs at a time when more than four million people were in need of training. Follow-up surveys indicate even more tragic results for those who entered these programs. They show, for example, that more than 50% of welfare recipients who enter these programs return to public assistance after leaving the programs, and that a vast majority of those placed in jobs are employed in "make work" positions supplied by State, local and Federal governments.

The most successful training programs have been those authorized under the Manpower Development and Training Act, particularly under on-the-job training programs conducted pursuant to Part II of this statute. I might note that this legislation was enacted two years prior to the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

The on-the-job training programs of M.D.T.A., where it has been possible to implement them, have placed over 90% of the trainees in existing job vacancies in our private economy. This is not too surprising when we note that these trainees are carried on payrolls of private companies which are providing the training and that they are trained for jobs with a particular company that are open and waiting for qualified applicants. Motivation is high and the drop-out rate low among these enrollees because they realize that successful completion of their training means immediate employment at a good job in familiar surroundings.

By contrast, the first part of M.D.T.A., which is administered by the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, and which provides various educational, vocational and institutional on-the-job training programs, has not been anywhere near as successful.

The most recent survey indicates that at least 25% of those who underwent institutional on-the-job training programs were unemployed when last contacted. It seems to me that the crux of the matter is that in this type of program the trainee has no assurance whatsoever of finding meaningful employment upon successful graduation. Far too often here we are training unemployed welders to become unemployed bakers and unemployed miners to become unemployed bulldozer operators.

I have been convinced for a long time that no program to substantially reduce poverty by providing meaningful employment opportunities can be successful without the full-fledged involvement and cooperation of the private sector of our economy.

In 1964, when Congress was considering enactment of the Economic Opportunity Act, I first suggested that we pass the Human Investment Act, designed to give private enterprise—a tax credit towards certain job training expenses for their participation in much needed work training programs. I did so because I believed then as I do today that investment in human capital by private industry is at least as important as its investment in new machines, and that the skills and talents of our potential labor force can never be fully developed without the active involvement of our nation's businesses.

The present version of my Human Investment Act is now sponsored by 29 Senators and 140 members of the House. This proposal is too complex to explain in detail here, but in general it provides a tax credit of 10% of expenses incurred as a result of training new employees in addition to the ordinary allowable deductions permitted under the Tax Code.

I am pleased to note that in recent months more and more leaders and scholars are reaching the conclusion that I have expressed for many years that the War on Poverty can never be successful unless and until it brings the resources and ideas of the private sector of our economy into the battle.

For example, speaking on the subject of urban renewal, Senator Ribicoff recently stated: "It is self-evident that the job is too big to be accomplished by government alone."

And just a few days ago that well-known Liberal, Daniel P. Moynihan, concluded that "Liberals should divest themselves of the notion that the nation . . . can be run from agencies in Washington."

A final point to consider today is the question of what can your companies do—what are your responsibilities in providing meaningful training and employment? In your role as formers of public opinion in your own area or locality, you can, of course, help to shape the type of educational and training policies which are necessary to achieve our objectives.

Specifically, however, you are in a unique position due to the fact that you offer temporary rather than full-time employment. Because of lifetime habits, many of the unemployed among our disadvantaged citizens are not psychologically adjusted to full-time employment even when they are qualified. When employment is obtained by these individuals, their environment and way of life is not conducive to their reporting for work early in the morning every day and working an eight-hour day five days a week.

If your agencies make a concerted effort to find and employ these people, you may be able to gradually instill proper motivation and work habits as an accepted part of their living conditions. When a man in these circumstances becomes accustomed to working two or three days a week, it seems to me that the transition to a full-time job would be much easier for him.

It is my understanding that many of your companies meet temporary needs for unskilled as well as skilled employees and I believe that this is another area where emphasis on hiring available members of minority and unemployed groups may contribute to meeting private enterprise's responsibility in this field.

For example, a concentration of effort along these lines could result in finding part-time jobs as clerks in stores for mothers from poverty families who have responsibilities which preclude their working full-time, as well as giving a male head of household from such a family temporary work in a warehouse.

Another area where special attention would prove beneficial would be in the recruitment of our older citizens for temporary and part-time employment. It is estimated that 5½ million Americans over the age of 65 have income below the poverty level. This represents approximately 20% of all Americans living in poverty. Many of these individuals have held productive jobs in the past and are qualified for further employment. I have introduced an amendment to raise the amount of money which these persons may earn without suffering a reduction or loss in social security benefits. In my opinion, you people are in an ad-

mirable position to provide these citizens with an opportunity to supplement their inadequate retirement pensions and to thus bring more dignity and independence to their latter years.

These are some of the ways in which you can contribute to the solution of the poverty crisis facing us today by assisting disadvantaged and unskilled members of our society.

An example of what can be accomplished in a much larger sense can be seen from what the President of one of your member organizations has done in Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

Mr. Elmer L. Winter, President of Manpower, Inc., has shown that his energetic imagination is not confined strictly to the business of running Manpower, Inc. He has exhibited sincere civic pride by devoting part of his energy to the job of being President of "We Milwaukeeans Housing Foundation, Inc.", a voluntary group of businessmen and civic leaders who are leading the way toward the development of a dynamic housing project which will have a two-fold purpose.

First, it will remove a blighted slum area from downtown Milwaukee. Second, it will provide 150 three-bedroom homes to serve families who are in the $5,000 to $9,000 income group.

The Secretary of Labor has instituted a pilot program based on the Human Investment concept, although the tax incentive idea has been replaced by a 4% to 6% grant towards training expenses. It is interesting to note that contracts for nine of the first ten projects entered into by the Secretary of Labor under this program are for the implementation of proposals submitted from private enterprise.

This seems to reflect the Secretary of Labor's agreement that job training for meaningful jobs can best be accomplished through private industry. If any of your companies are seriously interested, I believe that you can receive constructive suggestions on possible participation by contacting the Secretary of Labor.

I apologize for having taken more of your time than I had intended. In closing, I would like to quote a statement made by H. G. Wells many years ago, that "human history becomes more and more a race between education and catastrophe".

Let us hope that as a nation and as a people we have learned enough from our past failures to give us the wisdom to eliminate the Performance Gap and to win this race of destiny.

WHAT IS OUR NATIONAL INTEREST IN VIETNAM?

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, the Senate has heard a great many words—and a good deal of debate—about our involvement in Vietnam.

I think that few if any of the exchanges that have occurred brought us closer to the heart of the matter than the one we heard yesterday between the distinguished Senators from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

The fundamental question is: What is the U.S. national interest?

The eminent minority leader put his finger on this key question when he pointed out:

> Yesterday you said that our security is not involved at all. It depends on whether or not you take a global view of security. If you do not, the chances are that you are right. I take a different view, because we have conquered time, space, and distance to the point where this is a pretty small world.

Mr. President, this is the crux of the matter. Is our national interest to be defined broadly or narrowly? Is the issue Vietnam? Or is it our role and our interest in Asia?

We are all acutely aware of the pain and the sacrifice and the cost of our present course. But is that course going to make less likely incredibly greater pain, vastly greater sacrifices, and tremendously greater costs in the future?

It was said here yesterday that someone is trying to make Ho Chi Minh into a Hitler—and that that effort was nonsense.

I am not aware that such an effort has been made. What has been done—in this Chamber and elsewhere—is to underline the wisdom of meeting aggression in its early stages rather than later, when the cost may be disaster for mankind.

I remember very well a time not too many years ago when reasonable men in Europe argued that they had no national interest in Spain or in Ethiopia. I remember that many Americans argued that we had no vital interest in Europe. And this estimate of national interest produced inaction—and inaction produced disaster.

Surely the course of history would have been vastly different if men had only realized that what happened in far-off countries, small countries, did indeed ultimately involve their own deepest interests.

Ho Chi Minh is not a Hitler. But I would remind Senators that he was a founding member of the French Communist Party. He is something more than a genial old grandfather, more than a devoted nationalist leader.

An attempt was made in the Chamber yesterday to define American national interest by one simple, single criterion. Did country X have the capacity physically to attack the United States, or did country Y intend to use country X for such an attack?

That, I submit, is an oversimplified and naive description of the national interest of a great nation.

Thirteen years ago, the Members of this body debated and discussed the implication of our involvement in Southeast Asia. In the end, we determined overwhelmingly that our national interest was involved in that part of the world.

We were told yesterday that our only obligation under that treaty was to cooperate with other treaty members as to what course we should take.

That is not my reading of the SEATO Treaty. That is not my definition of what we said we would do.

I would remind Senators that the consultative portion of the treaty related to threats "other than by armed attack."

The heart of the treaty—article IV—says very explicitly:

> 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.

Mr. President, South Vietnam was designated by the treaty parties as a protocol state falling under the protective umbrella of the treaty. There is and has been armed attack against South Vietnam. And we have treated it as a threat to us—as we said we would.

We knew perfectly well what we were doing at the time. The vote in support was overwhelming. And we have lived up to our word.

I would remind Senators of what a former Commander in Chief, General Eisenhower, said of the importance of South Vietnam just 1 year before he left office:

> 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 (today it is 17 million people) would be lost immediately, and that of 150 million in adjacent areas (the number is now 200 million) 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 . . .

Mr. President, can there be any doubt that Southeast Asia is of importance to us? Can there be any doubt that all of Asia is of utmost importance to us? It is where about two-thirds of humanity lives. It is an area of rich resources and great potential. Southeast Asia is the crossroads between the Pacific and the Indian Oceans.

The problem is not whether one or another country in the area is going to be the base for missiles that might be used against us tomorrow. It is whether the millions of people are going to be able to live in freedom. It is whether their skills and resources and energies are going to be used for cooperation in creating a freer and better world or whether they are going to be harnessed under a system that has as one of its primary goals our destruction—and the destruction of all we believe in.

Looked at in this light, can there be any doubt of where our national interest lies?

And can there be any doubt of where the vast majority of Asians stand?

We have seen remarkable changes in Asia over the past few years. There is now more cooperation and constructive work going on there than ever before in history.

Just ask any Asian whether there is a connection between what has been happening in Asia and the firm commitment—backed up by force and determination—of the United States in Vietnam. The testimony is overwhelming—and it is unmistakable.

It is sad to see the kind of soul-searching and self-doubt that is reflected in some statements here—just at a time when our efforts in Vietnam are beginning to produce clear and positive results.

Slowly but surely, the Vietnamese people are building their own country, electing their own officials, moving down the road toward nationhood.

The military tide has clearly turned. Ho Chi Minh's legions and their followers in the South have been thrown back. They have failed in their goal—which

was very close, indeed, 2 years ago—of splitting South Vietnam and taking over. The number of Vietnamese who move under their own government's protection increases each month.

Two things have happened, then. We are winning in South Vietnam.

Second, all of Asia has taken new heart, new encouragement from our interest, from our commitment. And Asia is moving forward in cooperation with free men—with us, with Europe, with each other.

Yes, Mr. President, we do have a vital national interest in Asia. And in fighting in Vietnam we are expressing that interest in a highly effective way.

I predict that if our stand now begins to waver and to weaken, the Members of this body, the American people, and the world are going to rue the day. On that day, we can begin to prepare for world war III.

I pray that that day never comes.

THE WASHINGTON STAR ENDORSES SENATOR SYMINGTON'S PLAN FOR PEACE IN VIETNAM

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, earlier this week, after returning from an extensive fact-finding tour of the Far East, the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] proposed a solution to the war in Vietnam. The Senator speaks from a rich background as a former Secretary of the Air Force and as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services.

He has proposed that on an announced date, the United States halt all military activity in Vietnam, both in the air and on the ground. He proposes that our ally, South Vietnam, simultaneously offer to negotiate a settlement with the enemy forces.

If Hanoi fails to begin negotiations and continues to fight, the Senator concludes that:

> The United States would feel free to pursue the war in any manner of its choosing.

The editors of the Washington Evening Star yesterday, October 4, strongly commended Senator SYMINGTON for his thoughtful proposal. Referring to the Senator's proposal, the Star editors expressed the belief that if the administration were to try this formula, it would be a genuine test of whether Hanoi wishes peace or not. They say:

> We don't think Senator Symington means that, if his peace move failed, a massive escalation of the conflict must necessarily flow. That would not be our idea. We presumably would continue to slug it out along the lines that have already taken shape.

I agree with the Star that the Senator from Missouri has put forward a constructive proposal designed to end the war. I feel confident that he does not do so in the spirit of an ultimatum aimed at a radical change in our strategy in the event his proposal is not accepted.

I ask unanimous consent that the Star editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

A TEST FOR HANOI

Missouri's Senator Symington, a former Air Force Secretary, has come forward with a new and very interesting suggestion for getting to the negotiating table in South Vietnam. Before taking a closer look at the Symington proposal, however, it is useful to go back to President Johnson's speech last Friday night—and to Hanoi's reaction to the key paragraph in that address.

Most of the President's remarks were in the nature of an argument against leading this country to a "Munich" in Southeast Asia. Down in the middle of the text, however, this paragraph appeared: "As we have told Hanoi time and again, the heart of the matter is this: The United States is willing immediately to stop aerial and naval bombardment of North Vietnam when this will lead promptly to productive discussion. We would assume that while discussions proceed, North Vietnam would not take advantage of the bombing cessation or limitation."

The meaning of the first sentence in "the heart of the matter" is obscure. How and when would the President determine whether "productive discussion would promptly follow" a halt to the bombing? There seems to be a bit of give, however, in the second sentence. The statement that we would "assume" that North Vietnam would not take advantage of a bombing pause is new, and stops well short, in our view, of earlier insistence upon some assured reciprocal act of good faith on Hanoi's part. In fact, it comes rather close to an unconditional offer.

Hanoi evidently does not think so. After mulling over the Johnson speech for three days, North Vietnam's official newspaper, Nhan Dan, has rejected the Johnson appeal on the ground that it contained "nothing new." Perhaps this rejection was not quite as harshly worded as some in the past. But it did say this: "So long as the U.S. imperialists stubbornly pursue their war of aggression, the Vietnamese people will continue to fight them until their aggression design is shattered."

Very well. Let's overlook the hyperbole and go back to Symington.

The Missouri Senator is opposed to a bombing pause, which we have favored, because he thinks it would be used by the enemy to the disadvantage of our troops in South Vietnam. What he urges is a stop to *all* fighting in Vietnam, North and South, as of a certain date which would be announced in advance. He would also halt the dispatch of American reinforcements to South Vietnam and would have the South Vietnamese government declare "its willingness to negotiate with anybody and offer amnesty to members of the Viet Cong." Should Hanoi reject this and keep on fighting, "the United States would feel free to pursue the war in any manner of its choosing." We don't think Senator Symington means that, if his peace move failed, a massive escalation of the conflict must necessarily follow. That would not be our idea. We presumably would continue to slug it out along the lines that have already taken shape.

But what about Hanoi? How will Ho Chi Minh respond to the Symington suggestion if the President adopts it? Certainly he cannot reject such a move as "nothing new," or as another dirty trick by U.S. imperialists seeking to pursue their "war of aggression." For what Symington is saying in essence is this: We will stop all fighting, if you will. And then we can talk peace.

If the men who make the decisions in Hanoi really want peace, they will accept the proposal. If they want more war, they will reject it. And should they opt for more war, that at least should put a stop to the extraordinary dovish debate which has been the hallmark of the Senate in recent days.

SUPPORT FROM MINING CONGRESS JOURNAL FOR S. 522, A BILL TO ESTABLISH A NATIONAL MINING AND MINERALS POLICY

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I think that a recent editorial of the Mining Congress Journal should be brought to the attention of Members of the Senate. The editorial emphasizes that the current disruption of essential raw materials from some foreign sources has dramatized the need for a dependable domestic resource base to serve the needs of our growing economy.

It was because of my continuing conviction that the establishment of a national minerals policy is essential to the well-being of our country that early in this session of Congress I introduced legislation calling for the establishment of a national minerals policy. The bill, S. 522, simply provides for a congressional declaration that the establishment of a national minerals policy is in the national interest and that the Federal Government should foster a sound domestic mining and minerals industry, encourage the provision for adequate mineral reserves, and promote mineral research to provide efficient use of our mineral resources.

The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs [Mr. JACKSON] requested departmental reports from affected Federal agencies regarding S. 522 over 8 months ago. We are still waiting for these reports. As the chairman so aptly observed in his most recent letter again requesting the submission of these reports:

> It seems unreasonable that it should take this long to formulate a policy position with respect to this particular legislation.

The editorial of the Mining Congress Journal clearly demonstrates the emergent problem confronting this Nation. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

SERVING THE NATIONAL INTEREST

The recent hostilities in the Middle East have led to the banning of oil shipments to the United States and Great Britain by a number of Arab countries. The ban will apparently be of little immediate consequence to the United States but it does call attention to our vulnerability with respect to the availability of certain essential raw materials from some foreign sources.

This can be better understood by remembering that importation of mineral products continues to grow and by recalling, for example, the seizure of American-owned nickel properties in Cuba, the prohibition by the U.S. Government against importation of chrome and other products originating in Rhodesia, the tragic events that rocked the mineral-rich Congo a few years back, recent purchases of magnesium from Russia, the continuing releases of a variety of metals from federal stockpiles, and current disorders in Bolivia's tin producing areas. All of these add dimension to the matter of having an adequate and dependable resource base to serve the needs of a growing economy and, equally, to assure the national security.

It is widely recognized that mineral raw materials are being consumed at accelerating rates throughout the world. This is particularly true in the United States, which now

produces roughly 60 percent of its metal requirements from domestic resources compared to about 84 percent in 1920. It appears obvious that our dependence on foreign resources will continue to rise.

These circumstances, it seems to us, call for policy makers throughout government to do all possible to promote a stronger domestic mining industry. The first step in this direction would be for those who criticize the industry's every move to stop looking at the mining industry merely as a special interest exploiting our mineral resources, and instead consider mining's total contribution to our way of life and its basic importance to improving the lot of everyone. A realistic appreciation of this viewpoint will serve the national interest well.

SUPERSONIC TRANSPORT

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I believe it is a sad state of affairs that skeptics of the American SST program here in the United States do not share the opinion and confidence in America's excellence in aviation products as the foreign customers of those products. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article published in Aviation Daily of June 9, 1967, which quotes the executive vice president of Swissair, who said he thinks that Swissair will wait for the improved version of the United States supersonic transport before ordering a faster than sound airliner.

The foreign carriers have long since evidenced their faith in American-built equipment, and the above statement by a Swissair official shows beyond a shadow of a doubt that this faith is such that they will wait for the American SST. But how long will the foreign carriers wait for our SST? The answer is that if we share their trust in American leadership in aviation and we aggressively pursue this program now, we shall nullify the effect of the foreign competitors; the British-French Concorde and the Soviet Union's TU–144.

America has held aviation superiority since the dawn of aviation; let us not lose it in the darkness of doubt and indecision.

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

WILL WAIT FOR "IMPROVED" U.S. SST, SWISSAIR EXECUTIVE SAYS

Swissair thinks it "will wait for an improved version of the United States supersonic transport" before ordering a faster-than-sound airliner, Armin O. Baltensweiler, the carrier's executive vice president, said during a Seattle visit. "We think we could get such a plane in 1976," Baltensweiler said. "We will have to sit it out and wait."

Baltensweiler meant Swissair does not plan to order the Concorde for its North Atlantic run, preferring to wait for an improved version of the Boeing SST that would offer acceptable economics for the line's long Zurich-New York route. "We feel it would be no use to begin operating an SST (the Concorde) that would have to stop (on a Zurich-New York trip)," he said.

"I think we would be about four years behind the Concorde with 1976 deliveries," he said. "This might be hard to live with, but it would be tougher to buy the Concorde and operate one-stop SST service over the Atlantic. As it is now, the Concorde would be a terrific gamble for us. But they might come up with a better airplane."

The Swissair plan calls for beginning Boeing 747 service early in 1971, with both 747s the line ordered this spring to be in service by the peak-travel 1971 season. The line thinks bringing the 747 on line in the early 1970's will enable the carrier to build up traffic to cope with the great productivity of the American SST, he said.

"We think we could cover our route requirements with four SSTs," he said. "And we would commit ourselves on an SST just as soon as we could get the necessary range." Baltensweiler pointed out the Boeing SST was designed to meet FAA specifications, which included a 4000-mile range. A growth version proposed by Boeing, he said "would come closer to our requirements." He said "I believe very much in the supersonic transport. When it becomes a reality, we would rather put money in SSTs than in subsonic jets."

SST CENTRAL TO MOST OF AIRLINE'S EQUIPMENT PLANS

Much of Swissair's equipment planning revolves around the SST because of the airliner's importance on such runs as the North and South Atlantic and to the Far East. The question of an air bus, for example, is tied to the SST in the Swissair view, since the carrier wants to make certain if the SST becomes a reality that it has the money to buy it. Then, if Swissair were satisfied it could handle the SST financing, it would consider the air bus, Baltensweiler said. Such an advanced-technology plane would replace the line's Convair 990 fleet and part of its DC–9 fleet. "We have some very clear ideas on the air bus for such routes as London-Zurich, Paris-Copenhagen and Spain-Rome," he said.

"We also feel our Mediterranean and Africa routes could be served by an air bus in 10 years. So we need a range of 2000 nautical miles for such a plane. And we think an air bus almost requires three engines rather than two. We would rather have a 200-passenger plane with a 2000-nautical-mile range than a 300-passenger transport with a 1500-mile range." Swissair sees an eventual need for five to 10 air bus transports, Baltensweiler said. "But the air bus is not as important as getting the right SST," he emphasized.

Swissair, a major operator of Douglas jets, plans to be operating in 1972 a fleet of nine to 10 DC–8s, about 18 DC–9s, its 990s and 747s and three F–27s for internal services, Baltensweiler said. He revealed that Swissair had recommended selection of the Boeing variable-sweep-wing SST design over Lockheed's fixed-delta-wing plane. A key feature, he said, was the Boeing SST's "flexibility."

L. John Eichner has joined Simat, Helliesen and Associates, transportation economists with headquarters in New York, as v.p. For the past five years, Eichner was assistant v.p.-corporate planning of American Airlines, and prior to that was v.p.-marketing of Trans-Texas for eight years.

Delta Air Lines has made a $2,000 grant to the Institute of Certified Travel Agents. It will be used to develop business management techniques in the travel agent industry, through a project to be selected, the institute said.

CONGRESSIONALLY APPLIED DISCOUNT RATES ON PUBLIC WORKS HURT NATION'S ECONOMIC PERFORMANCE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, it is disheartening to report on national policies that are causing serious economic dislocations. These days, when we are barraged with demands for a tax surcharge, we must remember that there are indeed viable alternatives open to administration consideration.

The art by which such alternatives can be analyzed was the subject of recent hearings held by the Joint Economic Committee's Economy in Government Subcommittee, which I have the honor to chair. The hearings which covered 4 days concerned themselves with the planning-programing-budgeting—PPB—evaluation methods.

One integral tool in the PPB system is that of benefit/cost analysis; in simple terms, the overall benefits—that is, both direct and indirect returns—of a proposal are gaged against the overall costs, again, both primary and secondary. In using these techniques, it is important that the factors used to measure the variables be as honestly derived as possible. And foremost of these key factors is the discount rate used to evaluate a project's rate of return. Since 1962, Congress has kept the discount rate on Government projects based upon the average rate of interest payable by the Treasury on longrun interest-bearing marketable securities; historically, the rate remained at 3⅛ percent until only recently, when it was pushed up to 3¼ percent. In using this low rate, the Congress approves projects, primarily in public works, when the rate of return from the project is equal to or above the long-term Government security rate noted above.

But, Mr. President, in our hearings, a panel of highly placed economists emphatically emphasized that this rate is wrong. The correct rate, they told us, is the percentage rate of return that the resources could have obtained in the economy's private sector; a rate ranging from 10 to 15 percent.

While it is hard to measure precisely the total degree of waste caused by administration use of the lower discount rate, some effects can be noted. The administration requested over $4.5 billion in public works projects for fiscal 1968; fiscal 1966 public works expenditures totaled $4.67 billion, and the fiscal 1967 estimate is approximately $4.6 billion. Since 1961, almost $24 billion has been spent in various public works programs.

When the rate of return in these public programs is appreciably less than could be earned in the private economy, the whole economy suffers. Both public and private investment programs compete for scarce resources. The channeling of such resources to projects with low payoffs diverts resources from optimum allocations and tends toward creating inflationary pressures among those projects with higher returns, and leads to less overall economic growth.

In straightforward terms, administration utilization of "wrong" discount rates has contributed to the vexing problems in inflation, credit squeezes, capacity conditions, and sluggish growth over the past few years. Panaceas, like surcharges, have to be rejected in the face of the obvious fact that proper project evaluation could lead to substantial decreases in Government spending.

S. 1035, AN ACT TO PROTECT THE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF EMPLOYEES OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF GOVERNMENT AND TO PREVENT UNWARRANTED GOVERNMENTAL INVASIONS OF THEIR PRIVACY

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on September 13, the Senate passed S. 1035, an

act to protect all employees of the Federal Government from unwarranted invasion of their privacy in their personal thoughts, beliefs, and activities. To judge from the letters and telephone calls, I believe that the action of this body gave Americans renewed faith in Congress as guardian of the liberties of the people.

But the Senate only took care of half of the job: much remains to be done. The responsibility for steering this bill on to the Presidential signature now rests with the House of Representatives.

S. 1035 is pending before a subcommittee of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, together with several companion bills. Among sponsors of these measures are Representatives REUSS, GALIFIANAKIS, REINECKE, CUNNINGHAM, WATSON, MOSS, MATSUNAGA, LONG, LENNON, and FULTON.

The yea-and-nay vote on the passage of S. 1035 shows the overwhelmingly broad bipartisan support for the proposal. The hearing record and subcommittee investigation of the denial of employee privacy amply demonstrate the urgent need for such guarantees. It is my hope that the House will have the opportunity to act on the bill at this session.

Under unanimous consent I include in the RECORD at this point a number of articles and editorials commenting on S. 1035 and invasion of privacy. These are from the Gastonia, N.C., Gazette, August 31, 1967; the Wilmington, N.C., Morning Star, September 15, 1967; the Washington Post, September 16, 1967; the Christian Science Monitor, September 18, 1967; the St. Louis, Mo., Post-Dispatch, September 21, 1967; the Charlotte, N.C., Observer, September 14, 1967, article by James K. Batten; the Nation, September 25, 1967; Press, Pittsburgh, Pa., September 23, 1967; the Sentinel, Chicago, Ill., September 21, 1967; the Washington Daily News, September 21, 1967; Newsday, Garden City, N.Y., article by Clayton Fritchey, September 20, 1967; the Washington Daily News, September 15, 1967; the Charlotte, N.C., News, September 2, 1967; the News Sentinel, Knoxville, Tenn., August 30, 1967, article by Marshall McNeil; Federal Employees News Digest, edited by Joseph Young, September 25, 1967; and Post Herald, Birmingham, Ala., September 21, 1967.

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

[From the Gastonia (N.C.) Gazette, Aug. 31, 1967]

THE SENATOR HAS GOOD CAUSE FOR BEING RILED

North Carolina's Sen. Sam J. Ervin Jr. got riled again. And again there will be a lot of people who won't understand why.

From Washington it was reported that the Senator was red-faced, and editorialized that he was furious, because, as he saw it, the Central Intelligence Agency thinks it has a right to "stand above the law."

The Senator does not want the secret CIA organization to have the power to ask employees and applicants for employment about such personal matters as family relationships, religious beliefs, and sex habits.

And he resented the CIA's maneuvering in legislative places to win elimination of his bill which would safeguard people from such invasions.

Further, the Senator left no doubt that he considers the CIA is not only overstepping proper procedure and denying personal rights, but also is acting illegally by lobbying as a federal agency on pending legislation.

"They want the unmitigated right to kick federal employees around and deny them the basic rights which belong to every American," Senator Ervin charged. That is strong language for the usually cautious man. And it is forceful language, considering that he is a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee which is supposed to have jurisdiction over the CIA.

There is really no cause for failing to understand the Senator's attitude. It is the same attitude which has governed his words and actions in many other matters.

Senator Ervin understands perfectly well that the CIA and the National Security Agency—or some agencies by whatever names—have a vitally important job to do.

As long as nations of people build fences around themselves and regard those on the outside as foreign and potential enemies, there will continue to be a need for what used to be called spying and counterspying.

Both demand more than a little secrecy and a great deal of security within themselves.

Neither can ever be completely achieved. For that reason security agencies are always prone to push harder and harder for additional tools and additional powers.

In that, they are no different from any other close-knit pressure group. And, like every other pressure group, they come to a point where benefits gained have so diminished that they are not worth the cost.

That point comes very early when the cost is in terms of the individual person's rights. When those rights are lost, whatever security agency we have, it is no better than its counterpart in Moscow or pre-war Germany. We shall have spent our real treasure trying to protect it.

All this Senator Ervin knows.

And all this is only a part of why he has appeared over and over again struggling for recognition of the person first. It happens that Senator Ervin is an American. He finds the case for the individual extraordinarily well said in the Constitution. So that is where he makes his stand.

If he were an Englishman, he would make the same fight, taking his stand on whatever basic statement of rights he found in the law.

So he rises to the cause of the individual. He knows that every time a pressure group wins for itself, whatever the excuse or justification, every individual man loses.

In short, human rights have to take precedence over all. And those rights are the property of individual men and women, not of clubs, associations, unions, races, or government agencies.

Senator Ervin is usually called a conservative. The fact is, he is the most liberal believer in democracy one could find.

[From the Wilmington (N.C.) Morning Star, Sept. 15, 1967]

THE RIGHT OF PRIVACY

If ever an individual member of the Congress deserved credit for almost single-handedly protecting the privacy of the American citizen it must go to North Carolina's Sen. Sam J. Ervin, Jr.

For months and years Sen. Ervin has been campaigning against the "Big Brother Is Watching You" technique so vividly related by George Orwell in the frightening book, "1984".

Success came at long last for Sen. Ervin Wednesday when the U.S. Senate voted 79 to 4 to keep Uncle Sam's nose out of the private lives of federal employees. The legislation would prevent applicants for government jobs from having to undergo questioning about sex, religion and personal relationships. The bill now goes to the House.

The North Carolina Democrat was forced to go along with partial exemptions in the case of the CIA, the National Security Agency and the FBI, which will be permitted to use lie detectors and psychological tests during job interviews. No one can have much quarrel with this compromise in such sensitive areas.

During recent years, the invasion of privacy of the American citizens has grown to irritating proportions. His eating habits, his drinking habits, whether he's happily married, where was he on the night of July 3, 1953—all of these absurd queries are hurled at him at some time during his daily existence. He is even harried on the telephone as to his personal habits.

Sen. Ervin, under considerable adverse pressure from federal agencies, has just about won the good fight as a starter. It is to be hoped that the House goes along with the Senate and that President Johnson signs the measure into law.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Sept. 16, 1967]

OFFICIAL PRURIENCE

Those who defend intrusive and intimate questions regarding the private sexual lives of Government employes and job applicants argue that such interrogation reveals much that may help protect national security. Perhaps they do not quite realize how much they reveal about themselves. Probing the privacy of young men and women who want to work for their country may gratify arcane needs of the probers and may provide amusing material for coffee-break and cocktail conversation; but it has by no means been demonstrated that it has any utility whatever for judging fitness or reliability for Government employment.

Effective recruiting is a vital element of national security. A civil service that can enlist the best graduates of the Nation's colleges can contribute a great deal to national strength. But of course able men and women want to work for agencies that treat them fairly and with dignity and that respect their fundamental rights. Some of the questions asked of job applicants by so-called security agencies—Senator Sam Ervin gave a number of disgusting examples in the course of Wednesday's Senate debate on his bill to protect the privacy of Federal employes—are as pointless as they are prurient. They not only serve no purpose in screening the unfit; they outrage the healthy and make the Federal service repugnant to them.

The Senate passed Senator Ervin's bill overwhelmingly on Wednesday as, indeed, it should have done. But it adopted exemptions for the Central Intelligence Agency, the National Security Agency and the Federal Bureau of Investigation. It is a reflection on these agencies that they should want to be exempted. It is a reflection on the judgment of the first two—the FBI has long since learned better—that they want to place reliance in judging the candor of persons under investigation on those discredited instruments of contemporary witchcraft, lie detectors. It is currently fashionable to dress the lie detector up under the more hifalutin name of "polygraph"; but by any name it would be more sensible to rely on reading the entrails of sheep.

The House has important work to do on Senator Ervin's praiseworthy bill. It ought to make its old-fashioned American decency applicable to every agency of the American Government.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Sept. 18, 1967]

TO PROTECT THEIR PRIVACY

Government workers and job applicants have been asked by federal agencies all sorts of questions about their private lives and opinions—their religion and religious beliefs, race, national origin, family relation-

ships, sexual matters, finances, and outside activities.

Sen. Sam J. Ervin, Jr. (D), of North Carolina, along with 54 bipartisan cosponsors, introduced legislation forbidding government agencies to require or request current or prospective federal employees to disclose this kind of information about their private lives.

Senator Ervin and his subcommittee on constitutional rights had previously heard extensive testimony complaining that federal government personnel procedures violated personal privacy. They concluded that government has been gathering and filing personal information much of which has little or nothing to do with a person's ability or qualifications.

The bill, soon due for Senate floor debate, exempts from its provisions only employees of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. It makes special provision for the Central Intelligence Agency and the National Security Agency, but these are both seeking the same status as the FBI.

With technical advances making it much easier to gather, store, and widely disseminate personnel information, it is all the more important that Congress pass this "bill of rights for federal employees." The rights which this bill would protect are implicit in the Constitution of the United States.

But specific legislation is needed to erase any doubt whether a man, by accepting employment with the federal government, thereby bargains away these rights. Some government agencies, judging by their questionnaires and their psychological and polygraph tests, have apparently assumed that he does. Passage of this legislation will make it plain that he does not.

Senator Ervin put it more dramatically when he declared that this bill is based on the premise "that a man who works for the federal government sells his services, not his soul."

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch, Sept. 21, 1967]

A MEASURE OF PRIVACY

Though the President and Supreme Court have often spoken out against invasions of personal privacy, the leading invader of privacy for some years has been the Federal Government itself. To make the Government set a better example, the Senate has now passed by 79 to 4 a measure meant to uphold constitutional rights of federal employes.

If the overwhelming Senate vote is not enough to suggest the need for such a bill, results of a long investigation by a Senate subcommittee should prove it. For example, the Senators found that one woman applying for a Foreign Service job was asked to "answer quickly and without any thinking or deliberation" whether these statements are true or false: I believe in a life hereafter. I read the Bible several times a week. My sex life is satisfactory. Evil spirits possess me at times.

An 18-year-old college girl told the Senators she had thought working for the State Department one summer might be fun, until a departmental interrogator began asking her personal questions about her relations with a boy friend. She lost interest in a federal job.

Such intimate questions about family relationships, sex, religion and personal habits (even dreams) were a familiar part of what officials termed "psychological testing," involving both questionnaires and use of polygraphs, the so-called lie detectors. The subcommittee found that 16 federal agencies had hired 633 polygraph examiners, though it also heard expert testimony that polygraph results were not reliable. The FBI does not use them.

Of course, federal officials defended psychological testing on various grounds: national security, determination of fitness of employes, even the need to provide medical or other aid for employes. The diverse defenses did not make much sense. Senator Sam Ervin of North Carolina, subcommittee chairman, said the tests were both "useless and offensive." "If the security of the United States rests on these devices," he added, "we are indeed pitifully insecure."

But the invasion of privacy of government employes does not stop there. The subcommittee also heard of coercion against them to buy bonds, to take part in some outside activities and to avoid others, and to conduct any public writing or speaking according to some official's preconceived rules.

To make matters worse, this infernal meddling in private lives was not restricted to so-called security agencies, but was spread throughout the bureaucracy. Nor was there any relation between security and the granting of such elementary protection as a right to counsel in hearings; the Defense Department allowed counsel but, until recently, the Civil Service Commission did not.

As passed by the Senate, Senator Ervin's bill is aimed specifically at all these malpractices, exempting only the three major intelligence agencies: the CIA, NSA and FBI. The military is covered by its own rules.

For other federal departments, the bill prohibits bureaucratic demands that employes disclose their race, religion or national origin or take psychological or polygraph tests involving family, sex and religion. The measure bars demands that employes engage in outside activities or report those of a voluntary nature. It prohibits coercion as to charitable gifts and bonds and in political matters. It also requires the right to counsel in disciplinary hearings.

Senator Ervin deserves a great deal of credit for disclosing the Big Brotherly operations of government and proposing to put an end to them. As a practical matter, such invasions of a citizen's rights, innermost thoughts and beliefs can only discourage sound federal employment practices. But the principle involved is far more important.

The principle is the Constitutional one of protecting private thoughts from intrusion. When the Government itself assumes the privileges of keyhole aristocracy it should, as Senator Ervin said, "disturb every American who takes pride in his government." We hope the House will be as disturbed as the Senate proved to be.

[From the Charlotte (N.C.) Observer, Sept. 14, 1967]

ERVIN'S PRIVACY BILL PASSES—WITH CIA IN IT

(By James K. Batten)

WASHINGTON.—The Central Intelligence Agency lost its battle to be exempted from Sen. Sam Ervin's "bill of rights" for government employes Wednesday as the Senate approved the bill, 79 to 4.

Ervin called the vote "a great victory for human rights and human dignity." But Senate defenders of the CIA warned that the bill could hamper U.S. intelligence efforts all over the world.

Most of the four-hour debate centered on the use of lie-detector and psychological tests to screen out homosexuals and other undesirables applying for jobs with the CIA and the National Security Agency. The Ervin bill would sharply limit the use of such tests.

Sen. Henry M. Jackson, D-Wash., a member of the Senate's CIA watchdog committee, claimed that more than 10 "definite security risks" were screened out by the CIA last year after other methods failed to identify them.

Ervin remarked that two cryptographers who worked for the National Security Agency, William H. Martin and Vernon F. Mitchell, both had passed lie-detector tests before they defected to Russia in 1960.

"A man that will believe in polygraph tests will believe in witchcraft," Ervin declared.

The question of exempting the CIA and the NSA from the Ervin bill never came to a showdown, reportedly because a nose count convinced Jackson, Sen. John Stennis, D-Miss., and Sen. Richard B. Russell, D-Ga., that they would lose.

Stennis and his allies stayed in close touch with the CIA and NSA throughout the afternoon's debate. At least four agents from the CIA and the NSA watched the proceedings from the gallery, ducking out frequently to confer with strategists in the cloakrooms below.

The CIA, particularly, had fought hard to escape coverage by the bill. Just before the Labor Day recess, the Ervin bill was pulled off the Senate agenda on short notice in response to CIA request for time to plead its case.

CIA Director Richard Helms and other agents visited a number of senators shortly thereafter, insisting that the bill would cause serious problems for the super-secret intelligence agency. But apparently their efforts failed to sway the Senate majority.

Ervin did yield on one point in Wednesday's debate, and there were varying interpretations of its importance.

The N.C. Democrat agreed to an amendment permitting the directors of the CIA and the NSA to designate officials within their agencies to decide when special circumstances dictated use of otherwise forbidden questions on lie-detector and psychological tests.

Ervin originally urged the Judiciary Committee to require CIA and NSA, like all other government agencies, to abstain from asking employes and job applicants questions about sex, religion, or family relations in the course of lie-detector or psychological tests.

But the committee voted, instead, to permit such questioning when the direction of the agency personally determined that it was necessary to protect the national security.

On the floor Wednesday, Ervin agreed to permit an agency director to delegate such decisions to "his designee," if he wished. Whether such language would permit CIA and NSA to continue as they have in the past was not immediately clear.

Prospects for House action on the bill this year are uncertain.

In general, the Ervin bill is designed to safeguard the privacy of government employes from unwarranted intrusions by their superiors.

Among other things, the bill would forbid requirement that employes buy savings bonds, make certain charitable contributions, attend off-duty meetings and report on personal activities unrelated to their jobs.

"There is nothing in this bill which will handicap the CIA or NSA in protecting America against enemies of America," Ervin told the Senate. "All this bill does is try to make them have a proper respect for the rights of privacy of their employes."

[From the Nation, Sept. 25, 1967]

HOUSE OF SPOOKS

Critics of the Central Intelligence Agency have for years said that that house of spooks is nutty; but for the most part such things were said in the spirit of hyperbole. Now it appears that perhaps they were right in this: the CIA does in fact appear to be run by kooks.

Assuming that an organization's sanity can be tested by the manner in which it hires and fires its employees, consider this evidence of mental aberration: The CIA uses handwriting analysis (according to *The Wall Street Journal*) to test the character and personality traits of job applicants. This is scarcely a scientific or even a common-sense test, of course, but that doesn't seem to bother the men who run the CIA.

More recently Sen. Sam Ervin of North Carolina came up with the fascinating information that at least as late as 1963 the

CIA was financing the development of a "wiggle seat," a sly kind of lie detector. The job applicant would be seated in a plain-looking chair during his interview; but unbeknownst to him, the specially equipped seat would be recording his pulse, adrenalin flow, respiration and skin dampness. It is not known whether the wiggle seat has ever been put into service.

What is known is that the CIA is using its battery of ordinary lie-detector machines with a mindless fury. Senator Ervin has learned, through his own sources within the spy agency (its top officials will no longer talk with him) that more than 5,000 lie tests were administered on both employees and would-be employees during the last year, and only thirty for counterintelligence purposes.

Because of his psychotic affection for the machine, CIA Director Richard Helms is frantically determined that Congress shall not include his agency under the pending bill to outlaw lie-detector tests and to prohibit any government agency from asking a job applicant such things as whether he ever had sexual relations with an animal, whether he slept with his wife before marriage, whether he urinates more than other people, or whether he believes in the Second Coming. Helms has lobbied furiously in the Senate to keep the privilege of asking CIA workers questions of this sort, and he will undoubtedly now go to work on the House to defend his bureaucratic voyeurism.

He is especially interested in having the right to use the lie detector to hunt for homosexuals. But the reason is not clear. Does he wish to get rid of them as security risks? Or does he want to recruit them as agents? The latter is rumored and the rumor has been published, even in the highly responsible *Christian Science Monitor*. Helms has not denied the published rumors. Senator Ervin—certainly no defender of Helms—feels, however, that not even the CIA is that dumb. But even assuming the CIA wants to use the lie detector to weed out homosexuals, this makes little sense.

In one of the closed sessions of the Senate subcommittee considering Ervin's bill, Sen. Birch Bayh of Indiana, a close friend of Helms, argued with Ervin: "Sam, if the Russians find a queer on the CIA payroll, they can intimidate him and put him to their own service." To which Ervin responded tiredly: "Yeah? And how are the Russians going to find him—with a lie detector?"

But logic, as Ervin has discovered, isn't the best of weapons to use in fighting for legislation.

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa) Press, Sept. 23, 1967]

PRIVACY FOR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Largely through the long effort of Sen. Sam J. Ervin of North Carolina, the Senate has passed and sent to the House a bill designed to protect Government employes from unnecessary invasions of their privacy by zealous superiors or other official stuffed shirts.

In view of the evidence uncovered by a Senate committee, the bill not only is badly needed but long ouverdue. And it is a disgusting reflection on the petty-minded Government officials who not only tolerated this nonsense but promoted it.

In support of the bill, Sen Roman Hruska of Nebraska said employes had been coerced into revealing highly personal information, forced to account for off-duty hours and compelled to donate time and money to assorted projects—among other things. Some of the intimate questions asked of job applicants were outrageous.

As passed by the Senate the bill attempts to outlaw such practices as requiring employes to attend lectures or take part in activities unrelated to their jobs, quizzing them about religious beliefs or sexual attitudes, forcing them to attend political meetings, or to buy bonds or contribute to charities.

In short, it is a sweeping bill to do away with "big brotherism."

The Senate action is proper and the same protection eventually should be provided all citizens who are increasingly subjected to prying, irrelevant questions from nib-noses in and out of Government.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Sentinel, Sept. 21, 1967]

GOVERNMENT STALLING ACTION ON BILL BANNING DISCLOSURE OF APPLICANT'S RELIGION

(By Milton Friedman)

The Administration is seeking to stall action by the House on the Senate-approved "Bill of Rights" for Federal employees that would forbid Government agencies from requiring job applicants to disclose their religious background, national origin or race.

The bill also prohibits lie detector and psychological tests to force disclosure of other personal data. It protects individuals from other forms of coercion and invasions of privacy.

Five huge filing cabinets in the office of the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee are bulging with complaints. Some of the complainants told how the Government required them to answer "true" or "false" to such questions as "Christ performed miracles." . . . "I go to church almost every week." . . . "I believe in the second coming of Christ."

Subcommittee chairman Sam Ervin, Jr., North Carolina Democrat, felt that the Government had no right to force answers to such inquiries. He said that "anyone who wishes to understand what intrusion of privacy really means can find out by applying for a Government job."

PRESERVATION OF FREEDOM

Sen. Ervin and the 78 other Senators who voted for his bill, S. 1035, were concerned about the preservation of individual freedom in an age of computers and scientific technology. They noted not only the bold probing of religious beliefs under the guise of security requirements but also probes into philanthropic practices and even sexual behavior.

Pressure by the Administration forced the exemption from the protection of the bill the two agencies concerned with overseas sleuthing—the Central Intelligence Agency and the National Security Agency. Sen. Ervin told the Senate he did not favor even these exemptions.

The FBI was given the same authority provided the CIA and NSA. However, the FBI said it did not use the objectionable testing methods on its employees.

Sen. Ervin said that his own research as subcommittee chairman convinced him that polygraph machines (lie detectors) "are totally unreliable for any purpose." He said that "if the security of the United States rests on these devices, we are indeed pitifully insecure. Fortunately, it does not, for the FBI does not use these examinations."

"But even if it could be shown that psychological tests and polygraph tests have mystical powers and can be used to predict behavior or divine the truth, I would still oppose their being used to probe the religious beliefs, family relationships, or sexual attitudes of American citizens," said the Senator.

An exemption was made for questions concerning national origin where the information is needed for security purposes involving overseas assignments.

Under the pending legislation, Government officials found guilty of violating employees' rights could be suspended or fired. A three-member bipartisan board of employee rights would be created to police the program. The board would hear cases and make regular reports to Congress.

Although the watered-down bill passed the Senate by a vote of 79 to 4, it faces an uncertain future in the House. The Administration is expected to seek futher modification. An attempt will be made to stall action.

Government officials contend that there are already enough Administrative regulations to safeguard employee rights.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Sept. 21, 1967]

PRIVACY BY STATUTE

Largely thru the long effort of Sen. Sam J. Ervin of North Carolina, the Senate has passed and sent to the House a bill designed to protect Government employes from unnecessary invasions of their privacy by zealous superiors or other official stuffed shirts.

In view of the evidence uncovered by the Senate committee, the bill not only is badly needed but long overdue. And it is a disgusting reflection on the petty-minded Government officials who not only tolerated this nonsense but promoted it.

In support of the bill, Sen. Roman Hruska of Nebraska said employes had been coerced into revealing highly personal information, forced to account for off-duty hours and compelled to donate time and money to assorted projects—among other things. Some of the intimate questions asked of job applicants were outrageous.

As passed by the Senate the bill attempts to outlaw such practices as requiring employes to attend lectures or take part in activities unrelated to their jobs, quizzing them about religious beliefs or sexual attitudes, forcing them to attend political meetings, or to buy bonds or contribute to charities.

In short, it is a sweeping bill to do away with "big brotherism."

We applaud the Senate action and hope the same protection eventually will be provided all citizens who are increasingly subjected to prying, irrelevant questions from nib-noses in and out of government.

[From Newsday, Sept. 20, 1967]

SENATE PULLS PLUG ON LIE DETECTOR

(By Clayton Fritchey)

WASHINGTON.—It's hard to say what will finally become of the Senate's new proclamation of privacy for federal employes, because the bill has yet to pass the House, but come what may it has dealt the polygraph machine (lie detector) a withering blow.

Hopefully, the legislation ultimately will protect federal workers from all kinds of prying into the most intimate recesses of their private lives. Even if it falls short of this, however, it has speeded the end of the polygraph, which has been used so indiscriminately in government hiring and firing.

During the Senate hearings, the testimony against the lie detector, both as to its abuse and unreliability, was so devastating that its further use, outside of government as well as in, will undoubtedly be curtailed, irrespective of whether the House approves the Senate bill or not.

Federal discontinuance is certain to accelerate a similar trend at the state and local levels. A number of states, in fact, have already adopted statutes comparable to the one in Massachusetts, which says, "No employer shall require or subject any employe to any lie detector test as a condition of employment or continued employment." Oregon, Rhode Island, and Hawaii have similar proscriptions. More are on the way.

It is reported that no court in the land, state or federal, will now permit a polygraph test to be admitted in evidence. The reason for this, according to Sen. Sam J. Ervin (D-N.C.), a former judge, is that "the machine is of the most dubious value." It cannot interpret itself, he points out, "but must be interpreted by an operator. The machine

merely measures physiological reactions as blood pressure, the pumping of adrenalin by the adrenal glands into the blood stream, and the like, as a result of excitement and stimulation."

While presiding over a murder trial, the former judge said, he had given "close study" to polygraph tests when the prosecution tried to introduce them as evidence. "I came to the conclusion," he says, "that a brazen liar can pass a polygraph test without any difficulty but that a nervous or excitable individual, or an individual who resents being insulted, no matter how truthful he may be, is not likely to do so."

This view is supported by the Warren Commission, which said, "In evaluating the polygraph, due consideration must be given to the fact that a physiological response may be caused by factors other than deception, such as fear, anxiety, neurosis, dislike, and other emotions. There are no valid statistics as to the reliability of the polygraph."

The new Senate bill specifically exempts the FBI, but FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover is already on record against the polygraph for personnel purposes. Labor unions are also beginning to protest against their use.

The AFL–CIO Executive Council has "deplored" them "not only because their claims to reliability are dubious, but because they infringe on the fundamental rights of American citizens to personal privacy. Neither the government nor private employers should be permitted to engage in this sort of police state surveillance of the lives of individual citizens."

Only the CIA and the National Security Agency resisted the Senate legislation, which prompted Sen. Roman Hruska (R.-Neb.) to accuse them of being the "greatest transgressors" in using the polygraph. "What they want," said Ervin, "is to stand above the law."

The U.S. Civil Service Commission, on the other hand, has been showing a growing respect for the private lives of federal employes. It has just quietly, but efficiently, reprimanded one of its investigators for "improperly" inquiring into a report that an applicant had borne a child out of a wedlock.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, September 15, 1967]

U.S. EMPLOYEES' BILL OF RIGHTS

The "bill of rights" for Federal employees passed Wednesday by the Senate by a vote of 79 to 4, was sponsored by Sen. Sam Ervin (D., N.C.) and 54 other senators. We felicitate all of them, sponsors and those who joined in voting for the measure.

The bill would prohibit many forms of coercion which have been practiced upon Federal employees, and, further, would protect them against many indefensible forms of invasion of their privacy.

An amendment gives FBI, CIA and NSA special rights to make apply certain tests to employees for security reasons, which is only proper and wise.

Now the bill goes to the House where further action probably will be delayed until next year. We deplore this and wish that the whole legislative bundle could have been wrapped up right now. However, a fine start has been made toward assuring Federal employees their rightful dignity, and we hope that the bill rides into law before too long.

[From the Charlotte (N.C.) News, Sept. 2, 1967]

A CIA ABOVE THE LAW

The more there is to say about the Central Intelligence Agency, apparently, the less there is to say for it. The spy guys scare you when you can't see them but it's much worse when you can.

First, the CIA refused to appear in hearings on a Sam Ervin-sponsored bill that would limit the agency's blanket rights to pry into the lives of its employes. Then it announced it would be glad to take part in a—you guessed it—secret hearing before the Judiciary Committee. Then Richard Helms, the new CIA chief, got busy and managed to have the Ervin bill removed from the Senate agenda.

The performance prompted Senator Ervin to make public a blistering memorandum he had sent to other Judiciary Committee members accusing the CIA of trying to stand above the law and of active and illegal lobbying in Congress. He read the appropriate federal law forbidding agencies of the government from attempting to influence the passage or defeat of legislation before Congress and suggested that the CIA might leave its lie detectors long enough to investigate whether this statute has been violated.

An investigation of some sort definitely is called for. It is no light matter when government agencies begin bullying Congress or trading off favors for preferential treatment. The applicable law in this case is vital to protect government from the paralyzing grip of an all-powerful bureaucracy. If this matter is allowed to drop without further comment, Congress will serve notice that the CIA is indeed above the law.

[From the Knoxville (Tenn.) News-Sentinel, Aug. 30, 1967]

CIA ROCKS BOAT

(By Marshall McNeil)

WASHINGTON.—The Central Intelligence Agency wants its spies to be left out in the cold.

It is asking the Senate for exemption from terms of the proposed "bill of rights" to protect Federal Government employees from uninhibited grilling about intimate details of their family relations, sex life and religion.

The CIA request has caused the leadership to delay until next month debate on the "bill of rights," a measure co-sponsored by 50 senators and recommended by the Judiciary Committee.

Thus CIA, swathed in the secrecy said to be so essential to success in the shadowy crafts of spies and counterspies, has stirred up another public fuss, plus the ire of that eloquent old parliamentary battler, Sen. Sam Ervin (D-N.C.).

And the threat has been made that if CIA persists in its request, in which it is joined by that other supersecret bureau, the National Security Agency, both may endanger the partial exemptions already written into the bill for them.

There are some who think that if CIA ever is compromised, it may have only itself to blame.

USE LIE DETECTORS

The courtly Ervin discovered some time ago that to get a Federal job some young applicants were required to take lie-detector tests and answer such questions as: "When was the first time you had sexual relations with a woman? Have you ever engaged in homosexual activities? . . . Did you have intercourse with (your wife) before you were married? How many times?"

The bill, product of long hearings by Ervin's Constitutional Rights subcommittee, would put an end to such questioning. It would also prohibit:

Indiscriminate requirements that employees and applicants for Government employment disclose their race, religion or national origin; participation in outside activities unrelated to their employment; reports on their outside activities; or support of political candidates.

It would make it illegal to coerce an employe to buy bonds or make charitable contributions or to require him to disclose his personal assets, liabilities or expenditures or those of any member of his family unless such items would tend to show a conflict of interests.

"Why," asked Ervin, "do these two agencies want the license to coerce their employes to contribute to charity and to buy bonds? Do they not know how to evaluate a secretary for employment without asking for . . . if she loved her mother, if she goes to church every week, if she believes in God, if she believes in the second coming of Christ, if her sex life is satisfactory . . . what she dreams about, and many other extraneous matters?"

SELF SERVICES

Moreover, Ervin said, the bill already allows CIA and NSA to use lie-detector or psychological tests to elicit information from an employe or applicant on his personal relations with any person connected with him by blood or marriage, his religious beliefs, or his attitude or conduct with respect to sexual matters. The only requirement is that before such questions can be asked, the directors of CIA and NSA must make a personal finding that such a test is required to protect the national security.

Ervin said he was furnished a 10-page statement by CIA about things it objected to in the bill, but—wouldn't you know!—the statement was marked "Secret." He said in response to it he changed the bill to meet what he regarded as every relevant complaint.

"The idea that any Government agency is entitled to the 'total man' and to knowledge and control of all the details of his personal and community life unrelated to his employment of law enforcement is more appropriate for totalitarian countries than for a society of free men," Ervin said.

"The basic premise of (the 'bill of rights') is that a man who works for the Federal Government sell his services, not his soul."

[From Federal Employees' News Digest, Sept. 25, 1967]

BILL OF RIGHTS SNAG

(By Joseph Young)

The House appears in no hurry to take action on the Senate-approved "bill of rights" for government employees.

Rep. David Henderson, D-N.C., chairman of the House Civil Service Manpower subcommittee to which the Senate-okayed bill was referred, said his group has other legislation pending before it that will receive priority.

Henderson said he wanted to study the Senate-approved measure to protect government workers against unwarranted invasion of privacy before he decides what action, if any, to take.

"I guess you can't be against a bill such as this," Henderson said. "But I want to study it more thoroughly."

Indications point to Henderson's subcommittee preferring not to take action until next year. Since next year's session of Congress will be merely a continuation of this year, lack of House action this year would not kill the measure.

But Sen. Sam Ervin, D-N.C., chief Senate sponsor of the bill, is anxious to get final approval by Congress this year. Incidentally, Ervin deserves the great support and thanks of all federal and postal employees for his monumental efforts on their behalf. His name belongs in that small roster of the truly great champions in the history of Congress on behalf of government employees.

The administration is opposed to the measure as approved by the Senate and would like the House to either kill it or modify it drastically.

In the final analysis, it will be up to the federal and postal unions to bring pressure to bear on the Henderson group to hold hearings and take action on the Senate-approved bill. This the employee groups intend to do. They strongly favor the measure and feel its enactment into law is essential.

Individual employees can also help. Those living in the districts of the members of the subcommittee should contact their congressman and urge prompt hearings and action. The subcommittee members are Reps. David Henderson, N.C.; Charles Wilson, Calif.; Richard White, Tex.; Lee Hamilton, Tex.; Frank Brasco, N.Y.; H. R. Gross, Iowa; Edward Derwinski, Ill.; James Broyhill, N.C. Also, letters to Rep. Thaddeus Dulski, D-N.Y., chairman of the full House Civil Service Committee; and Robert Corbett, Pa., the group's ranking minority member, would be helpful.

[From the Birmingham (Ala.) Post-Herald, Sept. 21, 1967]

PRIVACY BY STATUTE

Largely through the long effort of Sen. Sam J. Ervin of North Carolina, the Senate has passed and sent to the House a bill designed to protect Government employees from unnecessary invasions of their privacy by zealous superiors or other official stuffed shirts.

In view of the evidence uncovered by a Senate committee, the bill not only is badly needed but long overdue. And it is a disgusting reflection on the petty-minded Government officials who not only tolerated this nonsense but promoted it.

In support of the bill, Sen. Roman Hruska of Nebraska said employes had been coerced into revealing highly personal information, forced to account for off-duty hours and compelled to donate time and money to assorted projects—among other things. Some of the intimate questions asked of job applicants were outrageous.

As passed by the Senate the bill attempts to outlaw such practices as requiring employes to attend lectures or take part in activities unrelated to their jobs, quizzing them about religious beliefs or sexual attitudes, forcing them to attend political meetings, or to buy bonds or contribute to charities.

In short, it is a sweeping bill to do away with "big brotherism."

We applaud the Senate action and hope the same protection eventually will be provided all citizens who are increasingly subjected to prying, irrelevant questions from nib-noses in and out of Government.

THE RESOLUTION URGING ASIAN ALLIES FOR MORE CONTRIBUTION IN VIETNAM

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I welcome the opportunity to speak in behalf of this fine resolution which has been introduced by my friend the able Senator from Illinois, which has been cosponsored by many distinguished colleagues.

While I do not wish to have this action of the Senate increase the many burdens or pressures now on our busy President, I do feel that this resolution, expressing the opinion of the Senate, will be useful in obtaining more military assistance from our Asian allies.

In this regard, I should like to give special recognition to the splendid record of the Australian and Korean combat units that are already fighting by our side in South Vietnam. And, of course, I am certain that we welcome the engineering, medical, and other support we receive from units of our other allies in the far Pacific.

I should like to have the RECORD show the total numbers of allied military men now on the scene in Vietnam. According to the Department of Defense, the following numbers of allied troops were in South Vietnam as of October 1:

South Vietnam (about 327,000 regular forces)	730,000
South Korea	45,000
Australia	6,300
Thailand	2,500
Philippines	2,000
New Zealand	400

The resolution is addressed to the non-Communist nations of Asia, and it asks for more contribution. I concur wholeheartedly with this general thought. At the same time I might add that, in my opinion, we need different kinds of contributions.

From the South Vietnamese, who have endured long years of conflict and who have many splendidly trained combat units, we could use greater assistance at our side on the frontlines.

With the possible exception of South Korea, which has done so much already, we could use additional combat and support units from our other Asian allies, particularly from Thailand. By its proximity to Vietnam, Thailand has one of the greatest vested interests in the outcome of the war.

Finally, I suggest that we not ignore the great potential of the armed forces of the Republic of China. That great country has, more than once, offered to send significant assistance to the Vietnam theater.

STATEMENT BY MORRIS B. ABRAM, IN FAVOR OF SENATE RATIFICATION OF THE HUMAN RIGHTS CONVENTIONS—CLI

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Mr. Morris B. Abram, U.S. representative on the United Nations Commission on Human Rights and president of the American Jewish Committee, presented to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee a most persuasive statement in favor of U.S. ratification of the human rights conventions.

Mr. Abram points out quite accurately that—

> No serious authority disputes the conclusion of Ambassador Goldberg on behalf of the Administration, that the provisions of these Conventions coincide the fundamental rights already guaranteed by our Federal Constitution, and that their ratification would neither enlarge the existing Federal competence, nor require any implementing legislation, nor impose higher standards than those already observed in this country.

I believe that it goes without saying that I agree wholeheartedly with the arguments and conclusions so effectively articulated by Mr. Abram. Because I am certain that the statement of Morris Abram will be of real value to the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT ON HUMAN RIGHTS CONVENTIONS BY MORRIS B. ABRAM, BEFORE THE SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE, SEPTEMBER 13, 1967

Mr. Chairman, I am Morris B. Abram, a member of the law firm of Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 575 Madison Avenue, New York City. I have the honor of serving as U.S. representative on the UN Commission on Human Rights. I also serve as President of the American Jewish Committee, and am a member of the American Bar Association.

I am grateful to you and to the other members of the Committee for the opportunity to present my views on the question before you. I regret that I was unable to present them at the earlier hearing last Spring of Senator Dodd's Ad Hoc Subcommittee, since I was then in Geneva at the session of the Human Rights Commission.

I shall not burden the Committee with a detailed analysis of the legal issues raised in connection with the three conventions which are the subject of these hearings. These were thoroughly and admirably discussed in the February 23 testimony of Ambassador Goldberg and in the statements of other excellent witnesses who appeared on March 8 before the Ad Hoc Subcommittee on behalf of a great many important citizens' organizations. I refer, in particular, to the testimony of Richard Gardner for the more than 50 organizations composing the Ad Hoc Committee on Human Rights and Genocide Treaties, I draw your attention also to the reports of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, and of the Committee of Human Rights and the Committee on Women of the National Citizens' Commission on International Cooperation. This material is reproduced in the record of the Ad Hoc Subcommittee's hearings. Though my remarks will touch on the legal issues, they will center on the question of policy and national interest.

I think it is significant, Mr. Chairman, that not one of the witnesses before the Subcommittee opposed the ratification of any of the three conventions, but, to the contrary, all strongly urged that our country join the great number of others that have become parties to these elementary human rights instruments. I think it is also significant that no local bar association opposes their ratification, and at least seven that I know of, have endorsed ratification. These are the bar associations of Alaska, Colorado, District of Columbia, Los Angeles, New Jersey, New York City and New York State.

Mr. Chairman, no serious authority disputes the conclusion of Ambassador Goldberg on behalf of the Administration, that the provisions of these conventions coincide with fundamental rights already guaranteed by our Federal Constitution, and that their ratification would neither enlarge the existing Federal competence, nor require any implementing legislation, nor impose higher standards than those already observed in this country. No authority challenges the assertion that none of their provisions contravene State laws which are otherwise valid under the Federal Constitution.

The chief argument voiced by certain opponents of ratification, is that these Conventions do not deal with matters properly within our Constitution's treaty-making power; that is, they deal with matters that concern the relations between a State and its own citizens, and are not matters of "international concern," and hence not proper subjects for the exercise of this power.

Ambassador Goldberg and other witnesses at the Subcommittee's hearings effectively disposed of this argument. They established that the treaty-making power extends to all matters that are proper subjects of international negotiation—in other words, of international concern—as determined by the contemporary situation. That the subject matter involved is of a domestic nature does not preclude dealing with it by treaty, providing it is also of international concern. The only treaties that are excluded by the Constitution are those designed as a contrivance to make law internally by circumventing the ordinary legislative processes; or treaties whose provisions contravene the express prohibitions of the Constitution—neither of

which exclusions apply to the conventions under consideration.

Ambassador Goldberg and the other witnesses substantiated with ample documentation that human rights in general, and the subject matter of these conventions in particular, are an established concern of our foreign policy as well as a concern of the international community. They cited the repeated humanitarian interventions by our government on behalf of oppressed groups in other countries, President Roosevelt's Four Freedoms Proclamation of 1941 and other historic Presidential statements, and our role in the drafting of the United Nations Charter (1945) and the Charter of the Organization of American States (1948). They referred to our role in the writing and our ratification of the ILO Constitution of 1919, whose premise is that the conditions of labor are a matter of international concern, our ratification of the Slavery Convention of 1926, and our participation in the peace treaties of 1947 with the several Central and East European states, containing provisions proscribing discrimination on religious, political and *sex* grounds. They drew attention to the large number of ratifications of the conventions under consideration here—68 for the Supplementary Slavery Convention, 75 for the Forced Labor Convention, and 51 for the Political Rights of Women Convention.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that there is no constitutional difficulty impeding our ratification of these conventions. Moreover, ratification would be decidedly in our national interest.

I am pleased to note that the American Bar Association, several weeks ago at the meeting of its House of Delegates in Honolulu, came to this conclusion with regard to the Supplementary Slavery Convention. However, as a member of this great Association, I must express regret that the House of Delegates did not make a similar finding with regard to the Forced Labor and the Political Rights of Women conventions. These, it declined to endorse—I may add, by a narrow vote, at which several former presidents spoke out eloquently against this posture—because, in its view, they did not meet these requirements.

Mr. Chairman, if the abolition of slavery in its various manifestations is an acknowledged objective of our foreign relations, and a matter of genuine international concern—because it is an evil which breeds social and political tensions and which, moreover, can have a harmful impact on the sales of American products within our country and in foreign markets—it is difficult for me to understand why this reasoning does apply equally to the evil of forced labor. It is relevant to recall, in this connection, that even the 1926 Slavery Convention, which we ratified long before the existence of the United Nations, called (in Article 5) for all necessary measures to prevent forced labor from developing into conditions resembling slavery—indicating that already then, over 40 years ago, we acknowledged by treaty the similarity of the two evils.

I believe, also, that the Political Rights of Women Convention meets the test both of constitutionality and national interest—in that it is both an important objective of our foreign relations and a matter of genuine international concern. Clearly, genuine economic and social progress is difficult of attainment, especially in the developing countries—to which we send quantities of aid—if half the population is deprived of status and dignity, of the right to vote and to hold public office. Moreover, as pointed out by one witness before the Subcommittee, the withholding from women of civil and political rights, the regarding of them as household possessions, is an obstacle to the progress of family planning—a crucial means for defusing the population explosion, which is perhaps the most critical problem that faces mankind today.

We practice no forced labor in our country. Our women enjoy political rights on a par with men. The standards of these conventions are entirely consistent with our own practices; they are a projection internationally of our own human rights principles and commitments. We should rejoice that they have become part of the growing body of international law in the field of human rights. We should have been the first to ratify them, rather than still be haggling about vague and fictitious dangers lurking in them.

I believe there exists in some circles a vague fear of the consequences that might flow from opening ourselves up to criticism from foreign powers. It is not clear whether what is feared is deserved or undeserved criticism. In either case, the fear is mistaken. For if the fear is that we may be criticized for national conduct falling below the standards in these conventions—for reinstituting conditions of slavery or practicing forced labor or depriving our women of their political rights—should not external criticism be welcomed? But this eventuality is obviously academic, since we have every reason to be secure in and proud of our standards in the areas covered by these conventions.

On the other hand, if it is feared that the conventions might be used as a peg for subjecting us to *undeserved* criticism, this reveals an unwarranted under-estimation of our capacity to defend ourselves in international forums. The truth is that by becoming a party to these conventions we would not give our "enemies" any propaganda weapon that they do not already have, and that we are not capable of effectively resisting. As an open society, with our practices widely discussed in our own as well as the world information media, we risk nothing. The risk lies rather with the communist and other closed societies, against which our ratification would provide us with a legal and moral handle to prod for *their* delinquencies.

Mr. Chairman, the question before this Committee goes beyond the three conventions under consideration. This question is whether our country is to operate with a conception of the treaty power that is suitable for the realities of the rapidly shrinking world we inhabit. It is whether our policies are to be responsive to the objective facts of the increasing interdependence of nations, and the relationship between the conditions of freedom, economic and social progress, and international peace and security. It is whether our policies will reflect the recurrently demonstrated truth that the effects of the suppression of liberty, of race and sex discrimination, of poverty and illiteracy, tend to overflow borders and affect adversely other countries and the world-at-large.

The question is also whether the ideals which inspired the authors of our Declaration of Independence and our Constitution, that human rights and freedoms are the rightful heritage not only of Americans but of all men, is valid for us today; whether the American tradition of espousing the cause of the oppressed, or promoting the fundamental values of human rights, not only at home but abroad, is still an essential element of our national policy. It is whether we still adhere to, or whether we intend to renege on, the commitment we made when we joined the United Nations, to cooperate with other nations "in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion", and in solving international economic and social problems.

Mr. Chairman, if we did not expect to carry out this commitment seriously, why did we ratify the UN Charter? If we did not intend to join in measures for implementing this undertaking, of which the most crucial is the adoption and the ratification of conventions, why did we indorse the inclusion in the Charter of this human rights purpose? Do we want the contemporary worldwide effort to extend the rule of law in the field of human rights to succeed or, by standing aloof from it, are we prepared to be a witness to its demise—as our failure to join the League of Nations contributed to the demise of that noble effort. For it is a fact of today's reality that when the United States, the world's strongest power and leading democracy, stands aloof from an international undertaking, that undertaking has little chance to succeed.

For this past July, before the World Conference on World Peace Through Law, and the First World Assembly of the World Association of Judges, both meeting in Geneva (organizations, incidentally, which are emanations of a praiseworthy initiative of leading members of the American Bar Association, and both of which have called upon the nations of the world to ratify human rights conventions)—the Chief Justice of the United States addressed himself to the subject of the treaty-making power in our time "of enormous growth and of unfortunate turmoil". "We believe," the Chief Justice said, "that the treaty-making power of all sovereign nations, broadly exercised, is at once perhaps the most potent, realistic and wholesome instrumentality for peace that can be exercised in our complex world." "Law," he said, "is the substance out of which man has most successfully fashioned ways and means to avoid or peacefully resolve conflict. It is not sufficient for us to know what the law has been in the past or what it is today. It is our responsibility to guide its future and see that it is adequate to meet conditions." The Chief Justice continued: "Those who seek to further world-wide cooperation, to spread social, economic and technological advances among all the world's peoples, those who seek to avoid conflict and collision by controlling threats to peace, usually urge that law is the tool whereby these things can be accomplished. Internationally, this chiefly means treaties."

Mr. Chairman, the thoughts conveyed by the Chief Justice—the law as a means for spreading progress and avoiding conflict, the importance of the law's adaptability to changing conditions and problems, the role of treaties as the principal means of developing law internationally—these are concepts projected by our founding fathers, concepts underlying our Constitution. Elasticity, capability of accommodation to change, domestically and internationally—this is the strength of our Constitution. As it has adapted itself so magnificently to the changing realities of the relationship between our Federal government and the several states—quite recently to cite a dramatic example, when the murder of a President, so obviously an event of momentous import to the nation as a whole, was made a federal crime—so it is designed, by way of the treaty-making power, to adapt to changing international realities.

And I would recall to this Committee that even the late Secretary of State Dulles, in the very statement of April 1953 before the Senate Judiciary Committee, in which he pronounced the intention of the Administration then in office not to seek ratification of human rights conventions, said "I do not mean to imply that the boundary between international and domestic concerns is rigid for all time."

Accordingly, I cannot indorse strongly enough the viewpoint expressed in the report of the New York City Bar Association, reproduced in the record of the Subcommittee's hearings: "Surely the Constitution does not render the United States impotent to do what other nations can do, i.e., participate in one of the major developments of the international community in the last half-

century—the quest for common minimum standards through 'international legislation' by multilateral convention."

In urging a forward-looking perspective in regard to the exercise of the treaty-making power, I do not intend, Mr. Chairman, to suggest that we should join in every convention drafted by the United Nations or other international agency. Clearly there are, and may be in the future, conventions which are not appropriate to us—either because they are not relevant to the setting or circumstances of our country or because they are inconsistent with our legal principles or domestic goals or policies. Such conventions we are free to abstain from ratifying, as are other governments with regard to conventions they consider inappropriate to their situation. We are free to evaluate—we would be remiss if we did not—any new convention on its merits. I would go further: we are free to withdraw from, "denounce" in the international law jargon, any ratified convention which proves mischievous or injurious to our domestic harmony or our national interest. In short, Mr. Chairman, the "wedge" argument of the opponents of ratification is without merit.

On the other hand, where the provision of particular conventions are in harmony with our principles, where they are consistent with our laws and practices, where it is in our national interest to encourage other nations to raise their laws and practices to the level of standards of these conventions—I find no justification for our failure to ratify them. I see no reason for us, by not ratifying these conventions, to lessen our capacity to encourage other nations to adhere to them and to implement them in their countries. I see no reason, by our failure to ratify, to prejudice our legal and moral standing to protest the infringement of the conventions in other countries. I see no reason to undermine the credibility of our participation in the ongoing international process of debating and drafting additional norms in new human rights instruments—indeed, the credibility of our participation in the overall "cause of human rights."

Mr. Chairman, this brings me to a problem of which I have had a frontline experience as our representative to the Human Rights Commission—the serious embarrassment to the conduct of our policy at the United Nations stemming from our failure to ratify these conventions. I would like to take as my text the following remarks directed to me by the Soviet Delegate in the course of the Commission's Spring 1966 Session. With your permission I shall read an excerpt from the Summary Record of that session:

"Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, having listened carefully to the statement by the United States representative on 25 March and having heard him warmly support the Costa Rican proposal for the creation of a post of United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, he was obliged to point out that once again the Commission was witnessing an attempt by the United States to divert it from its basic task, which was to promote respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. Once again, instead of being encouraged to follow its proper course, which was to draw up conventions and instruments in the sphere of human rights with supervisory machinery to ensure their implementation, the Commission had before it a proposal so nebulous that even those who supported it were unable to speak clearly on the subject.

"An objective analysis of the political orientation of the proposal so ardently supported by the United States and its allies soon revealed that the proposal was designed to give world public opinion the impression of active participation in the cause of human rights by States which in practice obstinately refused to fulfill their obligations under the multilateral international conventions in the field of human rights drawn up under the auspices of the United Nations and its specialized agencies.

"The United States representative had admitted that the United States had lagged behind in that sphere. That was an understatement; he would mention some of the conventions which the United States had not yet ratified.

"Firstly, there was the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, which had come into force on 12 January 1951. Not only had the United States failed to ratify that Convention, which was designed to prevent the recurrence of nazi and fascist crimes, but during the drafting of that instrument it had endeavoured to deform the text by a series of proposals and amendments.

"Similarly, during the preparation of the Convention on the Political Rights of Women, the United States had endeavoured to diminish its scope and, despite the concessions that had been made in the hope that it would ratify the Convention, the United States had still not done so, twelve years after it had come into force.

"The United States was still not a party to the Slavery Convention of 7 June 1955 or the Supplementary Convention on the Abolition of Slavery, the Slave Trade and Institutions and Practices Similar to Slavery of 30 April 1957. It might also be wondered when the United States would decide to ratify the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, which had recently been adopted by the General Assembly.

"With regard to the conventions drawn up under the auspices of the specialized agencies, he pointed out that the United States had so far failed to sign certain very important conventions, such as the Convention on Discrimination in Respect of Employment and Occupation and the Convention against Discrimination in Education, which included measures designed to ensure the implementation without discrimination of certain fundamental human rights at the national and international level.

"As for the draft Covenants on Civil and Political Rights and on Economics, Social and Cultural Rights, the United States delegation had long since made it clear that its country would not sign them.

"Instead of criticizing the various conventions adopted in the sphere of human rights for their narrow scope, the United States would do well to accede to those instruments and try to increase their effectiveness.

"It was clear from the facts he had just mentioned that the United States, wishing to escape from the untenable position into which it had been forced by its refusal to ratify the conventions in question, had thought that it could confuse the issue by strongly supporting the creation of the post of United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights." (E/CN.4/SR.879, pp. 9–10.)

As I sat and listened to Mr. Morozov, I felt indeed like "the embarrassed American," described in an article in the *Saturday Review*, which pointed out the harmful effects to our credibility in the international human rights field, of our record of nonratification of conventions. We participate in drafting them, in criticizing them, in proposing this addition and that deletion—and then we fail to ratify any of them.

Of course, I replied to Mr. Morozov's charges. I retorted that America does not need to ratify a genocide treaty in order to prevent genocide; we do not need to ratify a religious intolerance convention in order to guarantee the rights both of believers and atheists, and we do not need a convention on the right to leave one's country and to return, to persuade us not to build "walls," and so forth.

This was all fine as polemic, but it could not hide the fact the world's greatest Power, the professed leader of the Free World, stands side-by-side with Bolivia, Spain, Togo, South Africa and Yemen, as one of the tiny minority of Members of the United Nations which has not ratified any of its human rights conventions.

The Soviet Union holds our record in this field over our head as a club ready for use to counter any initiative in the human rights field of which they do not approve. Worse, the questioning of our sincerity is not limited to Soviet delegates. For, while others, including some friendly states, do not indulge in the same crude sarcasm concerning this record, their cynicism, often expressed in private, is not disguised.

I hasten to add that I, in no way imply that the sarcastic criticism of the Soviet delegates should be a deciding or even a weighty factor in the determination of our policies. (This hypocrisy, incidentally, is evident in the very statement of the Soviet delegate that I have just read, for he conveniently omits to mention the Forced Labor Convention which, except for Poland, none of the communist countries has ratified.) However, I believe, when a proposed policy or course of action presents no legal or practical problems, indeed, when this policy is an expression of our historic ideals, it makes little sense for us unnecessarily to play into their hands, to hand them a gratuitous propaganda weapon with which to flagellate us.

Nor do I intend to imply that the ratification of these, or even other Conventions, will bring the world significantly closer to a human rights millenium. Obviously, the prevalence of human rights is in the main a by-product of other conditions and developments within and among nations—of internal harmony and stability, of improved economic conditions, of lessened international tensions, and of a more generally cooperative international environment.

Nor, again, do I wish to suggest that our position in the United Nations, the attitudes of others to us, is determined solely by our policy in the matter of human rights conventions. For the fact is that we have earned respect on the basis of other considerations, by other demonstrations of our human rights concerns, among them, our espousal of measures to strengthen UN procedures in the human rights field—apart from conventions—and our interventions against specific violations of human rights in the Communist and other countries.

But, I contend, if as I believe to be the case, our participation in the human rights convention system will make even a modest contribution to bringing about a more decent world—by encouraging other countries to accept the standards of the conventions as binding obligations, by generating forces within these countries in support of their observance, by influencing the conduct even of nations which do not adhere to the conventions (for people tend to demand rights which others enjoy)—our failure to ratify cannot be justified. To prejudice our national image—by allowing ourselves to be included among the only eight Members of the 122 UN Member States which have failed to ratify any of the three conventions makes little sense. To be included—we who lay claim to the position of leadership of the Free World—among states which have failed to participate in the principal means available to the world for developing international standards in the field of human rights, I submit, is a national embarrassment and indignity.

Mr. Chairman, international cooperation for human rights—meaning primarily, treaty agreements in this field—is no longer an academic question; it is a practical necessity. I urge that, in pursuance of our national interest, our government resume the position of world leadership in the human rights field we occupied in the early years of the United

Nations, and to this end, that the Foreign Relations Committee recommend to the Senate to ratify all three conventions now under consideration.

Thank you.

ADDRESS BY ADM. THOMAS H. MOORER BEFORE NATIONAL SECURITY INDUSTRIAL ASSOCIATION

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I invite the Senate's attention to a thoughtful and significant speech delivered recently by the new Chief of Naval Operations, Adm. Thomas H. Moorer, speaking in Washington at the annual dinner of the National Security Industrial Association.

As a member of the Committee on Armed Services, it has been my pleasure to know and to counsel with Admiral Moorer. I regard him as one of the finest military professionals our Nation ever has produced, and I cannot commend too highly to the Senate his remarks on seapower and national security. I ask unanimous consent that the admiral's speech be printed in the RECORD.

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

U.S. SEAPOWER ON THE MOVE

(An address by Adm. Thomas H. Moorer, U.S. Navy Chief of Naval Operations, at the National Security Industrial Association, 24th annual dinner, September 28, 1967, Washington, D.C.)

President McFarlane, Chairman Joyce, Distinguished Guests, Ladies and Gentlemen, this is what I would believe would be labeled on Capitol Hill as my maiden speech in Washington since I assumed the duties of Chief of Naval Operations nearly two months ago. It is an honor and pleasure to make my podium debut before the members of the NSIA, for it is your ability, to look ahead, and to schedule and deliver on time the many thousands of complex items which we in uniform require, that makes you a partner in the most effective military industrial team in the world today.

I am sure that all of you came here expecting the new CNO to talk about the Navy. *You will not be disappointed. U.S. Seapower is on the move!* And I feel rather strongly about it. Tonight I would like to impart some of my feelings to you—tell you why I think the Navy's value and importance is accelerating—with the thought that each of you might better evaluate the requirements of the Navy together with their effect on you as an industrialist and you as an American citizen.

As background, let me begin my talk with statements in the form of conclusions that express some of the Navy's *beliefs* and *disbeliefs*. Then I hope that the remainder of my talk will demonstrate in part how these beliefs serve to support our overall use of seapower.

First, *the Navy does not believe* in a single strategy or a single weapons system. Rather, we believe that the military posture of the United States must be flexible enough to respond quickly—by the *discriminate* and *selective* use of force to the degree any particular situation dictates.

The Navy does believe that the coordinated combat power of all the United States Armed Services must be projected overseas in any type of conflict. We fully recognize the Navy's role in the support of the other Services in this matter.

The Navy believes that the United States must maintain at the ready the capability for causing unacceptable damage to a potential adversary no matter what preemptive action he may choose to take against us.

The Navy believes that for many reasons, including diversity and security, a good portion of our nuclear delivery system should be seabased.

The Navy believes that, so long as we maintain adequate deterrence, limited wars of all types are more probable than general war and that our readiness for nuclear war must not and need not be incompatible with a readiness for limited war.

The Navy believes that wars are never fought strictly according to a preconceived and documented plan. The capability for a rapid adjustment of forces, plans, and tactics for the unexpected must be retained.

The Navy believes in maintaining mobile streamlined forces that can operate at sea on a self-sufficient sustained basis and that can be tailored for a specific task. Task forces incapable of rapid alteration are not acceptable.

The Navy believes that the roles of all the armed forces are played best if they are coordinated, and that the combined strengths of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps and Air Force forces employed in concert is far greater than the sum of these separate strengths.

Finally, the Navy believes no matter how complex or how awesome you build the weapons of war that *man is still the vital element of our defense team.* Men make decisions—men fight battles—men win wars.

These then are some of our beliefs. Control and use of the seas for the benefit of the United States and her allies are basic to this philosophy, which incidentally has *long endured.*

Nevertheless, a few short years ago some people, perhaps blinded by the flash, considered the hydrogen bomb to be the total solution to future world security and wrote the Navy off as an effective force. Some—outside of the Navy—felt that the ultimate evolution of seapower had occurred during World War II and put forth the theory that no significant military action could be expected to take place at sea in the "modern" future.

Even further doubt occurred on the part of some with the advent of the missile age—but only for a moment. For it was at this time that the Navy with your help produced the Polaris weapon system. I need not tell those of you in this audience that besides being a complex and sophisticated industrial marvel, Polaris is, to this moment, the most invulnerable deterrent weapon in the U.S. armory.

Polaris is only part of the story. Concurrently, other weapons systems for other purposes were designed, programmed and produced.

For this, we must credit the incredible technology of American industry as well as the Navy—a technology capturing the *public imagination.* The variety and speed of accomplishment of this team in developing and perfecting myriad weapon systems—has been impressive.

Most of you are familiar with these weapons, now almost too numerous to enumerate:

The A-4 Light Attack Jet that entered service in 1956 and today has perhaps flown more combat missions over North Vietnam than any other single type of aircraft.

The F-4, probably the finest fighter aircraft in the world and the front line fighter of all the U.S. armed forces.

The A-6 Intruder, the first completely all-weather attack aircraft ever used in combat.

The SH-3A Helicopter, mainstay of both the Navy and the Air Force in the search and rescue of our pilots.

The *Navy missile family* stretches the imagination: Sidewinder and Sparrow in the air; for air to ground the 2.75 rocket, the Zuni, the Bullpup, the Snakeye, and the Shrike, just to name a few. It is significant that all of these were developed by the Navy *before* South Vietnam and almost every one was on hand in useful quantities when the war started. That's a record that *you* and those of us in the Navy are tremendously proud of.

This is just a suggestion of the modern technology which I referred to as a primary reason for our Navy being on the move. There is not sufficient time here tonight to discuss the effect of the tremendous advances in electronics, propulsion, nuclear physics, and the data systems which coordinate our command and control.

Our operations in Vietnam are obviously another large indication of the Navy's present course and speed. Typical of our efforts there are our air and land striking forces.

When it became necessary to launch air strikes into Vietnam, the first ones were flown from aircraft carriers. And when it became necessary to land additional combat troops in the Spring of 1965, the first ashore were our Marines from the 7th Fleet Amphibious Forces. Why? Simply because they were *there*; they were *ready*; they were operating on the free oceans, and they could be used immediately at the sole direction of our Commander in Chief. As the need for air power increased faster than we could build airfields, there was only one way to fill the need. More carriers. So we went from three deployed in the Western Pacific, to four, and then to five. And we're still keeping five deployed with three in continuous combat. During these last two years of combat operations in Southeast Asia, almost half of all the combat missions over North Vietnam have been flown from the decks of Navy aircraft carriers.

Beneath the Navy wings is the gunfire support of our Sea Dragon surface ships, to be joined later by the battleship *New Jersey*; the surveillance and inspection activities of our Market Time forces; the peace-keeping operations of our River Patrol Force; and the pressure on the Viet Cong exerted by our Riverine Assault Force.

The Navy Seabees are nearing completion of their part in the largest construction program ever undertaken in the history of the world—one billion dollars in airfields, petroleum facilities, roads, wharves, hangars, barracks—everything that can be built by man.

Ashore in Vietnam, including our Seabees, we have over 30,000 Navy officers and men, hospital corpsmen, chaplains, dentists, and doctors—the total variety of skills needed to sustain and maintain our troops ashore.

Off-shore is the Navy's sealift. The back-breaking, frustrating and often dull task of delivering the trucks, aviation fuels, the food, the ammunition, the heavy equipment, and all the construction materials. It is a 10,000 mile life line which delivers one long ton per month per man to the half million U.S. and allied soldiers in Vietnam. It is still true that about 98% of everything going into Vietnam goes by ship. Not only is it the Navy's job to get people and supplies to Vietnam, it also has the responsibility of making sure that no power—or combination of powers—can interrupt this flow of material. Knowledge of this sealift has, I think, brought home to a great many Americans and people of other countries just how vital open sea lanes are to a maritime nation such as the United States—and to our forces and allies overseas.

I've mentioned two reasons why the Navy is on the move—our superb technology and the accomplishments of our forces in the Vietnam conflict which exercise almost the entire spectrum of Navy capability in limited war.

There are at least three other main reasons for the inevitable increase in the influence of seapower in our immediate future. One is the wide variety of future military strategies being developed which lend themselves to the use of the oceans. These strate-

gies are not static. Strategies today, a product of our constant learning through the evolution of science and history, must, to be effective, run the entire gamut. That is, we must be prepared for almost *any* contingency in *any* environment in *any* area of the world.

In taking this large view, there is an awakening to the advantages of the ocean areas. They are away from our population centers, yet they are in proximity to all major population concentrations in the world. The oceans provide the only area wherein potential conflict does not involve the civilian populace. The oceans, contiguous to the lands of those who would choose not to be our friends, provide to a strong naval power the means of sealing off and combating the enemy under the water, on its surface and in the air in his own back yard—far away from American shores.

In this world of micro-second communication, supersonic transportation and weapon delivery, the world grows smaller by the minute. As long as three-quarters of its surface is covered by water, any war must necessarily include a wet war—waged in support of our Army, our Air Force, and our Marine Corps.

As our technology continues to leap forward, new ways of utilizing the oceans continue to present themselves. As contributors to the Navy's forward movement, I have mentioned our *technical expansion*, our *performance in Vietnam* and just a suggestion of the *strategic options* which are and will open to the sea. Next among the prime movement factors of indicators of increased seapower need and utilization is the acute shrinkage of overseas bases available to U.S. forces. Coupled with this is the impact of the British reduction in their naval presence in the Middle East and the area east of the Suez.

It is a simple matter of record that at the end of the Korean War in June, 1953, the United States had the rights to use a total of 551 major overseas bases. In December, 1966, our total bases numbered 179—a decrease of 372 major bases or almost 70%. A current case in point is the recent conflict in the Middle East. As you know, in that instance it developed that the air bases that had been available to us around the littoral of the Mediterranean became either unavailable for political reasons, or were of minimal use because of the distance factor. As it evolved, the only forces that could be put into position immediately were sea-borne forces and with the nationalism of newly emerging nations being felt all over the world, it is quite clear that as time goes on the availability of bases which we have come to rely on for routine military missions and possible contingencies is going to continue to be diminished.

What this means to me is that we are going to have to take another look at the way we have been operating our military forces and as always, be ready to adapt to change. It is quite clear that such an examination might readily dictate the movement of more of our military capability to sea. It is, I think, well known that the deployment of naval forces on the international oceans cannot be equated with the basing or operating of land environment, that is, air and ground forces, within the sovereign territory of another nation or state. The contrast between the two is that our President always has the *power* and *authority* to move naval forces as he desires to influence, to persuade, to assist, or, if necessary, to intervene for the protection of lives and property of Americans and foreign nationals. Sea forces can avoid intrusion upon the domestic affairs of another country while still providing the security, protection, and strength desired in a specific geographic location.

I have but two factors left to tick off—one of which, is perhaps the most telling in its impact on the future course of world events. I refer to the almost explosive expansion of the Soviet Navy and Merchant Marine.

Many people still think of the USSR as a predominantly land power with her military strength vested mainly in large armies. This was true at the close of World War II, and it was essentially true even ten years ago. Since then, however, the USSR has made a massive investment in both her Navy and her Merchant Marine, with the result today that the Soviet Union is a major maritime power. Their force of nearly 400 submarines is the largest in the world. It is no secret that one of the U.S. Navy's highest priority efforts is to develop and maintain the capability to counter this threat. Soviet surface ships have been equipped with modern missile systems which provide them with extended offensive weapon ranges and improved defensive capability. These ships are appearing on the high seas in the vicinity of our naval task forces and are ever-increasing the extent of their operations and their visits to other than Soviet ports.

It is obvious, that for military purposes at least, our assumptions concerning Soviet capabilities must be based upon that which we can see and measure, rather than estimates of their intentions. Furthermore, it can be assumed that Soviet military capabilities reflect their strategy and therefore must give us some indication of their political aims. By any measuring stick, they are today the second largest seapower in the world. In ten years the Soviet Union with dedication of purpose, large outlays of funds, and with priorities equivalent to or even surpassing their space program, has transferred itself from a maritime nonentity to a major seapower.

This new power is dramatically evidenced in their ever-increasing naval presence in the Mediterranean. Soviet naval forces there just prior to the Middle East conflict had grown to twenty-five to thirty ships. At that time this was the largest number of Soviet naval ships ever deployed into the Mediterranean. The conflict of the Middle East apparently presaged a significant augmentation of Soviet naval forces to the Med. Shortly after this conflict Soviet naval strength increased to thirty-five or forty ships and has remained at this level. This rather formidable force is comprised generally of from four to six submarines, approximately fourteen surface combatant ships, and then to twelve auxiliary and support ships. The number of their intelligence collecting trawlers has also increased. Certainly, there is nothing covert about the Soviet activity at sea, in fact, the Chief of the Soviet Navy has stated, "In the past our ships and naval aviation units have operated primarily near our coast, concerned mainly with operations and tactical coordination with ground troops. Now, we must be prepared for broad offensive operations against sea and ground troops of the imperialists *on any point* of the world's oceans and adjacent territories."

In the Mediterranean, it is apparent that the USSR is implementing these policies. Other recent speeches have highlighted the importance of war ship visits to far ports to develop relationships and strengthen the authority and influence of the Soviet Union.

It is clear that the challenge of our free use of the seas is here for all to see. Our Navy must stay on the move if we are to maintain the quality, valuable depth of experience, and sufficient numbers necessary to counter the Soviet challenge.

Taken in combination, it is readily apparent to me that the expanding state of the art of our technology, the spotlight on the Navy's accomplishments in Vietnam, the necessary evolving of new strategies, the diminishment of overseas bases, the Soviet's decision to meet us at sea with an enormous merchant fleet and modern navy all dictate that U.S. seapower must stay on the move! We will stay on the move because we have the dedication and desire, because we have the know-how and capability, and because the interest of our country demands it.

With this overview, one must conclude that the Navy, with your help, must exploit all technologies in order to retain a favorable position on the high seas.

With ever-increasing costs of production and the narrow time frames of the future we can no longer afford the luxury of three or four prototypes from which we choose the best. We will have to insure such integrity of design that we learn at an early stage and can meet the deadline in the end. The team effort between the military and industry—and the taxpayer, must be greater than ever before. We cannot operate on a sustaining basis in the oceans of the world without the very best equipment. We cannot meet the challenge of competitive forces of other countries unless our management procedures and workmanship blend with our technology to such an extent that we can produce hardware at acceptable cost and on timely schedules.

Our achievements are yours. Your achievements are our country's—the power base of democracy on which the security of the free world depends.

I look forward in great anticipation and enthusiasm to our continued work together in the future. Let us ensure that the U.S. maintains seapower supremacy.

WOODY GUTHRIE

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the folk singer of my generation was Woody Guthrie. He sang of dust bowls, redwood forests, big dams, and the people in picket lines, migrant camps, and freight cars. He could sing and compose about hard times because his own luck ran out early. He could have been rich, but he disdained wealth. He gave it away and hit the road with his guitar.

When Woody died Tuesday, he left a legacy of songs about America, the good and the bad. His "This Land Is Your Land" is one of the best known, and one of the best.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD Woody Guthrie's obituary, written by Phil Casey, and published in the Washington Post of October 4, 1967, and a tribute to Guthrie by Gus Norwood, who is now Administrator of the Alaska Power Administration, published in the Northwest Public Power Bulletin.

So long, Woody—it's been good to know you.

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

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 4, 1967]

WOODY GUTHRIE DIES OF MUSCULAR ILLNESS; WROTE SONGS, SANG ABOUT POOR PEOPLE

(By Phil Casey)

Woody Guthrie, who sang his songs in boxcars and bars, picket lines and concert halls, migrant camps and Madison Square Garden, died in Creedmore State Hospital, Queens, N.Y., yesterday.

The 55-year-old folk singer and composer, who has been described as "a national possession, like Yellowstone and Yosemite," had been doomed for 15 years by Huntington's chorea, the disease that killed his mother when he was a boy. It destroys muscle coordination, and Mr. Guthrie had been helpless for years. At the end, only his eyelids moved.

But before all that happened to him, he had been a traveling man, roaming the coun-

try for more than 20 years. He wouldn't give up the road. Even when fame and a chance for big money finally came, he avoided comfort like the plague and kept on wandering.

When he became the star of a radio show in the early 1940s, he bought a Chrysler after the first four programs and fled New York. He gave the Chrysler to a Farmers Union organizer in Oklahoma City, and kept on going with his guitar.

From 1932 to 1952, he is believed to have written more than 1000 folk-type songs (he wrote 26 to celebrate the building of the Grand Coulee and Bonneville Dams) and everybody, from Frank Sinatra to the long-haired boys twanging guitars in Dupont Circle, sings them.

Many of the songs are gone, but some are part of every folk singer's repertoire, and concert halls, night clubs, bars and kindergartens are filled with the sound of his music.

The best known, of course, are "Hard Travelin," "So Long, It's Been Good to Know You," and "This Land Is Your Land."

Mr. Guthrie was a poet of the down-trodden, the poor and the lost. He had grown up in hard times and had a hard life. He remembered the Okies vividly, the dust bowl and the refugees from their own homes. He sought out the poor.

Much of his work was filled with anger and outrage at what man had done and kept doing to man, but there was no despair. His lyrics contained wit, humor and tenderness.

"I am out," he said "to sing songs that will prove to you that this is your world and that if it has hit you pretty hard and knocked you for a dozen loops . . . no matter what color, what size you are, how you are built, I am out to sing the songs that make you take pride in yourself and in your work . . . I hate a song that make you think you're not any good. I hate a song that makes you think you are just born to lose. . ."

It was Clifton Fadiman, writing in the New Yorker magazine in the 1940's, who proclaimed Mr. Guthrie "a national possession, like Yellowstone or Yosemite, and part of the best stuff this country has to show the world." In 1966, Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall awarded him the Conservation Service Award and called him a poet of the American landscape. Mr. Guthrie couldn't attend the ceremony. He was bedridden, able only to move his eyelids and a hand, feebly. He could hear, but he couldn't talk.

Born in Okemah, Okla., one of five children, he learned blues and folk songs from Negroes and played the harmonica. But, it was a hard childhood. A sister died in a fire, his mother in an insane asylum. His father committed suicide, after bankruptcy.

Mr. Guthrie was on the road at 17, singing and playing his guitar and composing songs all over the Southwest and California.

The plight of the Okies, the dispossessed families of the dust bowl and the Depression, he saw them at first hand and the memory stayed with him.

He made art of the experience. As Nat Hentoff wrote in The Reporter magazine several years ago, "Guthrie wrote songs that have outlasted the Okies—'Talkin' Dust Bowl Blues', 'I Ain't Got No Home in This World', and 'Dust Bowl Refugee'."

He wrote poems, short stories, articles and letters. His autobiography, "Bound for Glory," was much-praised in the 1940s, and there have been plans to publish much of his other writing.

Short and lean, with a solemn, weather beaten face and wiry, bushy hair. He looked like the man of the people he insisted on being. He never got rich, though he could have.

Mr. Guthrie was married and divorced three times and had seven children, one of whom, a girl, died in a fire. He is survived by three daughters and three sons, one of whom, Arlo, is a folk singer.

[From the Northwest Public Power Bulletin]

"THIS LAND IS YOUR LAND"—TRIBUTE TO WOODY GUTHRIE

(By Gus Norwood)

The Boston Pops Orchestra finished their tune-up and settled down. The Maestro walked briskly as he received the applause.

Then he tugged at the hearts of his audience with Woody Guthrie's "This Land Is Your Land."

The Pacific Northwest had quite a few people in Boston's old Symphony Hall because the American Public Power Association annual convention was being held in Boston that first week of May 1966.

John Nelson of Seattle City Light, my daughter Emily, a student at Radcliffe, and I were seated together. Later we talked about Woody Guthrie and the need to write a tribute in his honor. More People should know about Woody.

UDALL PAYS TRIBUTE

A month earlier on April 6, 1966, Secretary Stewart L. Udall presented the Interior Department's "Conservation Service Award" plus a fine letter and news release addressed to Mr. Woodrow Wilson Guthrie, Brooklyn State Hospital.

Here Woody lies dying, a silenced victim of Huntington's chorea, an hereditary nerve disorder.

The popularity of folk singing came too late for Woody who has been hospitalized many years.

A prolific and creative composer and folksinger, Woody worked for the Bonneville Power Administration around 1947 writing 26 ballads about Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams on the Columbia River.

HIS STORY

Born in Oklahoma in 1912 Woody suffered the hardships of the dust bowl. His mother died of Huntington's chorea.

Uprooted, he migrated to California, always singing of the little man facing almost impossible odds. He lived the Grapes of Wrath, yet is remembered and described by many who knew him as optimistic, hopeful of ultimate victory.

He describes his youth in his autobiography, "Bound For Glory." Later he wrote another book, edited by Robert Shelton, "Born To Win."

He wrote much but he said no novel rings down the plaster like a room full of friends singing his songs.

Those who knew him and heard him sing speak of him as of a legend. Yet his songs are not easy to find. Our research effort located these in the Portland library collection of phonograph records.

SO LONG, WOODY

On May 8, 1966, the Sunday Portland Oregonian article by Ralph Friedman entitled "So Long, Woody" was headed by an ink sketch of the almost skinny Woody strumming his guitar against a background of snowcapped and forested mountains.

Meanwhile Bonneville Power Administration has named one of its substations in his honor.

ROLL ON, COLUMBIA, ROLL ON

Green Douglas firs where the water cuts through
Down her wild mountains and canyons she flew
The Canadian Northwest to the ocean so blue.
Roll on, Columbia, roll on.

Other big rivers add power to you
Yakima, Snake, and the Klickitat, too
Sandy, Willamette and Hood River too.
Roll on, Columbia, roll on

Roll on, Columbia, roll on
Roll on, Columbia, roll on.
Your power is turning our darkness to dawn
Roll on, Columbia, roll on.

At Bonneville now there are ships in the locks
The waters have risen and shiploads of plenty'll
Steam past the docks
Roll on, Columbia, roll on

And on up the river is the Grand Coulee Dam
The biggest thing built by the hand of man
To run the great factories and water the land.
Roll on, Columbia, roll on.

THIS LAND IS YOUR LAND

This land is your land, this land is my land,
From California to the New York Island,
From the redwood forest to the gulf-stream waters,
This land was made for you and me.

As I was walking that ribbon of highway,
I saw above me that endless skyway,
I saw below me that golden valley
This land was made for you and me.

I roamed and rambled, and I followed my footsteps
To the sparkling sands of her diamond deserts,
All around me a voice was sounding,
This land was made for you and me.

When the sun come shining, then I was strolling,
And the wheat fields waving, and the dust clouds rolling,
A voice was chanting as the fog was lifting,
This land was made for you and me.

PASTURES OF PLENTY

It's a mighty hard row that my pore hands has hoed;
My pore feet has travelled a hot, dusty road;
Out of your dustbowl and westward we rolled;
And your deserts was hot and your mountains was cold.

I worked in your orchards of peaches and prunes;
I slept on the ground in the light of your moon;
On the edge of your city you'll see us and then
We come with the dust and we go with the wind.

California, Arizona, I make all your crops;
Well, it's north up to Oregon to gather your hops;
Dig the beets from your ground, cut the grapes from your vine;
To set on your table your light sparkling wine.

Green Pastures of plenty from dry desert ground;
From the Grand Coulee dam where the waters run down;
Every state in this union us migrants has been;
We'll work in this fight and we'll fight till we win.

It's always we rambled, that river and I;
All along your green valley I will work till I die;
My land I'll defend with my life if it be;
'Cause my pastures of plenty must always be free.

FOREIGN AID

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, my attention has been drawn to an excellent speech on the subject of foreign assistance by a Member of the House of Representatives, Congressman LEE HAMILTON of Indiana. As he points out in this speech, delivered September 22 to the League of Women Voters of Columbus, Ind., the United States was, in its infancy, the recipient of considerable for-

eign aid itself. But our memories are short. Today, though there are many detractors of foreign aid, the consensus of four Presidents, the Congress and many Americans is that the world and, thus, the United States as well, is a little healthier with our help.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Congressman HAMILTON's speech appear in the RECORD.

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

AMERICANS HAVE ALWAYS HAD A TOUGH ATTITUDE TOWARD FOREIGN AID

Ben Franklin, in despair of human devices, proposed that Constitutional Convention (1787) be opened with daily prayer invoking divine guidance to save it from ruin.

Hard-headed Hamilton objected, saying they were not in need of "foreign aid."

Despite Hamilton's objection, the historians among us know that this country in the days of its infancy, was very much a recipient of foreign aid, including military assistance, soft loans, development loans, technical assistance. And it is the judgment of more than one historian that we would not have survived without it.

But our memories are short.

I got a letter the other day from a young man who asked indignantly how those idiots in the State Department thought that a candidate in South Vietnam elected by only 35% of the vote could run a country. I wrote back and suggested he read American history, and especially about John Q. Adams, who was elected President by 31% of the vote.

No major program consistently enacted into law by the United States Congress has fewer friends than foreign assistance. There are many reasons for this:

It costs a lot of money;

It is not one of the traditional and familiar tools of foreign policy;

It is hard to point to conspicuous, clear cut successes;

It is not difficult to find projects that just did not work out right;

It is a marvelous target for the politician; no one in his constituency has an entrenched interest in it. No lobbyists work for it. Everyone knows we are spending too much money—and this is the place to cut without getting anyone mad;

It is easy to refer to aid as a "gigantic giveaway" by "Uncle Sucker", the "International Santa Claus" pouring money down a "foreign rathole;"

Its beneficiaries are either far away and without votes or unorganized.

When you talk to people about where the budget should be cut, almost unanimously the response will include foreign aid.

And yet it is a curious thing. Since the end of World War II, every President, every Secretary of State, every Congress has supported foreign aid. It has been a part of American foreign policy for 18 years. My guess is that you could not find a professional diplomat in the United States Government today who would be opposed to it.

Always attacked, but always enacted (this year by only 8 votes in the House). Why? I'm not sure I know, but I think I do.

When the tumult and the shouting die, when the campaign orator has breathed his last fiery denunciation of waste inefficiency, giveaway, and those elected are faced with the stark realities of the responsibility to govern, the majority of them—not all—see that the foreign assistance program, despite its shortcomings, is in the national interest.

Let's draw back for a few minutes tonight and ask, and, I hope at least suggest, some answers to some of the basic questions about foreign assistance.

What are we trying to achieve—what is our purpose? It is important to understand what we are not trying to do.

The task of our economic assistance program is not to make over the world in our image of free enterprise in democracy. The task is not to buy votes in the United Nations or to win a political point for every dollar of aid. The task is not to win either gratitude or slavish devotion from other governments.

We do not appropriate aid funds with the intention of buying friends. When the critics say the foreign aid program cannot buy friends, they are exactly right. No one claims that it can.

If our primary objective was to assure the unquestioning support for our Foreign policy objectives or servile gratitude toward a beneficent Uncle Sam, we should have abandoned the Foreign Aid Program long ago. You cannot purchase loyalty or gratitude of sovereign nations.

DEVELOPMENT

The purpose of the Foreign Aid Program is to help create a community of free and independent nations. We are seeking not popularity or gratitude, but respect and results.

Foreign assistance is not sport for the shortwinded. We must discipline ourselves to take a long view. We are really interested in generating economic growth and political stability in less developed areas of the world.

The task is to provide the right additional resources, the right extra margin that will help to speed up social and economic progress.

So the major objective of the United States Foreign Assistance Program is to assist other countries which want to maintain their independence and to develop into self-supporting nations. The resulting community of free nations offers the best long-run prospect of security—prosperity and peace for the United States.

SECURITY

Certainly there is a humanitarian aspect to the foreign assistance program. We want to better human conditions. We want to help less fortunate neighbors. But much more is involved. The security of the United States depends in the long run upon a community of free, developing nations, building their own solid foundation for national growth.

On occasion we may be angered by criticism of American policies, by the very nations we are striving to help, but we should not allow our irritations to obscure the central objective.

There are those today who blame Foreign Aid for the restlessness in the world. However, we must not blame the doctor for the disease. The problems of the underdeveloped nations were not created by the efforts to solve them.

The development process is underway in nation after nation. It is very much in the interest of the United States to align itself with the forces of constructive national development around the world.

We should assist the development process because it is happening.

Unless the wealthy nations wage a vigorous war on the poverty, hunger, ignorance, disease and despair, that afflict more than half the world's population, widespread economic and political chaos will ensue.

The world's economically advanced nations have 29 percent of the population. They have 83 percent of the Gross National Product and an average per capita income of just under $1800 a year.

On the other hand 71 percent of the world's population in the underdeveloped countries have only 17 percent of the world's Gross National Product and an average per capita income of $154.

We simply cannot accept so stark a contrast between the future we ask for ourselves and the future to which others aspire.

There is an irrefutable relationship between violence in the world and economic backwardness and the trend of such violence is up not down.

Since 1958, 87 percent of the very poor nations of the world, 69 percent of the poor nations and 48 percent of the middle income nations have suffered serious violence.

Of the wealthy nations only one has suffered a major internal upheaval.

It would be reassuring if the gap between the rich nations and the poor nations were closing and economic backwardness receding, but it is not. The economic gap is widening.

Citizens of many developing nations walk in misery. Half the adults have never been to school, over half the people are hungry or malnourished, food production per person is falling and at present rates of growth population will double before the year 2000.

These are the dominant facts of our age, they challenge our security, they threaten the future of the world.

The conclusion is that the years that lie ahead are pregnant with violence for nations in the underdeveloped category. Our security is related directly to the security of the newly developing world and our role must be to help provide security to those developing nations which genuinely need and request our help and which demonstrably are willing and able to help themselves.

The blunt truth is that security means development. Without development, there can be no security. Without development, order and stability are not possible. Without development, Communism can spread.

In talking about the purpose of foreign aid, I don't want to overstate its importance. Keep in mind that Foreign Assistance is a very limited instrument. It is only one among many means for carrying out the foreign policy of the United States, along with military activities, information programs, diplomatic negotiations, participation in the United Nations, the Organization of American States and other institutions.

But the questions to ask about Foreign Aid, it seems to me, deal with its effectiveness, rather than its purpose.

Is the recipient nation using American Aid efficiently?

Is it making an honest effort to tax its people fairly, to encourage widespread landownership, to grow more food, to expand its exports, to root out corruption, to reduce its rate of population increase, to stimulate individual initiative?

IS THE FOREIGN AID ACHIEVING WORTHWHILE RESULTS?

There is no disagreement today that our economic assistance to Europe and our parallel help to post-war Japan were highly successful. Our economic aid to these countries ended years ago. They are now thriving economies, themselves contributing three and four billion dollars each year in Foreign Aid to the underdeveloped countries of Asia, Africa and Latin American.

Recently I attended part of a joint meeting of the United States and Japanese cabinets. The subject of discussion was how to increase Japan's Foreign Aid contributions. What a delightful topic of discussion!

Now we are concentrating on the much more difficult, underdeveloped countries.

What can we show in terms of results? There are many spectacular gains in human terms.

In India, for example:

Steel production is increased sevenfold since the early 1950's.

Electrical power is five times what it was in 1953. It will double again in the next five years.

The fertilizer industry is growing steadily.

The tax system is being revamped and improved.

Malaria has been reduced from 100 million cases annually to less than 50 thousand last year.

Four times as many youngsters are going to school.

Thirty million acres have been added to the 50 million already under irrigation.

In Latin America:

Six years ago there were several Latin American nations very close to coming under Communist domination. Now only six years later there is no serious Communist threat to any government in the hemisphere. The reason for this shift in tide has been the rise of a non-Communist alternative to satisfy the popular hunger for land and justice.

In tax reform, 9 countries have adopted legislation for more equitable and modern tax system.

In 10 countries death caused by malaria dropped from 11 thousand to 2 thousand in three years' time.

Smallpox declined just as sharply.

Twelve hundred health centers are in operation.

Two thousand rural wells have been dug.

Primary school enrollments have increased 23 percent.

Secondary school enrollments, 50 percent.

University enrollments 40 percent.

28,000 classrooms have been built.

160 thousand teachers trained.

14 million textbooks distributed.

16 countries have legislation dealing directly with land reform.

So Foreign Aid is attacking illiteracy, it's feeding hungry people, it is helping people build decent places in which to live. Illustrations of the type I have given could be cited in great numbers.

But let me express a word of caution. It would be a mistake to think that by themselves the measure of success of the Foreign Aid Program are these statistics.

We're after something even more fundamental than an improvement in the material welfare, as important as that is. We want them to stand on their own feet, independent of our help or any one elses.

We believe that the fundamental security of the United States rests on the successful establishment of independent self-supporting countries around the world, countries that are prepared to join in defending their own freedom against Communist aggression.

The test of the Foreign Aid Program is not merely the number of children fed, schools built, or business firms established. The test is whether the countries we are helping are enlarging their own resources, relying less on our gifts, less on soft loans to achieve economic development and where necessary, military strength.

Material accomplishment is not the only evidence we are making progress. A second type of evidence that aid is worthwhile is that several countries previously recipients of Foreign Aid no longer receive it. These include Greece, Taiwan, Israel, Mexico, Venezuela, and the Philippines.

And a number of other countries are making solid economic progress, although they are not yet at the end of the need for outside aid.

I believe that it's fair to say that United States Foreign Aid has achieved a great deal that is of fundamental importance to our national interests. Many countries have graduated from the need for aid. A number more can be expected to join them soon. Others are making strong and steady progress. We should also acknowledge, however, that there are countries where the Communist threat is grave and immediate and where we're not making nearly as much progress as we would like to.

There are many things we just can't know about the effectiveness of the Foreign Aid Programs. We don't know how many crises have been averted, how much violence avoided, how many minds have been won to the cause of freedom.

WHAT ABOUT MILITARY AID?

Why should the United States engage in a vast traffic of military weapons. Over the last 17 years we have either given or sold almost $50 billion worth of weapons, almost as much as we have given in economic grants and loans since 1948.

Military aid ordinarily consists of military hardware and training services for the military organization. It is distinct from outlays by this country on behalf of our military bases and forces abroad.

We face a Communist threat that is great and complex. At one end of the spectrum of aggression there is a possibility of nuclear war. At the other end there is the threat of subversion and terrorism. In between are the threats of major conventional attack, local probes and logistic and manpower support across borders. This entire spectrum is relevant and threats must be dealt with.

Great as our power is the United States simply does not have the resources to maintain a credible force by itself to contain the entire Communist threat.

The purpose of military aid is to achieve a posture to deter aggression and to assure sufficient indigenous military forces to combat subversion and insurgency.

If we did not have the military assistance program, it would be necessary for us to either drastically modify our foreign policy, move back to a fortress America concept, or to raise the military budget by 3 or 4 dollars for each dollar of the present military program. We would have to find the manpower to replace 3½ million allied or friendly fighting men. The average cost of annual cost to keep the United States soldier is $4,500. The similar average cost of the 3½ million allied fighting men in the forward stategy countries is about ⅛ of that, about $500 per soldier. If military assistance is cut, the United States either must make up for the reductions with United States forces or must retrench its foreign policy.

Let me interject a personal observation about military aid. I agree that it is necessary, but I have been among those who are critical of many aspects of it.

I believe the arms traffic in the world is almost out of control. It is not easy to stop. In some instances, it is probably necessary to engage in it. When the Soviets begin to rearm the Arab states to get great influence over the oil and transportation crossroads to Asia and Africa—with all this implies to our strategic position in Southern Europe—what is the United States to do?

But I am not persuaded that the United States should send more weapons to more countries than any nation in the world. Moreover, the trend is up, and I don't like that. Every situation must be separately analyzed. But my own feeling is that we must act with restraint and caution in the area of military assistance.

IS FOREIGN AID A MAJOR CAUSE OF THE BALANCE OF PAYMENTS DEFICIT?

This can be answered categorically. No, under present policies the United States programs of economic and military assistance are not major contributors to the deficit. About 85 to 90 percent of A.I.D. funds for this fiscal year will be spent in the United States. (In 1961—only 41% spent in U.S.) In fact, A.I.D. purchases help boost United States exports which contribute to a reduction in United States balance of payments deficit. An appropriation cut intended to reduce the balance of payments deficit would in fact mainly reduce U.S. exports.

The net impact in fiscal year 1968 of the A.I.D. Program will be about $100 million. It is now a virtually irreducible minimum.

SHOULD OTHER NATIONS SHARE MORE OF THE LOAD? THE ANSWER IS YES

We are not satisfied with the effort of our allies. In the recent Kennedy Round negotiation we insisted that other developed nations participate more in assistance programs, and major diplomatic efforts are underway at all times to get other nations to share development responsibility.

In 1965 net free world public aid to developing nations was $6.3 billion of which the United States contributed its proportionate share—about 60%. A guiding principle of Foreign Assistance programs must be that every advanced nation has a duty to contribute its share of the cost.

Many nations are doing their share in proportion to their capacities and problems. On a relative basis, some exceed the efforts of the United States.

Three countries provide proportionately more, and five lend for development on more generous terms than the United States. 7 Countries furnished relatively more aid on a grant basis while more than 75 percent of the experts and volunteers working and developing countries come from 8 donors other than the United States.

The burden of foreign aid in the United States has declined over the past 15 years. It has dropped from about 2 percent of Gross National Product at the start of the Marshall Plan to about 7/10 of 1 percent. As a percentage of the Federal budget it has declined from about 11½ percent in 1948 to less than 2% in 1968.

CAN WE OPERATE OUR AID PROGRAMS MORE EFFICIENTLY?

The answer is yes. There's room for improvement. We can do this in several ways.

First, is through a policy of careful selectivity and concentration, stressing aid to those countries where the United States interest is most urgent, and which countries are in a position to make the best use of our help.

Economic assistance is concentrated to a far greater degree than is generally realized. 92 percent of the entire amount goes to 20 countries. 80 percent of our development loans go to 8 countries, 93 percent of supporting assistance goes to 5 countries, 72 percent alone is for Vietnam and 65 percent of all Alliance for Progress funds go to three countries.

Secondly, we seek to obtain maximum by results by stressing self-help measures. Development can only occur when a government decides that they're willing to sacrifice and work for it. Development is work. It is they who must analyze the needs, determine the courses of action, acquire the necessary skills, make the commitment of energy, resources and wealth. On the average developing countries contribute the equivalent of $8 in their own resources for every one dollar in goods received from aid. Some do far more. India, for example, was in the ratio to United States assistance of 24 to 1.

Let me give you some specific examples of self help. Before a loan was made to a Bolivian Mining Bank to finance expansion and modernization, we required the Bolivian government to undertake a major reform of the mining code, a reorganization of the bank and tax laws to encourage mining investments.

In Korea, a recent $10 million loan to finance import of commodities commited its government to better budgeting, better foreign exchange management, restraint on private credit, higher revenue collection and increased domestic savings. The loan was dispersed in installments as Korea complied with the self-help agreement.

We must and we do hold back funds available for foreign aid if potential recipients are not helping themselves.

Third, another way we have tried to make the program work more efficiently is to increase the emphasis on loans as against grants.

FIFTY TO SIXTY PERCENT LOANS—FISCAL YEAR 1968

Most foreign assistance is in the form of loans, which must be repaid in American dollars.

The repayment record on Foreign Aid Programs has been as good or better than the repayment record for regular commercial loans.

Fourth, we are also trying to make the Foreign Aid Program more efficient by encouraging a country to use the initiative of its own businessmen, farmers. We do this by means of development banks and credit cooperatives, by conditioning assistance on government policy, reforms, urging governments to eliminate rigid import controls, inhibiting tax policies and encouraging land reforms.

Fifth, another way we are improving the foreign assistance program is to increase our focus on the key sectors of agriculture, health, education, as the critical elements of development.

Quite frankly, we have learned the hard way. For a long time the experts thought there was something magic about industrial development that would automatically put a developing country on the road to economic self-sufficiency. A lot of money was pumped into this vain pursuit of viability through industrialization.

Slowly, it has become apparent that no amount of investment in industry could have the desired effect until hunger, disease and ignorance were irradicated or brought under control.

Gradually we are learning more about the business of development and foreign assistance. One lesson we have learned is that we must concentrate on fundamentals of sufficient food, freedom from disease, and an opportunity to learn.

Sixth, we are making improvements in foreign assistance by the maximum use of American private enterprise and nonprofit institutions.

American Universities, businesses, labor unions, nonprofit organizations now provide more than 40% of the total number of A. I. D. technicians overseas.

We have also found that Government can't do the job alone. The private sector must be developed in these emerging nations. A key measure of self-help is the willingness of a country to encourage the initiative of its own businessmen and farmers.

For example, we try to open new sources of capital at the grass roots level by means of a development bank, or credit cooperatives. The record here is beginning to be impressive.

38 industrial development banks in 23 countries.

13 agricultural credit banks in 9 countries have been established.

88 savings and loan associations in 9 Latin American countries.

1,745 credit unions in Latin America.

One reason the program in Taiwan has succeeded is the remarkable increase in private enterprise.

The number of family farms rose from 118 thousand to 725 thousand.

The number of private businesses from 68 thousand to 227 thousand.

The number of business corporations from 1 thousand to 11 thousand.

Seventh: how much is it appropriate for the United States to spend on the Foreign Aid Program?

Some say we should spend much more. They say this country has not lived up to its obligations. They like to point to the British overseas effort during the heyday of the British Empire, which ran about 7 percent of their current Gross National Product. Today the United States is far below 1 percent.

Others argue we shouldn't spend anything. There's no question but the Foreign Aid Program has cost a great deal of money. And we do have a deficit problem.

On the other hand the United States is the wealthiest nation in the world. It has a Gross National Product of about $750 billion dollars a year, and to suggest that such an economic giant cannot afford to share less than 1 percent of this affluence with less developed nations is preposterous.

Well, I have spoken long enough and have scarcely begun to cover the problem of foreign assistance.

Many strong supporters of the program claim miracles for the program. Others can only see "a giveaway." The judgment of the Congress, four Presidents, and many Americans has been that the world is a little healthier with United States help, and think that the United States is a little healthier too.

RELIGION AND COMMUNISM

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, in 1962 the National Council of Churches initiated a publication entitled "Religion in Communist Dominated Areas"—RCDA—which provided for the first time a regular source of information on Communist policies and practices with regard to churches and religion.

Published twice monthly, the periodical consists largely of direct translations of articles selected from more than 100 Soviet, East European and Chinese publications. These articles reflect attitudes and activities of Communist parties with respect to life, work and concerns of people of all religions in Communist-dominated countries.

RCDA has been acclaimed by leaders of the Protestant, Orthodox, Roman Catholic and Jewish faiths, by academicians, Government leaders, and individuals representing other responsible groups.

This year, Christianity Today published two articles about RCDA, its editors and its future as a valued publication. I ask unanimous consent that the articles be placed in the RECORD at this time.

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

[From Christianity Today, Washington, (D.C.), Mar. 31, 1967]

KEEPING TABS ON RED RELIGION

Many American Christians see the National Council of Churches as giving aid and comfort to the Communist world through leftist-oriented reports and pronouncements. Few realize that the council also sponsors the best running account of Communist repression of religion: the semimonthly newsletter *Religion in Communist Dominated Areas.*

Last year *RCDA* made public the growing anti-government dissent among Orthodox and Baptists in the Soviet Union. This month it is printing details on the Baptist uproar gleaned from an atheistic Ukrainian publication. In the works is a report on what *RCDA* calls "brutal suppression of religious activities of dissenting Baptists in Kiev and other places."

RCDA consists largely of direct translations of articles selected from more than one hundred Soviet, East European, and Chinese publications. A brief comment accompanies each article. The maroon-trimmed first page always features a photograph or drawing. The February 15 issue showed a satirical cartoon from a Moscow publication contrasting the Oriental lines of an old shrine with the sleek, squared-off look of a modern building.

RCDA is put out by a pair of experts on Eastern Europe. The editor, 72-year-old Paul Anderson, an Episcopalian, served as a YMCA representative in Russia through the Bolshevik Revolution after a four-year stint in China. He has written two books on religion in Russia and has served as negotiator and translator in clergy exchange visits between the United States and the Soviet Union.

RCDA's managing editor is the Rev. Blahoslav Hruby, 55, a Czech-born linguist who fled the Gestapo on a bicycle and crossed the Pyrenees on foot before coming to the United States. He was a U.S. Army intelligence officer during World War II and worked for Radio Free Europe before joining the council. He and his wife can together handle translations from twenty languages. They live in a Manhattan apartment with their 16-year-old daughter, who spent last summer taking intensive Chinese language training at Columbia University. Between issues of *RCDA*, Hruby likes to go mushroom-picking ("I specialize in edible mushrooms").

RCDA grew out of a research project occasioned by a visit of American churchmen to the Soviet Union. Members of the delegation liked the information so well they suggested a continuing report. The newsletter was begun in the spring of 1962 with financial help from United Presbyterian Lutherans, Episcopalians, and Methodists.

RCDA runs eight pages per issue and costs ten dollars a year. It is now mailed to people in fifty countries, but circulation totals a mere 1,600, including many free copies sent to Africa, Asia, and Latin America. The publication costs the NCC's International Affairs Commission about $40,000 a year, and in 1966 the project went $17,000 in the red despite hundreds of hours of volunteer labor. Continuing deficits seem likely unless circulation can be substantially increased.

Competition for the budget dollar is keen among NCC agencies, and some people have campaigned against *RCDA*. They contend the reports do not contribute to the principle of coexistence.

But Hruby, a part-time Presbyterian minister, can preach a sermon of rebuttal on that point. "A fruitful dialogue cannot take place if we do not know the facts," he says.

"The Communist governments are sensitive to this kind of publication," Hruby adds, "and they seem to be less offensive in their policies concerning churches behind the Iron Curtain because they know that violations against religious freedom in the Soviet Union are reported. It is apparent that the Soviet Embassy and other embassies of Communist countries are eager to have good relations with *RCDA*."

[From Christianity Today, Apr. 28, 1967]

WHAT OF RELIGION UNDER COMMUNISM

Never has the religious situation in Communist countries been more confused and ambiguous than it is today.

Except for Mao's China, where the fury of the barbaric "cultural revolution" strikes hard against Buddhists and Muslims as well as Protestants and Catholics, a relative calm and a sort of "peaceful coexistence" now seems to prevail between governments and various religious groups. Church delegations from Communist countries visit the United States and other Western nations almost routinely. Various churches of the Soviet Union and other Communist nations have been permitted to join the World Council of Churches and international denominational bodies. Roman Catholic representatives from most Communist countries were able to attend the sessions of Vatican Council II.

The greatest breakthrough in church-state relations in the Soviet Union was the first visit of the head of the Soviet Union to the Vatican in January of this year, the fiftieth anniversary of the Bolshevik Revolution. Church dignitaries are now more often invited to official state receptions in Communist capitals though they are not yet asked to say grace at banquets given by Communist leaders. It is becoming almost rou-

tine for the officials of ministries of foreign affairs and other high state offices in Communist nations to be present at the arrivals and departures of national and foreign ecclesiastical dignitaries.

A superficial observer might be easily tempted to misinterpret such phenomena. He might conclude, hastily and optimistically, that the churches behind the Iron Curtain are now much better off than before, that the coexistence between religion and Communism works, and that a promising new era of a dialogue between Christians and Marxists is at hand. American churchmen, knowing neither the language nor the extent of complex problems in these areas, often make inaccurate and misleading appraisals of the religious situation. Their opinions tend to reflect wishful thinking rather than historical realities. A distorted picture of the situation not only disadvantages Christian brethren in Communist nations but also confuses churchgoers in the United States and other countries.

The need for reliable information about the religious situation in Communist countries was apparently one main reason that, five years ago, the National Council of Churches started a modest semi-monthly publication, *Religion in Communist Dominated Areas* (*RCDA*). It is published by the Department of International Affairs and edited by two experts on religion in Communist countries, Paul B. Anderson and Czech-born Blahoslav Hruby, and it garners surprising amounts of information on attitudes and practices of Communist parties in regard to the life, work, and vital concerns of Christians and people of other religions throughout the Communist world. Few publications issued by the National Council of Churches are so urgently needed, and none give so balanced a view of the problem of religion under Communism. *RCDA* publishes translations of articles and documents—regarding religion in Communist nations and originating from these countries—most of which can be found in no other publication. In its very first volume, *RCDA* discovered a viciously anti-Semitic author, T. Kitchko, whose Nazi-like anti-Jewish book *Judaism Without Embellishment* (published by the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences in Kiev) was condemned by the world press as well as by major Communist parties.

Perhaps the most important documents published by *RCDA* were two letters by two courageous Russian Orthodox clergymen, the Rev. Mr. Eshliman and the Rev. Mr. Yakunin of Moscow. Last year *RCDA* first disclosed to the American public their protest against the harassment of the Russian Orthodox Church, a protest addressed to President Podgorny as well as to Patriarch Alexei. These documents are a telling story of a continuous Soviet struggle against the Russian Orthodox Church and other churches, and they irrefutably detail numerous serious violations by Soviet authorities of Paragraph 124 of the U.S.S.R. constitution, which guarantees freedom of religion to citizens of the Soviet Union. *RCDA* has also published interesting material about dissent among the Soviet Baptists and the Czech Presbyterians.

RCDA tries to cover the whole Communist world, with an eye not only on the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe but also on Communist China, Viet Nam, and Cuba. This is highly important at a time when the monolithic type of Communism belongs definitely to the past and when a pluralistic type is more and more in evidence. *RCDA* editors handle about 150 foreign-language publications. Along with translations of articles from these sources, they supply factual comments and explanations that make such reports comprehensible to persons unfamiliar with particular areas. The publication is now being mailed to readers in almost sixty countries, although only a limited number of copies reach readers in Africa and Asia because of lack of funds. Ecclesiastical and academic spokesmen, as well as various private and governmental institutions and organizations, consider it an invaluable source of balanced information about religion and Communism.

One would think that such an important ecumenical project serving people in so many countries would have the moral and financial support of the most important denominations affiliated with the National Council of Churches. The truth, however, is that only the Episcopalians, Lutherns (National Lutheran Council), Methodists, United Church of Christ and United Presbyterians have supported this project, and their modest grants are not sufficient to balance the *RCDA* budget.

Jan van Hoogstraten, director of the NCC's Church World Service for Africa, asks whether "some people here in the United States on occasion feel" that *RCDA* is embarrassing their efforts to create "better relations" with the Communist world. He stresses the importance of making known to the larger non-Communist world what is largely printed for home consumption in the Communist world.

Rumors are rife that *RCDA* is in dire financial straits. If this is true, the ecumenical churches may discover too late that they are neglecting a worthy project. The financial situation of *RCDA* is apparently so serious that its survival beyond June of this year is now uncertain. If this publication's objective reports on religion under Communism are halted, the field will be wide open to peddlers of slanted news. They will tell us that churches in Communist countries are full and that religion is now much better off than before.

We must ask two questions at this point. First, has the National Council of Churches done all that is necessary to provide sufficient funding for this important project? Or has it capitulated to pressures by those individuals and groups who vocally and illogically peddle one-sided peace in Viet Nam, one-sided coexistence, one-sided dialogue between the Christians and Marxists, and almost anything one-sided that appeals to their soft "liberalism"? One would hope that Dr. Arthur S. Flemming, not only as president of the NCC but also as president of the University of Oregon and as a former leader in government, would recognize *RCDA* as a vehicle for information that is particularly needed today in Africa, Asia, and Latin America, as well as elsewhere. Instead of letting it die, the NCC should take pride in this balanced publication.

The second question must be addressed to various member denominations of the NCC that contribute little or nothing to support this effort. Why? Some denominations spend thousands of dollars to invite churchmen from Communist nations to the United States. We have no objection to a re-establishment of communication with Christian brethren after many years of separation. Such visitors should, however, be chosen with more care.

It is a known fact that Communists are using some churchmen as agents to spread Communist propaganda. A typical case is Milan Opocensky, a young theologian from Prague, Czechoslovakia, who has been invited to the United States at least five times in recent years. Recently, he joined the staff of the World Student Christian Federation in Geneva, Switzerland, as its European secretary. Opocensky never forgets to propagate the Communist regime while sprinkling his propaganda with allusions to the Gospel, Karl Barth, Bonhoeffer, Tillich, and others. He is quite successful in confusing the minds of American youth and students who are already disturbed by all kinds of theological nonsense. While students of European history know that Czechoslovakia was brought under the Communist dictatorship by Stalin's interference in Czechoslovakia's affairs, Opocensky repeats again and again that his country was not able to solve its problems in 1948 and that the Communists had no other choice but to take over the Czechoslovakian government. He also defended Stalin and his policies when Stalin's cult was shattered by Khrushchev. American Christians pay thousands of dollars for Opocensky's travel expenses while Communists in Prague laugh at how cheap and easy it is to spread Communist propaganda in the United States.

Several American denominations spend thousands of dollars to send delegates to various meetings of the Christian Peace Conference (CPC) in Europe, or to bring its representatives to the United States. CPC headquarters is located in Prague, Czechoslovakia. It is a meeting place for many Christians from Communist countries who otherwise would have little chance to travel abroad. CPC statements and manifestos have the classical trademark of a Communist-front organization.

If some American denominations spend so much money for such projects offering one-sided and unbalanced information, why do they not give money to support *RCDA?* Have the American churches no moral duty to support this effort to provide balanced information on religion in Communist countries?

Communists take *RCDA* seriously; they would like to see it disappear. Churchmen from several Communist countries have expressed appreciation for *RCDA*. They have reason to believe that Communist governments are sensitive to a publication that keeps constant tabs on their behavior toward religion. We are not in a position to divulge details, but we know of Communist attempts to interfere with *RCDA* by personal threats and harassment. When these tactics did not work, Communists spread word through their church emissaries in the United States that *RCDA* hurts East-West relations between nations and churches. Some naive churchmen apparently believe this Communist nonsense and seem to be trying to do what the Communists have so far been unable to do—eliminate *RCDA*.

We hope that the NCC and its major member churches will see that *RCDA* is continued and assured of moral and financial backing. If they fail, other American Christians and local churches will do well to give this publication full moral and financial support. Church members reluctant to support other phases of NCC work may designate their contributions for this purpose. Gifts (which are tax deductible) may be sent to *Religion in Communist Dominated Areas*, National Council of Churches, Room 566, 475 Riverside Drive, New York, New York 10027.

SENATOR EUGENE McCARTHY'S NEW BOOK

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, Senator McCARTHY has just seen his new book come from the press, a book which without a doubt will be widely discussed. "The Limits of Power," which is subtitled "America's Role in the World," is a book which, in the language of a discussion of it on the editorial page of yesterday's Washington Star, "in lucid compass, conducts a brilliant analysis of our present foreign policy, how we got where we are, why we ought to reconsider our position and what we really ought to be doing in the world of men and nations."

We in the Senate are well aware of the soundness and clarity of the thinking of our distinguished colleague from Minnesota, who speaks in this book from the vantage point of membership in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

The limits of power to which the title refers are real, as the Star column notes in stating Senator McCarthy's thesis that "no nation can run the world singlehandedly and it is high time we stopped trying."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article by Frank Getlein, "The U.S. Illusion of Impotence," from the October 4 Washington Star may appear in the Congressional Record.

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

The U.S. Illusion of Omnipotence

(By Frank Getlein)

The ancient wisdom expressed in the line, "O that mine enemy would write a book," is not an absolute. It depends entirely on how good your enemy is at writing books. The varied examples of Norman Mailer and Jim Bishop to the contrary, it is possible to write a good one.

Senator Eugene J. McCarthy, D-Minn., has just written one and it is hard to see how his enemies—or the enemies of the general position he advocates—can derive much pleasure or profit from the fact. The book is called "The Limits of Power," and the very title must seem a contradiction in terms to such enemies. Yet in lucid language, in brief compass, the last Stevensonian conducts a brilliant analysis of our present foreign policy, how we got where we are, why we ought to reconsider our position and what we really ought to be doing in the world of men and nations. . . .

In the senator's compressed summary of the years since World War II, we have drifted into the illusion of omnipotence in foreign policy, partly by accident, partly by self-righteous design, mostly because we didn't know what we were doing and still don't.

The last good times, in this view of our history in the world for the last two decades, were with Truman and Acheson, the latter a classical, therefore conservative, shaper of foreign policy. They were succeeded by Eisenhower and John Foster Dulles, the latter a stern and rockbound moralist and fighter of Communist devils.

Dulles did two things that still take their toll. He established a worldwide system of treaties that gives us the theoretical justification to do anything, anywhere, anytime, to anyone that pleases us. And he allowed the CIA, under his brother Allen, to become the quasi-independent, policymaking, operation-mounting entity that it is. . . .

Perhaps the most damning judgment in the book is the judgment that no judgment is yet possible on Rusk: after six years in office he remains an unknown. Yet the policy set by the Dulles brothers continues to shape our ends, rough hew them as we will. It is a policy based on the belief that communism is always evil and always the same and always to be opposed or "contained" by us in any way necessary.

Senator McCarthy is keenly aware of the inertia factor in government at large and in foreign policy in particular. He feels that much of our present trouble comes from inertia, the dead weight of vested interest that keeps policy going in all areas long after its original purpose in one area has been fulfilled or abandoned.

The underlying thesis is simply that no nation can run the world singlehandedly and it is high time we stopped trying.

It is an extremely attractive possibility that emerges in the final pages, an America that would base its foreign policy on close examination and constant re-examination of the way things actually are in the numerous parts of the world, an examination steadily illuminated by the knowledge that there are limits to what power can do, any power. He concludes, "America's contribution to world civilization must be more than a continuous performance demonstrating that we can police the planet."

Yes, we can all agree, it must be. But will it be? Can it be?

The melancholy answer is probably in Senator McCarthy's note that the personal mark of his book, if any, is "that which I believe Adlai Stevenson would have made on American foreign policy, had his ideas and his attitudes been translated into political reality."

We all know what happened to those ideas and attitudes, first at the hands of the electorate and second at the hands of his own party in victory.

But even beyond that question of whether, there is the question of how. As others have so often in history, we are finding in Vietnam that the only hard part about going for a ride on a tiger is getting off.

STERNER ACTION NEEDED

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record an editorial, entitled "Sterner Action Needed at Outset," which appeared in the October 3, 1967, edition of the Williamson Daily News.

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

Stern Action Needed at Outset

Rioting and crime in the streets are two of the most urgent problems confronting this nation. These have resulted in a myriad of suggestions as to their causes and an even greater number of remedial measures for their cure. By virtue of his long career in directing the nation's No. One law enforcement agency, J. Edgar Hoover, director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, certainly should be competent to discuss these conditions with an air of authority. This he does in his message to all law enforcement officials which appears in the FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin. Mr. Hoover's message reads as follows:

In a riot there are no victors. The losers include everybody—the rioters, the victims, law enforcement, the community, the State, and the Nation.

Causes of riots can be counted by the score. A study of the overall problem indicates, however, that the widespread violence in our country to some degree is a direct outgrowth of the civil disobedience movement. In recent years, some leaders of dubious stature have made a grandiose gesture of willfully violating laws they deem to be unjust. For the most part, these individuals, although admittedly guilty of breaking the law, have gone unpunished. Young thugs and misguided teen-agers, seeing others defy authority and the courts with impugnity, have been led to believe that any crime under a banner of complaints is justified. Consequently, they ignore the law and roam through their communities creating violence and terror. Certainly, those who espouse the theory of civil disobedience and authorities who free guilty violators must share a portion of the blame and responsibility for the turmoil in our streets. It should be abundantly clear that the doctrine of civil disobedience is a doctrine of self-destruction.

Stern, decisive action is needed when a street disturbance begins. Justice is not served when a growing horde of vandals and looters is appeased and their pillage overlooked lest "a show of force might provoke them to greater violence." Quiescence does not satisfy rioters. Procrastination or uncertainty on the part of authorities denotes weakness or concession to a mob. Thus, the offenders are encouraged and their violence gains momentum.

A judicial self-appraisal by the news media of their riot coverage might also be in order. Some media have already taken action in this regard. There can be no quarrel with the all-important role of keeping the public informed as quickly and as completely as possible. No one rightfully expects riots to be played down or salient facts withheld.

On the other hand, militant agitators, hate-mongers, and publicity-seeking rabble rousers who incite riots have no fear of overexposure. They know that television, radio, and front-page news stories are the best and quickest means of getting their views before the public. Thus, they seek attention from the news media. In riot reporting, objectivity and balance, always key factors of responsible journalism, help expose distortion and reduce the special treatment of those who advocate violence. Strict adverence to high journalistic principles is a valuable public service in matters affecting public safety.

Many proposals have been advanced to help eliminate the causes of riots. Just as there is no single cause, there is no single remedy. I do know, however, that the answer will not be found in sociological remedies alone. If our system of law is to survive, then the law must be enforced. Those who break the law, acting alone or in concert, must be detected and arrested, promptly prosecuted, and given proper, substantial punishment. In halting riots and removing crime from our Nation's streets, this should be the first order of business.

USING THE POOR, CHEAP POLITICS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record an editorial, entitled "Using the Poor, Cheap Politics," which appeared in the September 28, 1967, Wheeling, W. Va., News Register.

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

Using the Poor, Cheap Politics

It is a shame that the politicians have come to believe that in every city they visit today they must walk through the slums and have their pictures taken patting some poor child on the head.

If anything, this sort of press agentry is bound to create ill-feelings among the residents of the rundown neighborhoods who must feel they are being used by politicians. Some of these people are getting angry over being treated as tourist attractions. They are fed up with the political gimmicks and with politicians who make a whirl-wind tour of the slums while TV and newspaper cameras click away. They know the politician will not return again until the next campaign.

Under the circumstances we would suggest that quick-tempered politicos of the George Romney stripe especially should stay away from the guided tours of the slum neighborhoods. Last week Gov. Romney, who has presidential aspirations, got into a shouting match with a young Puerto Rican in a Chicago slum. The young man spoke out his resentment of politicians using the poor people. Gov. Romney's temper got the best of him and according to reports he almost punched the Puerto Rican in the mouth.

That should have been enough to alert the Romney camp to avoid any further excursions into blighted areas. But it wasn't and thus on Monday the Republican Governor of Michigan had a similar encounter while touring the poverty areas of Los Angeles. The press reported a sharp exchange between Gov. Romney and two militant young Negroes.

The politicians have done enough to create the tensions existing today in many of the dilapidated neighborhoods which infest every

city. Often they have made grandiose promises on which they could not deliver. They have played the poverty issue to the hilt for the sake of politics. They have created committee upon committee, commission upon commission. Always it is the same—study, survey, consult, plan, testify, investigate. The talk is the same too, rats, slum housing, no jobs, cold water, unheated rooms. In the end the money goes to the bureaucrats, the political hangers-on and the consultants. It is a disgusting situation and shows no real charitable concern for the truly needy among us. Shame, shame. The politicians should quit posing for pictures in the slums and go about doing something meaningful about the urban problems which confront our Nation.

As for Gov. Romney and his temper that is something else again. It seems wherever he goes he gets into a fight. He did it recently while visiting in San Francisco where he had an encounter with the hippies. Imagine that, a fight with the hippies. They are arch enemies of violence!

Gov. Romney also dislikes newsmen asking him questions, which leads us to the advice handed out by The Philadelphia Inquirer the other day in preparation for Gov. Romney's visit to the City of Brotherly Love.

All newsmen were requested to refrain from asking Gov. Romney about the following:

North Vietnam, South Vietnam, black people, white people, Republicans, Democrats, the Mormon religion, American Motors, the Detroit News, and the American League pennant race.

About the only thing open for newsmen to discuss with Gov. Romney would be his stamp collection. That should be safe.

STANDARDS NECESSARY FOR LIBERTY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a recent column by Bruce Biossat, entitled "Standards Necessary for Liberty."

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

STANDARDS NECESSARY FOR LIBERTY

(By Bruce Biossat)

WASHINGTON.—An enlarging number of Americans seem bent on defining American democratic freedoms to allow them greater and greater license in their personal and public lives.

Increasingly, freedom is seen by some as, above all, an immunity—in the extreme view, from the law and the moral code themselves; in the less extreme, from criticism, from any kind of gradation, from all social penalty.

To the extent that political radicals of the right and left, with some support from more moderate types, are attacking the established framework of U.S. society as an inhibitor to freedom, they seem to give the sanction of a "high cause" to the libertarian bent of many average Americans.

But the latter probably do not need that sanction. On their own, by their own route, they have come to the notion that it is virtually undemocratic to note differences between one individual and another in matters of achievement or potential; to call attention to mistakes; to fix blame; or to make too much of many kinds of wrongdoing.

In all this there is a wicked irony. In the name of allowing individually its freest rein, the growing army of libertarians would bar society from making some crucial individual distinction among people.

ARRESTS ARE RESENTED

Grades and tests in school are increasingly frowned upon. Legitimate arrests for offenses against the law are resented as unwarranted invasions of personal rights. Minor wrongdoing is widely acceptable. Law enforcers, engulfed by rising serious crime, seem to underscore the tolerance by leaving many minor transgressions unprobed and unpunished.

The libertarians want no harsh words, no penalties, no standards to be measured by. Democracy, thus rationalized, means being left alone, to do as one wishes.

Those social analysts who are not caught up in these loose notions brand them as painfully immature. The bent is all for privilege and pleasure, with no balancing burden for responsibility.

One practiced observer, author Barbara W. Tuchman, sees a great failure of confidence among Americans as a key cause. In a McCall's article she added:

"As a result we tend to shy away from all judgments. We hesitate to label anything wrong, and we therefore hesitate to require the individual to bear moral responsibility for his acts. . . .

MUST MAINTAIN VALUES

"To adopt the position that we must not condemn but only understand may be very Christian in intent, but in reality it is an escape from the necessity of exercising judgment. . . . What is required is courage—just a little, not very much—the courage to be independent and stand up for the standard of values one believes in. . . .

"If the educated man is not willing to express standards, if he cannot show that he has them and applies them, what then is education for?"

Should it be correct that immaturity and lack of confidence underlie the mounting libertarian strain among us, then at the very least we shall have to face this reality—and cease trying to invest these tendencies with high nobility.

The blunt fact is that we cannot function as a society or as individuals without a "system," without law, a moral code, an encompassing set of standards, a capacity and a willingness to make judgments about people and their problems.

Flaws and roadblocks in the system deserve to be attacked. But freedom cannot exist without the shelter of a durable framework. A discerning radical, Harvard sociologist Martin Peretz, sees that. Those who want to short-circuit the system, he says, simply lack the proper patience and stomach and drive to change society for the better by truly democratic means.

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE NEEDED IN INSURANCE OF LOW-LYING AREAS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, periodically Texas is visited by a great disaster caused by driving wind and water, such as Hurricane Carla, in 1961, and very recently, Hurricane Beulah. This problem is of common concern to other coastal States in the United States. Likewise, from time to time lowland areas in such cities as Dallas and Fort Worth, far inland from any coastal regions, are swamped by floods of major proportions.

The estimates of the losses incurred, while reaching into the millions, do not approach the true economic consequences. Aside from the loss of life and human misery, all regular activities are disrupted, productive capacity is impaired, strategic facilities cannot be used, and housing is destroyed.

We have various programs to rebuild public facilities and to make loans for the purposes of rebuilding private structures; but what about a small businessman or homeowner when he has to stand such an economic loss alone? He may be able to get a loan to rebuild, but how can he pay off two mortgages? The nature of flood damage is such that insurance companies have been unwilling to write policies that will provide relief for these victims.

I have for a number of years been engaged with other Senators in the search for a sound flood insurance program. This search led to the passage earlier this session in the Senate of S. 1985, of which I am a cosponsor. This Senate action is a tribute to the author of the bill, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS].

A flood insurance bill has been reported favorably by the Housing Subcommittee of the House Committee on Banking and Currency.

The Houston Chronicle took this occasion on September 28 to publish an editorial supporting the quick passage of the bill. I agree with the Chronicle, because I think that the bill is necessary to make small home ownership and small business ownership secure in high-risk areas.

The editorial is to the point and the reasoning is sound. Since it is representative of the thinking of many of my constituents and of the great majority of the American people, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE FLOOD INSURANCE BILL

Hurricane Beulah packed some of the strongest winds ever recorded for a hurricane. But it is the flooding in South Texas that is causing the worst damage. Unfortunately, the less serious wind damage will be covered by insurance; the water damage will not be.

Anything is insurable. The reason little if any flood insurance is sold is that the cost of premiums makes it prohibitive. Insuring against flood damage violates two basic actuarial principles:

First, high risk must be spread across a wide population base. People who live on high ground aren't interested in flood insurance. Those living in areas that may flood can't pay the exorbitant premiums necessary to cover their potential loss.

Second, in floods high loss is coupled with high frequency of loss. For successful insurance-writing, these two characteristics cannot be combined. For example, in fire insurance loss may be high but the frequency of loss is low. In auto insurance, frequency is high but claims generally are small. In floods, the loss per property holder is high and everybody gets hit at the same time.

Help for flood victims may soon arrive, however. A bill is now before Congress that would establish a federal flood insurance program. The bill, sponsored by Sen. Harrison Williams of New Jersey, passed the Senate almost unnoticed on Sept. 14. A similar measure, sponsored by Rep. Wright Patman of Texarkana, is now before the House Banking and Currency Committee.

This plan, which is backed by the administration, would set up a flood insurance system supported both by the private insurance industry and the federal government. A $500 million fund in the Treasury Department would be used to subsidize the premiums. It also would reimburse private companies should a catastrophic loss—like Beulah—occur which might threaten the companies with bankruptcy.

Under this plan, a number of private companies would set up an insurance pool to deal with the federal government. The insurance could then be sold at rates that would appeal to the average individual. One-family dwellings would be insured up to $15,000, multiple units up to $30,000, and personal property up to $5000.

Disasters like Beulah, or Hurricane Betsy which caused $1 billion of damage to Louisiana in 1965, vividly demonstrate the need for such insurance. This is good legislation.

THE REAL AMERICA FOUND IN DAKOTAS

Mr. MUNDT. The Dakota Twins—South and North Dakota—are indebted to a Chicago stock-brokerage firm for bringing national recognition to the fact that our area of the Union reflects what these analysts refer to as "the real America." Certainly no citizen of either Dakota would argue with that gratifying finding.

For the information of Congress and the country, I ask unanimous consent that the report issued by Wayne Hunter & Co. of Chicago, Ill., be printed in the RECORD.

I completely endorse this report on the two Dakotas. Whether it is to invest one's time as a tourist, his talents as a pheasant hunter in the world's best pheasant hunting country, or as one seeking to buy a home, a farm, or a business, I suggest investing in the Dakotas—preferably, of course, in South Dakota. I give assurance that it will be a triple-A, gilt-edged, guaranteed, and most profitable investment.

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

[From the Aberdeen American-News]

THE REAL AMERICA FOUND IN DAKOTAS

The South Dakota image is improving!

One of the first honorary citizenship certificates awarded by Gov. Nils Boe in connection with the Proud State program for bringing recognition to South Dakota should go to Wayne Hunter & Co., Chicago stockbrokers.

The nationally respected brokerage firm has reprinted in its widely circulated bulletin what it calls a Bank Bond Comment Letter. Under the title, "The Real America," it said:

"We have just returned from a visit with some of our banker friends in North Dakota and South Dakota. There we discovered afresh the spirit and character that made the United States great. At a time of strife in many large cities, unease in Washington and crisis in the sense of natural purpose, an atmosphere of self-fulfillment and resolute determination is evident at every turn in the road in the 'Dakota Territory'. These are people whose forebears, like themselves, sought opportunity rather than privilege. This is big country, whose settlers needed abundant ambition and energy.

"The rewards of successful enterprise are mirrored in the large farms that dot the countryside with their well-kept buildings and many acres of carefully-tended crops. Even old-timers whose memories go back to the 1890's can recall few better years than 1967 for small grain crops.

"Grass is thick and hay, in bales and stacks, is everywhere. Cattle, with calves by their sides, are fat and sleek. There are problems. Canada's drought has slipped over the border and damaged the corn crop in some areas. Farmers again find grain prices hitting lows even as costs of operating a farm continue to spiral. Concern is sometimes expressed about conditions among the Indian population.

"Yet, problems are viewed more as challenges than as reasons for complaint. Difficulties are not unheard of in this country. The early pioneer families underwent severe trials. A wave of bank failures occurred in the 1920s. Few Americans have ever withstood such hardships as the great drought and duststorms of the 1930s which struck just as depression gripped the nation. These Dakotans who stayed and fought back were rewarded when the scales of nature were brought back into balance. Today, to the visitor on a brief sojourn, there is an inescapable overall impression of peace and plenty, health and happiness.

"Driving down the long and narrow road toward the endless horizon, the visitor to the Dakotas can only conclude—here is a measure of the real America, here is the spirit representative of so much of the nation that is not reported on the front page. Here is reason enough not to harbor fear for our free society, but instead to look upward in hope for the future security of the United States."

PRIVATE INDUSTRY AIDS TEXAS DISASTER VICTIMS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on Friday, September 29, I received a telegram from Mr. Thomas M. Rauch, president of Smith Kline & French Laboratories.

This was, indeed, a welcome message since in it Mr. Rauch informed me that he had made arrangements through drug channels to replace at no cost all uninsured stocks of medical products produced by Smith Kline & French which had been damaged or destroyed by hurricane Beulah or its aftermath. This is an excellent example of how private industry can accept a responsible social role in times of great disaster.

I thank Mr. Rauch for his action, and I invite the attention of the Senate to the telegram. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,
September 29, 1967.

Hon. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH,
U.S. Senator,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Smith Kline & French Laboratories expresses deep sympathy for the citizens of Texas whose lives have been disrupted by the recent floods. My company stands ready to help as best it can the difficult process of return to normal conditions. We have made arrangements through drug trade channels to replace at no cost all uninsured stock of medicinal products produced by SK&F and our subsidiary, Menley & James, which have been damaged or destroyed. Please accept for the people of Texas our hope for an early and complete recovery.

THOMAS M. RAUCH,
President, Smith Kline & French Laboratories.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. 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 and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the pending question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and ask unanimous consent that the time for the quorum call be charged equally to both sides.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The Clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Delaware is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the purpose of the pending amendment is to reduce the authorization as provided in the pending bill from $2,258,000,000 to $2,060,000,000. This is a reduction of $198 million.

The adoption of the pending amendment would still give this agency every dollar that was requested in the budget. It would give them every dollar that the agency itself said it could properly spend. Certainly, at a time when we are operating with a deficit that is approaching $2 billion a month and is estimated sometimes to be as high as $28 billion to $30 billion for the next fiscal year the very least we can do is to hold the appropriations not to exceed the amount which the agency itself says it can properly spend.

Personally, I think we shall have to go even further before this is over and reduce the budget estimate.

Nevertheless, this is an opportunity for the Senate to go on record as to whether it wants to live up to its promise to reduce the expenditures or whether it wants, by rejecting the pending amendment, to provide more money than the Budget Bureau says the agency can properly and efficiently spend.

I urge the adoption of the pending amendment and reserve the remainder of my time.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. If the pending amendment is agreed to, to what extent would it curtail the job training program?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It would not curtail it at all as it has been recommended by the budget or by the agency itself. Job training is covered in title I, parts (B) and (D). Two titles are covered under this amendment: Part (A), title I, provides $295 million, and the amendment would allow $295 million. Under part (B) of title I, the Senate bill provides $567 million. The pending amendment provides $579 million, or an increase of $12 million.

The pending amendment would provide for that increase on this item. It does eliminate $105 million which the Senate bill would put in part (D), title II.

Mr. COTTON. In other words, the impact of the pending amendment on the job training aspect would be comparatively minor.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct. It would give to the agency every dollar which the Budget Bureau says can efficiently be spent during 1968.

Mr. COTTON. Undoubtedly the Senator is aware that the other body has just overwhelmingly rejected the conference report on the HEW appropriations bill which, incidentally, would provide for more money for the established, tried, and tested job training activities and programs that have been long established. That indicates that if we exceed the amount recommended in the President's budget with respect to the pending bill the other body is likely to reject the amount by which we exceed the President's budget.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct. Last year the total appropriation was only $1,750,000,000. We might also jeopardize the enactment of the proposal itself by approving this further increase of $200 million. This is not the only job training program. In a bill pending before the Finance Committee the HEW has a substantial amount included for job training.

With the adoption of the pending amendment they will still have every dollar that they can efficiently spend. Certainly that is the objective.

Last year the total authorization for this agency was $1,750,000,000. Budget requests for this year are for $2,060,000,000. This is an increase of about 17 percent over last year. The Senate bill proposes to add another $198 million, or 10 percent more than the administration requests. The pending amendment will cancel this Senate increase.

Mr. COTTON. I thank the Senator.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may require.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I have listened with interest to the comments of the Senator from Pennsylvania. I am sure that, quite inadvertently, he did not state the position of the agency request.

The Senate bill has recommended for this agency almost $250 million more than the committee has put into the bill. It was the Bureau of the Budget, and not the agency, which made the cut resulting in $2.06 billion.

Let me say very candidly that, so far as the other body is concerned, I am well aware of the attitudes over there. And, quite frankly, I want some wiggle room in conference. And, if for no other reason than that, I would urge my Republican friends to give us that wiggle room. We are going to have a tough time in conference and we need some flexibility.

With respect to each of these increases, let me point to where they came from.

The first is a $10 million increase in the training program in title I. That is a Republican amendment. It was put in the bill at the request of the minority members in order to give incentive to private enterprise to train and employ the hard-core unemployed.

We asked for $925 million for that purpose yesterday and were turned down on a close vote. There is only $10 million in there at the request of the Republicans. I hope the Republicans will not make us take it out.

With respect to the special impact program, which is the joint brainchild of the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] and the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], that matter will be discussed in a few minutes by the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY]. We put $83 million into that in excess of the entirely inadequate $22 million which the Bureau of the Budget had allowed us.

If that is not entirely a Republican program, the Republicans must take at least half the credit for the authorship or parenthood, as the case may be.

With respect to the $40 million added to the community action program, $10 million of that is for health aid; $15 million is for aid to the elderly who have generally been shortchanged in this program; and $15 million is for family planning.

If there is any way to curtail the number of young Americans who are going into poverty if nothing is to be done about it, I would suggest that family planning is perhaps the best. The agency reported that for every dollar spent on family planning they got a higher return than for any other project in the antipoverty spectrum. The next item was for the migrant program and involved $3 million. That is a joint project of the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] and me.

I am happy to accept the junior parentship of what the Senator from California so badly wanted for the migrants in California and elsewhere.

The next item is $25 million for small business loans in poverty areas. That was the brainchild of the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], a Republican addition.

Title V had an additional sum put in, $35 million, at the specific request of the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS]. That is a Republican addition.

The final addition, $2 million, means we will add $2 million to the VISTA program which, with all deference to my friend, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], has been a conspicuous success in practically every State of the Union.

That $2 million provision has 16 cosponsors in an effort to add this amount to the VISTA program, a great many of whom are Republicans.

So, that is where the $198 million in excess of the budget comes from.

I hope very much that the Senate will reject the Williams amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. Yes; I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I thank the distinguished floor manager of the bill, and tell him that I will be brief.

The amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] will strike $198 million from the bill, and will do so in the manner just outlined by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK].

I was the author of an amendment, accepted by the committee, which is responsible for $40 million of the funds the amendment would cut from the bill, and I would like to explain the rationale for my amendment.

OEO's effort in programs for the elderly poor has been distressingly small, as ample testimony in the hearings confirms. Consequently, I proposed a new, national emphasis program—Project Find—to enlarge OEO's effort, and it was accepted.

Similarly, I proposed a program designed to bring new people into, and to enhance knowledge of, the field of health services for the poor. Once again, ample testimony confirms the need for a program of this sort, and I refer my colleagues to a statement I made in this Chamber on October 3 for excerpts from the testimony.

One other new program—family planning—was added by the committee to title II of the bill, and this, too, was supported by testimony.

Now, the budget request for title II, already pared to the bone by the Bureau of the Budget, did not, of course, take into account these new programs. Consequently, I proposed to raise the authorization $40 million in order to obviate the need of taking funds from other title II programs.

That is the rationale for $40 million of the $198 million proposed to be cut from the committee bill, and I know that the other $158 million is equally well justified.

I urge rejection of the Williams amendment, as the programs they will affect are badly needed.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, it had been my intention to support the amendment of the Senator from Delaware. One reason why I had intended to support it was that I happened to serve on the Subcommittee on HEW of the Committee on Appropriations; and many of the meritorious programs in this bill are, in my

opinion, duplication of or parallel to the programs in HEW. I believe the HEW people, who have worked through the years, are much more competent—or at least have the better experience—to administer the programs.

However, since yesterday, we know that the HEW programs will be severely cut. I am not interested in which of these programs is advocated by Democrats and which by Republicans. I do not wish to see the job training cut, if I can help it. I believe I could only continue to support the amendment of the Senator from Delaware upon one of two bases: If it were amended to give more money earmarked for the job-training program; or, two, if it were amended so that those who administer the program would be empowered to transfer funds back and forth within the program—just within this program—so that they would have the opportunity to use funds for purposes which they consider the most vital. I consider the actual job training the most vital.

Incidentally, I am not interested in giving the able Senator from Pennsylvania more "wiggle room" in conference. I believe the Senate should work its will and stand as steadfast as the other body. There has been too much "wiggling" in conferences.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I thank the Senator from New Hampshire, and I appreciate his position.

In the colloquy earlier with the Senator from New York—who will discuss his own position with regard to this amendment—the suggestion was made that if this amendment were adopted I should agree to go along with a second amendment which would give to the conferees the right to rearrange these figures in a manner within the confines of the bill as they thought best. I told him I would have no objection to such a proposal. I was only seeking to reduce this amount by the $198 million, and I would be willing to confer upon the conferees the authority to rearrange this amount in a manner they believe would be best.

I call the attention of the Senator from New Hampshire to the fact that not only in the HEW bill which he mentioned, which is now before the House, but also in the social security bill, about which the HEW representatives are testifying before the Committee on Finance, there are included sections dealing with welfare, the Job Corps, and aid to the elderly. Under that bill the administration proposals call for a separate multimillion-dollar job training program, which will be handled either by HEW or by the Secretary of Labor.

There is no question about the fact that all these agencies are recommending an expansion of the job-training program. This is by far not the only agency dealing with this subject.

The question is what is the most efficient manner in which to handle the job training program and just how much can we afford. I agree with the Senator from New Hampshire that this is one of the more important items in this program and one that should be given top priority. Nevertheless, we have before us an amendment which gives to this agency all it can spend properly and efficiently.

Mr. CLARK. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I shall yield shortly——

Mr. CLARK. That is the second time the Senator has misstated the fact.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's 2 minutes have expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield myself 1 additional minute. The Senator from Pennsylvania is in error. I will agree with the Senator from Pennsylvania that the agency could spend more if Congress wants to be so free. I do not doubt that any agency under this Great Society could spend five times more than it gets. They are experts at spending.

Mr. CLARK. Asked for more.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. They are not bashful about asking. I have never seen any of these agencies that did not ask for more and spend more just as I have seen the Senator from Pennsylvania ask for more and spend more for every spending program. But to spend more we also have to tax more, and which Senator is going say, "Tax more"? It is all right to promise, but with what are you going to pay for it?

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

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold that request for 1 minute?

Mr. CLARK. Yes.

Mr. COTTON. Will the Senator yield me 1 minute?

Mr. CLARK. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. I am disturbed because of the fact that the ax fell yesterday, and the money for job training which we expected in HEW will not be there.

Before this matter is frozen with the yeas and nays, I wish the Senator from Delaware would consider amending his motion, while he can, to allow a little more money earmarked for job training, because we are not likely to get it in the HEW bill, though we shall fight for it.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I wish to say to my good friend from New Hampshire that it may be his suggestion has merit, but we are on limited time. We have Senators about to leave the Chamber, and we have committed ourselves to voting at the end of 45 minutes. There will be opportunity after we dispose of the Williams amendment, with a little less speed and a little more wisdom, to see what can be worked out. I do not believe that we can do it on the floor in the next 20 minutes.

Therefore, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. COTTON. The Senator is compelling me to vote for the Williams amendment.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I shall vote against the amendment of my colleague, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

There is logic and consistency in his position that we should oppose appropriations larger than recommended by the administration and should, in fact, reduce appropriation. I have been following this position. Only a few days ago I was one of three Senators who voted against a $2.5 billion appropriation for military construction in the United States and all over the world because it has little relevance to the war in Vietnam and should be postponed. We will have a pay raise bill coming up shortly costing up to $5 billion. I intend to vote to postpone pay raises, other than for the military.

The human needs of the people who have no jobs must be considered. Each Senator makes a judgment as to the relative worth of various programs. I believe there are no more pressing problems before the country than jobs for people who are out of work, for decent housing and measures to close the gap between people who are steadily advancing and those who remain behind.

I have my doubts and troubles concerning the poverty program, its waste and duplication in my State and in the country. This bill is an improvement and I hope that the programs will be improved.

Mr. President, I shall vote against the amendment.

I congratulate Senator CLARK for his able management of that bill, and the members of the committee, Republicans and Democrats alike.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Who yields time?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Delaware if he intends to use the remainder of his time. He has more time remaining than I have.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If the Senator is ready to vote, we can terminate the debate now and vote, if he wishes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, what concerns me in connection with this amendment is not only that it would cut down on the war on poverty, but also that it would cut down on it in a number of particularly critical areas.

President Johnson made a statement just 2 days ago about the importance of the private enterprise system in dealing with poverty; he announced that about $50 million was going to be taken from various programs to permit private enterprise to proceed on the unemployment problem.

This amendment would eliminate almost all private enterprise effort from the war on poverty.

It would cut down on it first by deleting $10 million for special incentives to private employers to hire poor people. In committee the senior Senator from New York [Mr JAVITS] led an effort, which was supported by the Republican members of the committee, to get the private sector more actively involved.

Although the proposal was offered by the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], it was supported by all members of the committee. This resulted in a $10 million incentive to private enterprise to actively go out and hire people; it seeks to bring the private sector in in a major way and to assist in an ongoing program.

Second, the special impact program added to the law last year is based on inducing private enterprise to locate in the ghetto, working with Government, and yet giving incentive to the private sector to hire people who are unemployed. This program has worked well, as Secretary Wirtz and Mr. Shriver told the committee at our hearings.

So there is a major effort at the present moment to bring in the private sector. And so, Mr. President, it does not seem to make sense to agree to this proposal. It would also cut all funds to aid the development of small business in the ghetto. Again, this would eliminate money in an area where the private sector of our economy was to be involved in fighting poverty.

The proposal of the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] was supported by all members of the committee. We discussed the importance of bringing in the private enterprise system, and what it can do. We talked about the fact that we want to get away from the Government doing everything out of Washington, the fact that we do not like centralization of Government, and that the private sector should be involved.

Mr. President, hearings were held and it was unanimously agreed that the idea of greater private enterprise involvement is a good one. Some amendments were introduced by Republican Members and some amendments were introduced by Democratic Members, with everybody getting together and agreeing that we do want this kind of program. Now, in one amendment which is advocated on the floor, all of those programs would be eliminated in one fell swoop; almost all of the programs existing at the present time to bring in the private sector to focus on unemployment are going to be eliminated.

It does not make a great deal of sense when we realize that the statistics show that "subemployment" in our urban poverty areas varies from 27 percent to on up to 49.1 percent, and that unemployment on Indian reservations, and among Mexicans and Negroes is steadily growing higher instead of lower. This was a new and innovative way to approach the problem and now it is suggested that we eliminate it on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. President, I hope we reject the amendment.

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

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I think the remarks of the Senator from New York are valid because here is an opportunity for the Senate to bring the creative element of private enterprise into a cooperative effort with the Federal Government. I believe it is a partnership.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. The Senator is correct.

Mr. RANDOLPH. A partnership is needed if we are to bring about employment and reemployment in America. We must mobilize our entire society if this Nation is to wage an effective battle against the conditions of poverty and lack of education under which so many of our citizenry exist. Our endeavors in this area must be creative, and our task will not be fulfilled in a matter of days or months or a year. The challenge of increasing opportunities for education, jobs, housing, health care, and for a better life for the low-income citizen involves a timespan of years. I believe that significant and constructive beginnings have been made—there has been meaningful progress. In many cases, this progress is very evident. The point is, however, that the stage has been set for the pulling in of our total resources in the attack against poverty. And our resources include the private enterprise system, which will exercise a vital role.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time, but I now yield to the Senator from Vermont 3 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Vermont is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I endorse what my distinguished chairman of the subcommittee has just said.

Had the amendment which I offered yesterday been approved by the Senate, I would give serious consideration to the proposal made by my distinguished colleague and friend, the Senator from Delaware. My amendment would have provided substantial funds for job training under both the existing NDTA legislation and through additional job training programs under the human investment approach. If this had been approved, I could consider cutting the present funds. However, since the effect of this cut would now be to reduce amounts expended for job training, I cannot agree. I am in favor of reducing expenditures where possible. Many Republicans, including myself, have made proposals to do so. But, we cannot afford to cut funds at the risk of discouraging private industry from entering the job training field.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, how much time is remaining?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Delaware has 10 minutes remaining, and the Senator from Pennsylvania has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Delaware is recognized.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the arguments advanced on the other side have a certain amount of merit when they discuss particular programs, but they overlook the fact that by the adoption of the pending amendment we are not destroying the program. Even with the adoption of this amendment, we would leave over $2 billion in the bill, or 17 percent more than they had last year.

In addition to this bill there is pending in the Committee on Finance another bill which has the support of the administration and which would provide another $6 billion for aid to the elderly, the handicapped, and family planning plus millions for the Job Corps. All of these programs are covered by other agencies.

At some point, somewhere, Congress must face its responsibility to reduce these expenditures. Programs cannot be financed with promises. If Congress is going to keep adopting and approving all of these increased spending programs we should be hearing speeches on the other side of the aisle supporting the 10 percent tax increase, or perhaps a tax increase of 15 or 18 percent. Significantly, most of those advocating the spending say that they are also against the tax increase.

What good is a promise to these people if they are not going to finance it and if they are not going to vote for the tax increase? If they are going to vote for a tax increase of 5 to 10 percent I would be glad to yield to them to state their position.

Those supporting these ever-expanding spending programs must accept the responsibility for the higher taxes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's 2 minutes have expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 additional minute. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I wish to ask a specific question of the Senator from Delaware. What is the President's recommendation of the total amount of money that should be allocated to this general program?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The President, through the Bureau of the Budget, asked Congress to approve $2.06 billion to cover all phases of this program. The adoption of this amendment would give them every dime which the Bureau of the Budget said could be efficiently spent.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is my understanding that this same program was adopted in 1964, at which time we allocated to it about $1 billion. In fiscal year 1968, according to the figures discussed, it has risen to $2.06 billion on the basis of the President's recommendations; is that not correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct. In addition, during the same period we have had other duplicating programs, with other agencies being built up into multimillion-dollar programs, all operating at the same time.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is it not correct that there are job training programs in the Department of Labor, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and also in OEO which fights the war on poverty?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct. It was confirmed before our committee by the agencies themselves that the rivalry between the various agencies operating all in the same areas is resulting in an unnecessary waste of taxpayers' money.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the

Senator from Delaware yield me 3 minutes?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I intend to support the amendment authorized by the Senator from Delaware because I am convinced that $2,060 million is an adequate amount to allocate to this program.

Of course I am conscious of the fact that we have job-training programs in the three departments I mentioned a moment ago. There seem to be so many of them that few are able to identify the job training programs which are being duplicated time and time again.

I cannot dismiss from my mind the fact that the President is asking for a 10-percent surtax and that while he is asking for that, I should also begin to subscribe to expenditures in excess of what he regarded and what he believed to be his best judgment in helping to solve the problems of those who are out of work or who are poor.

Mr. President, I shall not be placed in that class which votes for increased expenditures but will vote against taxes which the President has asked for. The two positions do not go hand in hand. If we adopt one, we must of necessity exclude the other. We cannot vote against the tax proposal and at the same time vote for increased expenditures.

I humbly say, Mr. President, that if we are going to get into the trouble which the President now fears, it will be because of the adoption of the policy that we can expand on spending without increasing taxes. We just cannot do it and I shall not join with that group which advocates such an indefensible principal in the management of our Government.

I shall vote against the 10-percent surtax, and while I do so, I shall vote against expanding the spending recommended by the President.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield my remaining 2 minutes to the majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what is under consideration here is something quite different from the $2.8 billion added on in title II of the bill and deleted by the Senate yesterday. Insofar as that matter was concerned, no formal hearings had been held, although pertinent information was obtained incidentally during the course of the hearings on the bill itself.

So far as the tax bill is concerned, it is my intention, based on the information at my disposal and the accounts which have been given by reputable and knowledgeable witnesses, to vote for a 10-percent surtax as recommended by the President. I can see no other way out of the difficulty which faces this country and Congress at this time.

With respect to this bill, as a result of the hearings $198 million was added to title I. I support the addition. I think this is a reasonable sum. The difficulties which have confronted the urban centers of the Nation during the past few months—difficulties which may confront them during this coming winter and which may continue as a way of life for some years to come—alone warrant this added authorization.

Ten million dollars will be used for special incentives for private employers to hire the disadvantaged.

Eighty million dollars will be available for the special impact programs established in urban ghettos and other areas.

Forty million dollars will be used for projects for the elderly, family planning, training, and health provisions.

There will be $3 million for temporary housing for migrants and $25 million for technical assistance to small business and low income areas; $35 million for day care; and $2 million for VISTA demonstration projects related to persons returning from correctional institutions.

All of these are worthy objectives.

It is my further understanding that the $198 million indicated in the titles which I have just read were incorporated in the bill not because of Democratic initiative, but on the basis of bipartisan understanding and appreciation of the problems confronting this Nation at this time.

Therefore, Mr. President, I would hope that the amendment to strike this part of the authorization would be rejected.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Who yields time?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Delaware is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I respect the position of the majority leader, and I want to compliment him in that while he endorses the increase but he also endorses the tax increase to pay for it.

I take my hat off to any man who is willing to raise taxes to cover the cost of the money being spent.

I think that is the question which all of those who vote for the increased spending should begin to ask themselves.

There is merit in the job training programs, but I am not unmindful of the fact that there is a limit as to what we can afford in job training programs. We are today being told that they want to help train the 4 million to 5 million unemployed in this country, yet just a few days ago the Secretary of Labor issued a report pointing out how the booming economy under the administration there were less than 3 million unemployed in the country. This figure included those who were temporarily laid off as well as those poorly trained. Which figure is correct?

Where do they get these statistics? Are more people suddenly getting on poverty rolls, and is the administration planning on bankrupting another couple of million in the next 2 years by inflation which will result from their increased spending policies?

What concerns me is that the more we spend on these programs the larger the estimated number of unemployed gets.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Do Senators yield back their remaining time?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, how much time is left on the other side?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Pennsylvania has used up all his time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time. Let us vote.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. All time on the amendment has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were free to vote, I would vote "yea." Therefore, I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. LAUSCHE (after having voted in the affirmative). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. MANSFIELD (after having voted in the negative). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. MONTOYA (after having voted in the negative). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] and the Senators from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL and Mr. TALMADGE] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] is paired with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG].

If present and voting, the Senator from Georgia would vote "yea," and the Senator from Ohio would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] is absent on official business.

The pair of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE] has been previously announced.

On this vote, the Senator from Ne-

braska [Mr. HRUSKA] is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON].

If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea," and the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 36, nays 50, as follows:

[No. 280 Leg.]

YEAS—36

Allott	Ervin	Mundt
Baker	Fannin	Murphy
Bennett	Hansen	Proxmire
Bible	Hickenlooper	Smathers
Boggs	Holland	Smith
Byrd, Va.	Hollings	Sparkman
Byrd, W. Va.	Jordan, N.C.	Spong
Cannon	Jordan, Idaho	Stennis
Cotton	Long, La.	Thurmond
Curtis	McClellan	Tower
Eastland	Miller	Williams, Del.
Ellender	Monroney	Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—50

Aiken	Harris	Metcalf
Anderson	Hart	Mondale
Bartlett	Hartke	Morse
Bayh	Hatfield	Muskie
Brewster	Hayden	Nelson
Burdick	Inouye	Pearson
Case	Jackson	Pell
Church	Javits	Percy
Clark	Kennedy, Mass.	Prouty
Cooper	Kennedy, N.Y.	Randolph
Dodd	Kuchel	Ribicoff
Dominick	Long, Mo.	Scott
Fong	Magnuson	Symington
Fulbright	McCarthy	Tydings
Gore	McGee	Williams, N.J.
Griffin	McGovern	Yarborough
Gruening	McIntyre	

NOT VOTING—14

Brooke	Lausche	Pastore
Carlson	Mansfield	Russell
Dirksen	Montoya	Talmadge
Hill	Morton	Young, Ohio
Hruska	Moss	

So the amendment of Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware was rejected.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, in this 2-week debate on the 1967 antipoverty bill we have explored a great many of the programs and projects which we devoutly hope will make major contributions, next year and in the years that follow, toward the eradication of penury and deprivation in this most affluent of all nations.

One of the programs that other Senators and I feel has been most successful, a program that we feel will have an enduring effect, is the OEO legal services program. To a large extent its success has been due to the active and abiding interest taken in its operations by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. Senator KENNEDY's interest and support have helped make the OEO's legal aid program one of the most glowing accomplishments of the war on poverty.

On September 29 Senator KENNEDY made a memorable address on the subject of legal services for the poor to the OEO's Legal Services Northeast Regional Conference in New York City. It is an address that merits careful study by all Members of Congress and, indeed, by all Americans interested in seeing to it that American law does not discriminate, that it serves the rich and poor alike, people from all walks of life, without regard to race, color, creed, national origin, or economic status.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this excellent address by the Senator from Massachusetts appear in the RECORD at this point.

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

I was extremely pleased and honored when Bill Greenawalt suggested that I join you here today. I am a member of both the Senate Judiciary Committee, which has jurisdiction over many of the Federal Government's legal activities, and the Labor and Welfare Committee, which watches over the entire Poverty Program, including legal services. In this dual role I have taken a special interest in the OEO Legal Services Program and have sought to be your spokesman and your advocate in the Senate.

I do so because I firmly believe that Legal Services has been one of the most promising, and effective and exciting dimensions of the War on Poverty. Its product is seen not only in the specific result of its clients cases but perhaps more strikingly in its broader effects:

A new sense of participation in the social system by those who have been alienated from it;

A confidence in the ability of the law to be a force for good, in those who have only experienced it as an adversary;

The development of a sensitivity in official agencies to the impact of their actions and procedures on the poor;

A growing demonstration to the public that the legal profession has a heart and a conscience;

The increased attraction of law, as a lifework, for many of our most talented young people;

A stimulation of new social awareness and participation among the nation's law schools;

And, finally, and perhaps in the long run, most important, the establishment of contact and communication and understanding between the world of poverty and deprivation and injustice, and the separate, settled world of the bar leader, who with this new experience can be a strong force for social change and human progress.

Yet I hardly need convince this audience of the merits of the legal services concept or of its accomplishments. If the programs in your cities and states are running well, each of you, in one role or another, observes these phenomena first hand and daily.

Apart from my own interest in your work, I am especially pleased to be here today to help celebrate the second anniversary of the formal organization of the Legal Services unit in OEO. The progress since that day in 1965, when Clint Bamberger was sworn in, has been incredible. There are now nearly 300 programs funded, with 800 offices and 1,800 attorneys, at an annual cost of over $40 million.

In fact, of course, the Federal Government's involvement in the law and poverty field goes back beyond 1965. It was in the Fall of 1963 that the first Federal funds went to a neighborhood legal office right here in New York, as part of the prototype of the Poverty Program which was developed under the 1961 Juvenile Delinquency Act. But we can go back still further. For the spirit which guided the Federal planners in 1963 and 1965 traces back to the vital work in the field of criminal justice for the poor which preceded, and laid the necessary predicate for, Federal entry into the civil legal field. Less than three months after President Kennedy's inauguration, the Justice Department was immersed in the problems of the poor defendant. The Attorney General appointed a Committee on Poverty and the Administration of Federal Criminal Justice, now known as the Allen Committee. The now famous Allen Report cited Judge Learned Hand's remarks that "If we are to keep our democracy, there must be one commandment: Thou shalt not ration justice." The Report added, "One of the prime objectives of the civilized administration of justice is to render the poverty of the litigant an irrelevancy."

That is the course the Federal Government has pursued for the past six years. The Allen Report, the establishment of the Office of Criminal Justice in the Justice Department, the passage of the Criminal Justice Act, the funding of the early Legal Services Programs, the establishment of the OEO, and the formation of the OEO Legal Services Program, all form a continuum of which we here are part.

One would think that a program with this history and these roots would be well-embedded and well-accepted by now, especially when it has received the support and assistance of the organized bar at every step of the way.

Yet incredibly enough, in the past several days we have witnessed the irony of the very success of the Program leading to a re-questioning of its basic principles and purposes. One Congressman stood on the floor of the House and gave what he intended to be a scathing attack on one OEO funded Legal Services Program, but which seemed to me to contain the highest kind of praise. He said that the lawyers for the poor had brought the entire Department of Labor into "groveling submission," that the Department had "paid tribute to a rump organization which suckles the Federal Poverty Program for its existence." He called the settlement agreed to by the Labor Department a "surrender document" and pointed out in horror that it would enable the poverty lawyers to insure continuing review of the disputed issue and full access to the information necessary to bring future cases.

* * * * *

Now the lesson I would take from his words is that here was a program that had identified an injustice, made it visible through the initiation of litigation, and had achieved not only the possibility of relief in the particular plaintiffs' cases, but also a means of future relief in future cases. This would certainly seem to be legal services at its finest.

Yet the Congressman saw a different message. He could not understand how one entity funded by the Federal Government could do battle with another Federal entity. He saw an infringement by the Poverty lawyers into the Labor Department's territory. He saw the filing of a suit as blackmail and coercion. He implied a lack of legitimate standing and interest in the Legal Services Agency, because it existed only by the grace of OEO.

At this point in time, I don't think anyone could take seriously the resultant proposal by this Congressman and others that the Legal Services Programs be prohibited from filing cases against government agencies. Your task is to assist your clients in resisting and rooting out injustice wherever it is found. If it is found in the laws or regulations or practices which govern the government, then they must be attacked. If you refuse to do this, then you can hardly convince your communities that you are a force for justice, nor, most likely, can you be much help to them.

If fact, to some extent the heat of the opposition to your work may be a good barometer of your success. If you are not perturbing someone in some government each week, then the chances are that you are not doing an effective job. For your job is to change the status quo, when the status quo ignores the needs, and problems and legitimate aspirations of the poor. As lawyers, you have no more right to be reticent about taking on a government agency than the Justice De-

partment's lawyers have when they take on the FCC or the Comptroller of Currency, or than the defense lawyer paid with Federal Criminal Justice Act funds has when he takes on the U.S. Attorney.

We had another relevant example presented to us during the riot hearings in the Judiciary Committee. A policeman from Newark complained that lawyers from the Legal Services Program were advising demonstrators as to their legal rights and obligations during picketing of city officials. One Senator recoiled in horror at the thought of Federally-paid attorneys performing such a function. Yet now can anyone doubt the desirability of having dissatisfied citizens know what the legal limits on their activities are, and at the same time having the police in the heat of conflict know that they are on their best behavior. The effect can only be moderation and caution on both sides. The alternative may be, as we have seen repeatedly this summer, one of those small incidents which can spark an orgy of lawlessness, or at least an abuse of privilege on one side or of power on the other, leading to increased tension and frustration.

Again I would hope that there is no doubt on these questions in this audience. But I think it is healthy to review them in our minds regularly to make sure that we have not slipped unconsciously into a posture we would not conciously assume. The fact is that the first "acceptance" stage of your programs is past. You have the support of the Bar, of the Congress, of the public, and of the Executive Branch. And more and more you have the support, as well, of local leaders. They realize that the kind of change you bring about, and the way you bring it about, are good for the entire community. So you need not be shy, or timid or fearful. I do not think anyone, not even Congress, could turn the clock backwards on Legal Services now.

The question really is where we are heading as the clock goes forward. We have discovered, or aroused, a demand for legal services. How is it to be met? How should the supply be rationed where demand cannot be met? Here again you have an obligation to proceed boldly. For in your discussions here, in the law reviews, in the symposia, in the proceedings of the 1965 Conference on Law and Poverty, you will find a whole spectrum of proposals, suggestions, ideas, and issues which should be explored and developed. You have before you large immediate questions, such as the division of lawyer time between routine cases and test cases, the possible use of supplementary lay personnel, and the standards of indigency. And you have large, long-term issues, like the proposed development of new forms of group legal services legal insurance, the role of mediation and arbitration, and the formulation of new mechanisms and new directions to combat the roots of poverty by providing adequate housing, employment education, and health care. And you have smaller questions like library access, salaries, relationships, to CAP's and so on.

As an interested outsider let me express the hope that your discussion of all these subjects can be open and frank, with no holds barred and no taboos. All of us must constantly reexamine the foundations on which our traditional ethical, procedural, and philosophical approaches to the law stand. For times and conditions and needs change. And perhaps some of the constraints we lawyers put on our own activities need updating, too.

And let me express the hope as well that your discussions here can lead to action, that you can go back home with the determination and courage to experiment with new ideas and new assumptions. For example, I am sure someone here will suggest that you be more selective in accepting cases, that you avoid overloading your lawyers with so many service cases that they turn into impersonal automations giving routinized attention to a continuous stream of clients. You will be told that your client population will understand, if you explain that turning some away gives you more time to concentrate on, and win, cases which will benefit many people at one time, cases which might change the whole fabric of community life by changing the basic nature of relationships with landlords, loansharks, retail stores, or welfare agencies. You may be told that the community *can* be kept involved if you appoint a citizen advisory committee to help select the general kinds of cases which should receive emphasis. It will then be easy for you just to say "that's nice," and quietly go home. But you can do yourselves and all the other programs a favor if you try some of the suggestions out, analyze them, and report your results. For no professor sitting in his office, and no administrator sitting in Washington can do what you can do or learn what you can learn. You are where the action is.

You are also in a unique position to play another vital role. Because your clients are at the receiving end of so many governmental practices and procedures, you can see, in a way which government administrators can never see, exactly how their agencies are operating *vis a vis* the ordinary citizen. Your descriptions, your assessments, and your suggestions, whether communicated directly to the agencies involved, or through legislative representatives, can have a direct result. Most government officials want their staffs to do a good job and a fair job, but they may not know of long-accepted, inbred abuses and barriers unless you make these visible.

This is really a two-sided job. You can provide the information about the many government programs you come in contact with. And there are many other direct and indirect government programs which impinge on every facet of our daily lives. In each of these there can be an important difference if the factors of poverty, inexperience, or lack of education are not taken into account. The Department of Justice discovered, for example, that the rules governing settlement of damage cases against the government were such that they caused people to file suits and incur legal expenses for small claims when quick administrative settlements would have been feasible and proper. The result was a change in rules which will benefit many hundreds of citizens every year. And similar instances can arise in all sorts of activities large and small.

In fact we in the Federal Government should be doing more than we are, both legislatively and administratively to see how each of our activities affects the poor or disadvantaged. Are we making people incur bus costs and miss work in order to fill out forms in person which could be filed by mail? Are our welfare standards causing families to break up? Are our farm programs, home mortgage programs, park programs complementing or contradicting our anti-poverty programs? Do we make dealing with the government so complex that poor people either stay away or feel impelled to secure unnecessary attorney services.

As I have said, you can help us to identify many of these issues, and I am hopeful you will; but we also have to do a better job within the government to get our own house in order. Certainly changes in housing and welfare regulations, for example, could moot many of your cases. And in these cases an administrative policy win, may be worth several judicial wins.

I know you have a good deal of talking to do yourselves, so I will vacate the rostrum now. Again my thinks to you all for having me here today. I congratulate each of you for taking part in this important task of assuring citizens of every status a chance to see that the full majesty of the law is meant to serve not just some of the people, but all of the people.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Are we under controlled time?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. All time is under control.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

JUDICIAL CONFERENCE SUPPORTS WIRETAPPING

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on September 26, the Judicial Conference of the United States endorsed legislation to permit Federal and State law enforcement officers to wiretap and eavesdrop electronically, under court observation and supervision. Since then, a number of newspaper articles and editorials have been published regarding this endorsement.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point an article entitled "Judges Back Bill To Ease Wiretaps," written by Fred P. Graham and published in the New York Times of Wednesday, September 27, 1967; an editorial entitled "Judges Back Wiretaps," published in the Washington Daily News of September 28, 1967; and an editorial entitled "Wiretap Support," published in the Washington Evening Star of Saturday, September 30, 1967.

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

[From the New York Times, Sept. 27, 1967]

JUDGES BACK BILL TO EASE WIRETAPS—PERMISSIVE RULES ENDORSED BY FEDERAL CONFERENCE

(By Fred P. Graham)

WASHINGTON, September 26.—The Judicial Conference of the United States threw its weight yesterday behind an effort in Congress to legalize court-approved wiretapping and electronic eavesdropping by state and Federal policemen.

In a letter to Sentaor James O. Eastland, Democrat of Misssissippi, chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, the Judicial Conference endorsed a permissive wiretap bill that has the support of many Republicans and conservative Southerners and is opposed by the Johnson Administration.

The bill, introduced by Senator John L. McClellan, Arkansas Democrat, would permit law enforcement officials, in investigating certain serious crimes, to tap telephone wires and plant hidden microphones in private premises under court orders.

Under the bill, judges could approve eavesdropping in a broad spectrum of crimes, ranging from graft and bribery to murder and espionage. Information picked up by the listening devices would be admissible in court under the bill.

LONG BILL BACKED

The Johnson Administration has supported a proposal introduced by Senator Edward V.

Long, a Missouri Democrat, that would outlaw all wiretapping and electronic eavesdropping by state and Federal police, except in internal security investigations.

The Judicial Conference, which consists of ranking Federal judges from across the nation and is headed by Chief Justice Earl Warren, told Mr. Eastland that it approved the purposes of the McClellan bill, "providing that it be amended to comply with the standards set forth in the opinion of the Supreme Court in Berger v. New York."

In that 5-to-4 decision, which was handed down June 12, the Court struck down New York's permissive police bugging law on the ground that it did not meet the search and seizure standards of the Fourth Amendment.

Legal scholars have since debated whether any effective statute could be drafted to satisfy the standards that were mentioned in general terms in the Berger opinion. The opinion by Justice Tom C. Clark implied that any valid law would have to include such safeguards as limited time periods of surveillance and notice to the subjects of the eavesdropping.

Although these requirements might be met through such devices as periodic disclosure of the names of those who had been bugged, the dissenting Justices warned that the rigid standards might prove to be impossible to meet.

However, proponents of legalized police bugging have insisted that the Berger case was intended by the Court to be an invitation for Congress to pass a detailed law, and Republicans have charged that organized crime cannot be brought under control without it.

EXISTING LAW CITED

Under existing law, wiretapping is a Federal felony and wiretap information is not admissible as evidence in United States courts. Electronic eavesdropping with hidden microphones is not outlawed by present Federal statutes, but United States officials have been forbidden by Attorney General Ramsey Clark to use it.

The Judicial Conference also urged Congress to pass "as quickly as possible" a bill designed to provide a cross-section of the population on Federal District Court jury panels. The bill, which was drafted by a special committee of judges headed by Judge Irving I. Kauffman of the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, would require that prospective jurors' names be picked by lot from voter lists.

[From the Washington Daily News, Sept. 28, 1967]

THE JUDGES BACK WIRETAPS

Federal judges from all over the country have indorsed the proposal to legalize circumspect wiretapping and bugging in criminal cases.

The indorsement was approved at a meeting of the National Judicial Conference, composed of the chief judges of the circuit courts, district judges from each circuit and the presiding judges of special courts. Chief Justice Warren is chairman of the conference.

The bill before Congress would permit law enforcement officers to use wiretaps and bugs in investigating serious crimes—such as espionage, murder, kidnaping—and especially organized rackets and crimes involving national security.

Before using these devices, a law officer would be required to obtain permission from a court, and the judges recommended that these petitions should be specific about the crimes and the evidence which might be acquired. This evidence would be admissible at trials.

Also the bill would outlaw wiretaps and bugging by other than law officers.

As it is, evidence obtained from wiretaps is not admissible in Federal courts, and the Supreme Court last spring nullified a New York state law which authorized wiretapping under rigid conditions. But private wiretappers virtually are free to ply their sneak trade.

A wiretap law would provide an important—and sometimes the only—means of gathering convincing evidence in many instances. It ought to be used.

The Johnson Administration, while calling for an all-out drive against crime, for some inscrutable reason balks at using wiretaps, even under the most restricted conditions.

The judges, it seem to us are much more practical.

[From the Evening Star, Sept. 30, 1967]

WIRETAP SUPPORT

The drive during this session of Congress to pass legislation permitting the use of wiretaps and electronic bugs has received a helping hand from an unexpected source. At least, support from this source—the Judicial Conference of the United States—was unexpected as far as we are concerned.

What the conference did was to go on record as approving the "purposes" of Senator McClellan's wiretap bill, provided it is amended to conform to the requirements announced by the Supreme Court last June in its decision in the Berger case. That decision struck down a conviction obtained under a New York law which permitted the use of wiretaps and bugs in certain types of cases and under judicial supervision. As far as the constitutionality of that law was concerned, the court divided 5 to 4, with Justice Tom Clark, now retired, writing the majority opinion.

It would be unwise to read too much into the action by the judicial conference, which consists of Chief Justice Warren, the chief judges of the 11 federal appellate courts and perhaps a dozen federal district court judges. It does not mean that any law which may finally emerge from Congress is assured of judicial approval. But at the very least, it would seem to mean that the judicial conference recognizes the need for appropriate legislation in this area. And this is in refreshing contrast to the attitude of Attorney General Ramsey Clark and President Lyndon Johnson, who are backing a bill which would outlaw all wiretaps and bugging except in what they choose to consider national security cases.

Almost everyone having anything to do with law enforcement, except the President and his attorney general, recognizes the need for wiretaps and bugging. Let's mention just two. Justice Black wrote a scathing dissent in the Berger case. Pointing out that Berger was a briber and a corrupter of public officials, Justice Black said: It cannot be denied "that to deal with such specimens of our society, eavesdroppers are not merely useful, they are frequently a necessity." In recent days, Representative Poff of Virginia, chairman of the House Republican Task Force on Crime, has released a statement by the Association of Federal Investigators, representing 1,000 federal career employes active in law enforcement. The association says electronic surveillance devices "are necessary, useful and effective investigative weapons, particularly where organized crime cases are concerned."

Yet Ramsey Clark and Lyndon Johnson, heads deeply buried in the theoretical sand, insist that these devices, though necessary in national security cases, are of no value in dealing with other types of crime. Which prompts us to ask once again: Why?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, this announced support of wiretap and eavesdrop legislation by the Federal judiciary should weigh heavily with Members of Congress. Such endorsement, it seems to me, should dispel any fears that court authorized and supervised wiretapping and eavesdropping might be abused, since it is the judges themselves who would have such operations under their jurisdiction, constant surveillance, and control.

I call to the attention of the Senate a resolution adopted by the National Association of Attorneys General, supporting court-supervised electronic surveillance, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

RESOLUTION XIV, FEDERAL LEGISLATION AUTHORIZING LIMITED ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE

(Resolution adopted by 61st annual meeting, National Association of Attorneys General, August 30, 1967, Portland, Oreg.)

Whereas we believe that modern law enforcement, in order to be both effective and law abiding, must not be denied the right to use advanced, scientific methods of crime detection, including electronic surveillance; and

Whereas at the same time we recognize the strong public interest in guarding the right to privacy of law-abiding individuals and against the dangers of abuse of electronic devices and hence the need for devising safeguards, controls, and restrictions applicable to their use;

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the 61st Annual Meeting of the National Association of Attorneys General in Portland, Oregon that we favor in principle federal legislation now pending before the Congress, permitting the use of electronic surveillance devices limited to federal and, where authorized by state law, state enforcement agencies, under strict supervision by the courts, along principles applicable to the issuance of search warrants and confined to specifically enumerated classes of cases involving serious crimes and organized criminal activities, as each state may deem appropriate.

(The States of Kentucky, New Jersey and New Mexico were recorded as voting "no.")

Mr. McCLELLAN. I also call to the attention of my fellow Senators a letter to the editor of the Washington Star, published in that newspaper on October 3, 1967, signed by the 23 members of the July Federal Grand Jury No. 1 of Washington, D.C., entitled "A Jury Looks at Crime," in which that Federal grand jury emphasizes that the pendulum has swung too far in one direction, and that the scales need to be balanced.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

A JURY LOOKS AT CRIME

SIR: Can it be that 23 people sitting on a grand jury cannot come to some reasonable accurate conclusions regarding crimes and their handling in our city? We are not lawyers, prosecutors or judges, and we grant our ignorance in many of the subtleties of law, but we are people from many walks in life with many experiences to help us in arriving at some sound conclusions. We should be able to at least observe the obvious.

It may be that some people have forgotten, but we would like to again remind them, that there are people who commit crimes. At some time in the past they were referred to as criminals and society was protected from them. Perhaps too harshly in many cases.

But we feel that the pendulum has swung too far. After two months of duty we find ourselves amazed and shocked at the exag-

gerated considerations given to those who roam our streets indulging themselves in acts of the most outrageous nature. Pity the mother who is silly enough to think that the child molester will not be back in a few days after being caught redhanded. Pity the teller or shopkeeper who thinks he won't see the robber again before the week is over. If the criminal does not return, it will not be because of our police, prosecutors, legislators or judges. It will be because the criminal only chooses to commit his crime elsewhere.

Police and prosecutors have made serious mistakes in the past and will make them in the future, but by and large we have been impressed by the high caliber of these officials. But how can they work with the limitations being imposed upon them?

As an example, the Bail and Bond Act in force at this time allows any prime suspect to be free in hours except where he has committed a capital crime or it appears he will "skip" bail. We have our legislators to thank for that and any number of unsound laws.

If you happen to decide to murder someone in the near future, feel free to confess to one of a hundred people. Unless you are informed of your rights in the most precise terminology, the odds are that the judiciary branch will see to your freedom.

We are aware that there are a fantastic variety of reasons for a criminal act as well as good and bad police, judges, prosecutors, defense attorneys, rights groups and hard-headed conservatives, but we must protest the injustices being laid upon the law-abiding majority of our society. When can we look forward to a balancing of the scales?

23 Members, July Federal Grand Jury No. 1.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 1411) to amend title 39, United States Code, with respect to use of the mails to obtain money or property under false representations, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 1411) to amend title 39, United States Code, with respect to use of the mails to obtain money or property under false representations, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2388) to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). The bill is open to further amendment.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 2, strike out lines 18 and 19, and insert in lieu thereof "There is authorized to be appropriated $2,360,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. The Senator from Colorado is recognized.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes, and I ask for the attention of the Senator from Pennsylvania, the manager of the bill.

This is an amendment designed to cure what I think is a fundamental defect in procedure, by placing a specific amount on an authorization. At the present time, the authorization with reference to the 1969 fiscal year simply says "Such sums as may be appropriated," which means that the Appropriations Committee does not have the faintest idea as to what the authorization should be; and which also means that Congress has not gone ahead, in a legislative manner, and stated what it believes its authorization figure should be.

Ever since I have been a Member of the Senate, I have had a feeling, which I think has been shared by the majority of Senators, that we should state an authorization figure in every piece of legislation we pass. The particular figure I have chosen is $102 million more than the total authorization for fiscal 1968, thereby gives us some room for the inflationary process which seems to be so prevalent today.

I see no objection to it, frankly. It can still be apportioned in whatever way Congress or the Appropriations Committee wants to. I would hope that the Senator from Pennsylvania would accept the amendment.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum without the time being charged to either side, so that I may confer with the Senator from Colorado.

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

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I modify the figure in my amendment to $2.4 billion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is accordingly modified.

Mr. DOMINICK. On that basis, it is my understanding that the Senator from Pennsylvania will accept the amendment.

The purpose of the amendment is to keep consistent our rule that we should have a specific authorization in any legislative matter of this kind.

I think it is also important to point out that this makes the bill not a bill for $2,258 million, but for $4,158 million over a 2-year period, which will, I think, emphasize the amount of money that it is being poured into this program.

I think this is important for the country at large to realize.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I am receptive to the suggestion of the Senator from Colorado. However, I would like to address a question to him as a matter of legislative history.

I ask the Senator from Colorado, who is a valued member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, whether it is not correct that if the administration should decide it wants a higher sum next year than $2,400 million, or if the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare should want to hold hearings to determine whether the authorization should be increased next year, that would be entirely feasible.

Mr. DOMINICK. It certainly would. I think the figure is entirely open for Congress to take whatever action they need to take next year. If we are in very bad fiscal shape then, we may want to cut the figure back.

The purpose is to lay some ground work for the carrying on of a program which has no set figure for the fiscal year 1969.

Mr. CLARK. The reason why the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare left the amount open was that it felt there was so much uncertainty with respect to the future of the poverty program and the possibility of further riots this winter or next summer.

There are too many variables to attempt to fix a realistic figure at this time and have it accepted by the Senate. That was a possibility we were not prepared to face up to. Nevertheless, the Senator from Colorado has made a strong case.

I wonder what the views of my friend, the Senator from Vermont, are on this matter. He being the ranking minority member on the committee, I would be inclined to accept the amendment if it were agreeable to the Senator from Vermont.

I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I am very happy to support the amendment introduced by my friend, the distinguished Senator from Colorado.

It is as both the Senators from Pennsylvania and Colorado pointed out, sound legislative procedure for the Senate to place a specific amount on authorizations. It will be a guideline to the Appropriation Subcommittee. The amount agreed upon should be adequate. However, I would like to point out that under the amendment which I offered last Friday, and which was accepted, the Comptroller General will in 1969 report to Congress regarding the poverty program. From this report, and in the future we should be able to better assess the needs of the program, and be better able to make changes at that time.

I have no objection to the amendment and will support it.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, under the circumstances, I am prepared to accept the amendment, to fix the authorization for fiscal 1969 at $2.4 billion.

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

I wish to make it crystal clear that I am not saying that we should go forward with the poverty program in fiscal 1969 at a rate of $2.4 billion. It is my opinion that we can do more for the poor in other ways than we can under the poverty program as it is now organized. But

whether I believe this or not, it is important to follow through on our legislative procedures, one of which is to require a specific sum in an authorization bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Do Senators yield back the remainder of their time?

Mr. CLARK. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Colorado.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment proposed by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] and myself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 98 line 21, strike out "SEC. 636" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 636(a)".

On page 99, between lines 2 and 3, insert the following:

(b) No financial assistance shall be extended under this act for the purposes of voter registration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator yield himself?

Mr. MURPHY. I yield myself 8 minutes.

Mr. President, I am becoming increasingly alarmed over the use of funds appropriated by the Office of Economic Opportunity for the purpose of increasing voter registration.

On September 3, I watched 83 percent of the registered voters, or some 56 percent of the eligible voters, in South Vietnam walk into the voting booths to cast a ballot for democratic government. Some of them arrived wrapped in bandages, on crutches, or assisted by their fellow citizens who had not been injured by the Vietcong terrorist activities aimed at preventing them from voting and demonstrating their belief that a better way of life could be had than that which exists under a Communist yoke of oppression.

They voted because they cared. Yet, here in America, without the echo of explosions and the fear of death, 83 percent of the people have never voted in a presidential election. To my mind, this is a travesty. Election day in Vietnam was the greatest example I have ever witnessed of people demonstrating their determination to live under a democratic form of government, while here in America we have to coax and beg people to exercise their right to vote.

One reason ascribed to the lack of participation is economic and social impoverishment. Yet, the people who voted in Vietnam, I would venture to say, were far more impoverished than the people living in our great land. The Office of Economic Opportunity, nevertheless, has decided that part of its task should be to "get out the vote." Included within its community action program in some parts of the country has been a drive to register voters.

While a nonpartisan voter participation drive in no way violates the Hatch Act or OEO regulations, I sincerely question the propriety of using taxpayers' dollars for this purpose. I am quite certain that it was never the intent of Congress that funds set aside to help the poor should be used for the purpose of voter registration. Surely, there are programs more necessary—more improvements of immediate importance—for which we can spend tax dollars in order to make the disadvantaged individual a real participant in his community and his nation. This is the intent of the community action program, and I do not believe that a voter registration drive, no matter how carefully it is supervised in order to make certain that it is nonpartisan, is a priority item.

In Reading, in Berks County, Pa., the League of Women Voters last month aided the Economic Opportunity Council by lending technical assistance and training community service aides under the summer opportunity program to register voters. My colleague, the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], aptly pointed out that while the local EOC was lending its staff and money to accomplish this drive, the OEO was compelled to deny a program application designed to aid retarded children in McKean County because of lack of funds. This I consider an excellent example of very bad judgment in the allocation of poverty funds.

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

Mr. MURPHY. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT. I should like to point out that I learned of the activity of OEO in the city of Reading, in Berks County, Pa., and found, to my astonishment, that a function which normally should be performed by such civic organizations as the American Heritage Foundation, the League of Women Voters, and so on, would be undertaken by OEO with taxpayers' money—namely, the registration of voters.

I am in favor of the registration of voters. I will support every movement for the registration of voters. But I do not favor the covert, rather slick, and, in my mind, definitely underhanded way in which voters were carefully selected and registered from areas where only one political party was dominant, where the county chairmen of both political parties were solicited to support this program and did so in good faith, without any idea that it would not be a broad, general registration program, but would, in fact, undertake registration of the most partisan aspect.

I received a letter from Sargent Shriver; and, as usual, he jumped high in the air at the moment anyone criticizes the OEO, whether one is right or wrong. In my opinion, I happen to be right. He said in his letter to me, if I can recall the phraseology—I will paraphrase it as closely as I can—that he is doing what the law permits. He gives the impression that he is doing what the law encourages.

I am not aware that any part of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 says that you may go out and register voters of a single political party in selected areas, anywhere in the United States, with taxpayers' money. If the act permits such activity, or if those charged with its administration believe that it does, I am for stopping it, and I hope we will; and I support the amendment offered by the Senator from California and the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. MURPHY. I thank the Senator. That is exactly the purpose of the amendment, stated much better than I would be capable of stating it.

In early June of this year, it was brought to my attention that the Santa Clara County, Calif., Economic Opportunity Commission intended to establish a voter registration drive. At that time I sent a letter to Mr. Shriver, and on June 26 I received his reply. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that these two letters be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

The letters are as follows:

JUNE 8, 1967.

Mr. SARGENT SHRIVER,
Director, Office of Economic Opportunity, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SARGE: It has recently been called to my attention that the Economic Opportunity Commission in Santa Clara County, California, intends to establish a voter registration program.

The task of voter registration has been undertaken by both political parties, the California Non-Partisan Registration Committee, the Chamber of Commerce, the League of Women Voters, and many other groups in the past. To my mind there is little need for the local arm of the Office of Economic Opportunity to embark on such a program utilizing Federal funds. I would prefer to believe that local community action activities are directed towards advancement in the area of education and job-skill development. Granted that the cohesiveness of a community may be important in waging a battle against poverty within that community, and that attention can certainly be paid to this end by the E.O.C., I, nevertheless, do not envision a voter registration program in this spirit. It seems to me that such a program, while it might not result in direct political action certainly offers the opportunity for such activity.

Consequently, I hope you will be kind enough to inform me of the structural operation of this program as it is being designed by the Santa Clara County E.O.C. and to advise me of the names of any other Community Action Programs throughout the country which are presently, or are intending to embark on similar activities.

Thanking you in advance, I am,

Sincerely,

GEORGE MURPHY.

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY,
Washington, D.C. June 26, 1967.

Hon. GEORGE MURPHY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MURPHY: Thank you for your letter inquiring about the voter registration program in Santa Clara.

The Santa Clara Economic Opportunity Commission (SCEOC), with which the program has been linked both in the press and in the minds of many people, is neither financing nor itself conducting a registration drive. The confusion over SCEOC's role arose on May 18 when Dr. Stanley Skillicorn, in his final report as outgoing president of SCEOC, suggested that there should be a county-wide voter registration program for the poor.

Plans were then made to establish a joint

committee of SCEOC and the county-wide Santa Clara League of Women Voters organizations to pursue the idea. This committee has not yet been set up. However, the Central Santa Clara League of Women Voters, one of the four local chapters of the League, has now decided to conduct a voter registration drive on its own, and SCEOC has offered to help locate volunteers for that drive, which has not yet begun. We understand that certain SCEOC neighborhood workers in the Morgan Hill area, who are already licensed by the county as deputy voting registrars, may have done some individual voter registration. This appears to be the entire extent of SCEOC's current involvement in registration activities.

Non-partisan voter registration projects are undertaken as part of local community action programs—which, as you know, vary with every community action agency—such as multi-purpose neighborhood centers, community development programs, community organization programs, and the like. To obtain a complete list of community action agencies involved in such activities would, therefore, require a canvass of each of the approximately 1100 communtiy action agencies in the country.

All CAP activities, however, must be carried out under stipulations of community action guidelines. I enclose Community Action Memo 50-A and draw your attention particularly to part D, pages 5 and 6, which emphasizes the strictly non-partisan nature we require of all such activities. If a community action agency should violate these guidelines, we would, of course, not allow the expenditure of OEO funds and would take whatever other measures are appropriate for the individual case.

I sincerely hope that this explains to you satisfactorily our policy regarding voter registration.

Thank you for your continued interest in our programs.

Sincerely,

SARGENT SHRIVER,
Director.

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

Mr. MURPHY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I do not have copies of those letters. Will the Senator give me copies?

Mr. MURPHY. I will.

While Mr. Shriver is correct in saying that nonpartisan voter registration projects do not violate the stipulations of community action program guidelines, particularly those of Community Action Memo 50-A, I cannot believe that such a program is a priority program. I am certain that there are many programs to help the poor that need more immediate attention than does this. Furthermore, this type of program might easily result in political activity which would be violative of the Hatch Act.

In order to demonstrate what might be the end result of activity which begins as a nonpartisan voter registration drive, I should like to call the attention of Senators to the report by the Comptroller General of the United States—dated May 1967—entitled, "Report on Investigation of Alleged Political and Union Activities by Certain Grantees Under Grants by the Office of Economic Opportunity." After reviewing recent activities in Palm Beach County, Fla., the GAO concluded that two community action fund—funded by the OEO—employees were appointed as deputy voting registrars; that while the registration in Palm Beach County is predominantly Democratic and that the ratio of Negro voters in the county is up to 14 to 1 Democratic, the persons registered by the two CAF employees registered Democratic at a ratio of more than 100 to 1; and that CAF employees "were extensively engaged in transporting farmworkers to voter registration places over a period of several months and in transporting voters to the polls on November 8, 1966, and that grant funds were used for these purposes." I have also heard rumors of similar activity taking place in several areas in the great State of Texas.

Senators may remember the statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 27 by Congressman GARDNER regarding the work of Operation Breakthrough in Durham, N.C., while local OEO activities may often stay within the confines of the law and OEO regulations, Operation Breakthrough, which did exactly that—it broke through the regulations—had its workers drive voters to the polls and hand them sample ballots already marked, something I never saw while I was in Vietnam.

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

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I yield myself an additional 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, maybe they should have gone to Durham, N.C., to observe elections there.

What is the effectiveness of a voter registration drive? Is it worth the money? The Springfield, Mass., News, on July 22, 1967, reported that six VISTA volunteers, working over a 4-week period, attempted to register some 800 citizens. Only 106 of these completed the registration procedure. At this point, I must wonder whether these six volunteers could not have accomplished something far more constructive over a 4-week period than register 4.3 voters each a week.

Mr. President, it is deeply disturbing to me that the Office of Economic Opportunity has decided to allow its local community action programs to divert their efforts and funds from educational and job developmental services, which are so badly needed. Also, I would like to point out that taxpayer-financed registration programs could very easily lend themselves to perversions so as to fulfill the political ambitions of the leaders of the local arm of the war on poverty. This would result in an ultimate disservice to the people the program was designed to serve. Consequently, I would hope that my colleagues see fit to amend section 636 of S. 2388 by adding a new subsection stating:

No financial assistance shall be extended under this Act for the purposes of voter registration.

Local poverty warriors should not become involved in voter registration, while they are working on the poverty program. This most commendable activity should be conducted on their own time without Federal funding. This is not a poverty program by any figment of the imagination. Furthermore, registration drives which have begun as nonpartisan can easily develop into a partisan operation. The OEO should never be permitted to operate as such. In that it has been unable to control itself, Mr. President, I believe that prohibitive legislation is now necessary.

Mr. President, from the very beginning, I have fought as hard as I could to keep politics out of the poverty program. I hope that Senators will vote in favor of this amendment designed to benefit the poor by keeping funds from being expended on a nonpriority program.

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

Mr. MURPHY. I yield.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I can think of nothing more likely to endanger the success of the war on poverty than to have poverty workers, poverty volunteers, and community action agencies become actively involved in partisan politics. The few mistakes of voter canvassing by poverty workers which have been publicized substantiate my feeling that such drives cannot escape being partisan, and as such should be forbidden. Since I am very concerned about making our poverty programs successful, I hope very much that the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee will find it possible to accept the amendment. We must insure that poverty workers attend fully to their work of reducing poverty rather than becoming pawns in the hands of partisan governments at the local level.

I highly commend the distinguished Senator from California for proposing the amendment.

Mr. MURPHY. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. MURPHY. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

Mr. MURPHY. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Delaware.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I shall need only 1 minute.

Mr. MURPHY. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, as a cosponsor, I strongly support the amendment offered by the Senator from California. Certainly it was never intended by Congress that public money be used to finance registration whereby either political party could channel the money into districts where they would have an overwhelming advantage. Whether it is so intended or not that is the result, and, in my opinion, the present law would already have precluded that. However, since the law has not been interpreted differently and we know there has been public money used for registering voters, I think the amendment should be agreed to.

Mr. President, I wish to point out one additional fact. Ofttimes these programs are financed partly by public contributions, which, for instance, may raise

$25,000, and the Government will match that amount with $100,000 or $125,000. We then are faced with the question as to whether or not this matching money would be deductible for tax purposes. If there happens to be an educational group sponsoring the registration drive the private money could be tax deductions. If this practice is not stopped we will have a situation where private contributions could be made and a tax credit received, while at the same time the money would be used for the political registration of voters.

Mr. President, we have just passed an election reform bill, and certainly it would be a backward step if this procedure is not stopped before it gets out of hand. This is a gray area as to whether or not these contributions, which are matching the Government money, would be tax-exempt. I have discussed the matter with the staff; and they are unable to give a categorical answer, but they admit that in some instances it could be tax-exempt.

Mr. MURPHY. I thank the Senator.

(At this point Mr. BIBLE assumed the chair.)

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

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I shall support the amendment of the Senator from California. I shall do so because, in my opinion, we would be entering into a most dangerous field in spending the money of taxpayers to participate in elections.

The object here is to augment registrations at the voting places. Those who are in charge should not be put in the dangerous position of using their office to promote the success of one political party or the other. This is a field that the Government should stay out of. No administrator should be put into this hazardous position of handling money in the field in the election of officers to the Government of the United States. What I have said applies to Democrats and it applies to Republicans. A dangerous precedent would be established.

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

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

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

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished colleague from Ohio.

From the beginning of our experience in Los Angeles there was a political tug of war that held up the poverty program for over 18 months. I am sure that happened in other parts of the country.

I am in complete favor of registering the greatest number of voters. I have worked on this matter for over 25 years of my life. However, I do not think this is a proper application of poverty funds which are designed to help the poor. I know that an argument can be made that it was perhaps a part of instruction in the rights of citizenship. I would agree if it were limited to that. I would not have proposed the amendment if it were limited to that, but the temptation of taking political advantage might be too great. Therefore, I have proposed the amendment. I thank Senators for supporting the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAUSCHE in the chair). The time of the Senator from California has expired.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, this is a matter about which I do not believe the committee feels very strongly, but I do think the case made by the Senator from California has been somewhat exaggerated.

I looked carefully into the situation in Reading, Berks County, Pa., after my colleague became somewhat aroused about the matter. I find that the OEO community action summer program in Reading was funded for $65,000. I reiterate that it was a summer program and, therefore, a temporary program. The local community action agency wanted to spend $3,000 of that amount for a voter registration drive in the city of Reading, where registration was pretty low.

They went first to the chairman of the Democratic county committee and then to the chairman of the Republican county committee, and they both endorsed the registration drive, publicly and in print. Thereupon, they went to the League of Women Voters, a well-known nonpartisan agency for training young people they send to register nonregistered voters. They found 15 youngsters aged 16 to 21, all of them from low-income families, and they got all their training and instruction from the League of Women Voters. As a result of that, they went through with the registration projects. I do not know whether they registered more Republicans than Democrats; but let me say with respect to the argument about using the taxpayers' money, I assume that many Senators are familiar with conditions in local municipalities throughout the State.

In Philadelphia, as my colleague knows, we have had for many years a bipartisan registration commission which conducts an active drive each year for registering. They send traveling registrars all around the city. They advertise in newspapers that they are coming to a particular district for the purpose of registration. When I was mayor—and the practice has been continued since—I always appointed a bipartisan citizens committee to promote registration with cochairmen, one a Republican and one a Democrat.

Thus, I do not see anything particularly wrong with this practice. As I said, I do not feel too strongly about it. Concerning Durham, N.C., that was a nonpartisan election. Candidates on the ballot were not permitted to have any particular affiliation.

Mr. MURPHY and Mr. SCOTT addressed the Chair.

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

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield to my colleague from Pennsylvania, from my time, 2 of my precious minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. SCOTT. I shall be very brief. I do not want to make this a sort of confrontation, but I do want to make my point clear.

Let me say that I would not object if some people encourage registration on their own time and at their own expense. I do not think it is right to register anyone with taxpayers' money, regardless of party, because I think that the money should be used to fight poverty. At the very time I was trying to get money for a children's program way up in McKean County, I did not like to see $3,000 diverted to the city of Reading and invested in an area, for voter registration, where it was well known to the citizens of Reading that it was inhabited only by members of one party, even though other low-income areas of Reading were inhabited by members of both parties.

I thought that the sponsors of this project had shrewdly picked out the closest electoral situation in Pennsylvania at that time, and sought to affect the outcome of that election by selective registration. That was all I was pointing out.

I support the poverty program. I even agree, as my senior colleague knows, with many of his views on the poverty program. But I do not support making any part of this of political advantage to either political party.

I thank my colleague for yielding to me.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. CLARK. I think the RECORD should show that there is no connection between the funding of the summer program of CAP in Reading, and the failure to fund a program up in McKean County. As I said before to my good friend from California, I do not have any strong feelings about that.

If the Senator from California would withdraw his request for the yeas and nays on his amendment, I would be glad to accept his amendment.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I should like to point out to my esteemed colleague that it is true that the example in Durham he and I cited was of a nonpartisan registration drive and election. The fact that disturbed me is that OEO volunteers showed marked ballots to the voters. This was an attempt to actually guide people in their voting and I object to this.

I would be glad to withdraw the request for the yeas and nays, if my colleague——

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

Mr. MURPHY. Let me say to the Senator from Pennsylvania that I must de-

fer and yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CLARK. He is a tough customer. [Laughter.]

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The amendment of the Senator from California is certainly meritorious. I think that the position of the Senate should be made clear that we are strongly against any such use of these funds for that purpose. Therefore, I would insist on a RECORD vote on this proposal. I think we should settle it definitely.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] to ask questions of the author of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I should like to ask the Senator from California a question or two on his amendment.

If a VISTA volunteer or a poverty worker is approached by individuals in the poverty area about how they can obtain their rights, or how they can exercise greater political power in an area, is there anything in the amendment that would prevent such VISTA volunteer or poverty worker from telling them to go out and register to vote?

Mr. MURPHY. Does the Senator mean in casual conversation with regard to that kind of information? For instance, if an individual said to the volunteer, "Do you know where I can go and register to vote?" or "Do you know where I could go and get some information for voting?" or "Where can I get a list of the candidates?"—that sort of activity. There is no objection to that, of course.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I understand.

Mr. MURPHY. The fault would be where paid employees of the OEO are sent out on a definite program to register voters. I think it is dangerous. I do not think we should divide the poor as between Democrats and Republicans regardless of which party happens to be in power. The poor should be treated in a bipartisan way.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. That is what I thought the Senator from California intended. Part of that which I expect the Senator from California would not object to is either a VISTA volunteer or a poverty worker urging people to go out and register and participate actively in the political life of their country; is that not correct?

Mr. MURPHY. Within the limitations of the amendment, of course, it would have to be decided. I have found, in my short experience in the Senate, that we write language and later on the legal staff of the department or bureau concerned tells us what the language actually means.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. That is what I thought, that the Senator from California might be able to work something out that would be acceptable.

Mr. MURPHY. I find myself at a disadvantage with the distinguished Senator from New York. He has had experience as Attorney General of the United States. So it would be presumptuous of me to attempt to enter into a dialog with him in order to establish this meaning. I think the Senator understands what I have in mind, and I am quite certain that the Senator is in agreement with me.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Right. I am not attempting to put words in the Senator's mouth, or to trap him. I have thought about what the intent of the Senator from California is. I thought that if there were activities in which VISTA volunteers or poverty workers might be involved, they should be able to look at this legislation and know whether they could be involved in any registration efforts at all. For example, what if someone came up to them and said, "What can we do to take a more active part in the political life of this country?" Can they answer, "Go ahead and register?" Or, in the course of conversation or work of VISTA volunteers or poverty workers, could they say, "Why don't you go out and register?"

Mr. MURPHY. So far as I am concerned it would be perfectly acceptable. This comes under the heading of personal rights.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. That is right.

Mr. MURPHY. There is no intention to invade those rights. This is merely a restriction on organized activity.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. That is what I thought. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may require to ask the Senator from California a question about his amendment.

As I understand it, all it does is prohibit the use of Federal funds to finance a registration drive by the OEO; is that not correct? It has nothing to do with what was developed in colloquy between the Senator from California and the Senator from New York just now, as to individual activities of employees so long as they are not being paid by the Federal Government, except to the extent that partisan political activity is already forbidden by the bill.

Mr. MURPHY. That is correct.

I have the feeling somehow——

Mr. CLARK. I am not trying to trap the Senator. Let that be written into the RECORD.

Mr. MURPHY. That never occurred to me. How could the Senator imagine such a thought on my part?

There are certain individual rights which the Senator from California would be the first to defend for all citizens. This amendment merely sets out a restriction for the Office of Economic Opportunity whereby it may not use funds that were taxpayers' dollars appropriated in the desire to help to set up voters' drives.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I regret the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] is insisting on the yeas and nays after the sponsor of the amendment, the Senator from California, has been willing to withdraw them.

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

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I happen to be one of the sponsors of the amendment. The reason I insist on a record vote is that I think the Senate should be on record as being unalterably opposed to using Government funds to register voters or to pay workers on election day.

Mr. CLARK. I ask the Senator to speak on his own time, and not on mine. I suggest that he yield himself time on the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I have nothing further to say. The issue is clear. I am willing to get to a vote.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself the balance of my time and such time as I may require on the bill, on which there is an hour.

On behalf of the committee, I am not going to oppose the amendment. I shall advise my colleagues on this side of the aisle to vote for it if they see fit. I imagine most of them will.

To me, this amendment has none of the fierce spirit of righteousness which the Senator from Delaware, but not the Senator from California, has endeavored to give it. I hope, for the legislative record, it might be clear that this is a matter of relative insignificance which arose because 15 young people between the ages of 16 and 21 went out on the streets of Reading, as part of a summer program, for 1 month, to get people registered who were not registered. A number of people, in spite of the fact that the chairman of the county Republican committee had endorsed the project, felt this was a foul Democratic trick to get more Democrats registered for Reading. Nothing is further from the truth.

I could not get excited about the amendment. Nor do I think the practically unanimous vote which I am sure it will receive has any significance.

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

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. MURPHY. I suggest the amendment might have great significance. As the Senator knows, I am not too long in this distinguished body——

Mr. CLARK. The Senator has made a great record in a short time.

Mr. MURPHY. A successful vote, once in a while, for a member of the minority party would do much for his confidence and such a vote would cause me to do more in the service of my State and people. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, if for no other reason than those stated by the Senator from California, for whom I have a deep affection and whose reputation in the Senate is growing day by day, and has now reached practically gigantic stature, I am glad to support the Senator from California on this vote. I hope the Senate will adopt his amendment by a smashing majority.

I am ready for a vote.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I want to point out to the Senator from Pennsylvania that I had

not heard of the use of poverty funds to which he refers as having taken place in Pennsylvania, but I had heard about it in several other States. My attention had been called to this abuse as a result of registration drives in Tennessee, Michigan, and California. Today the Senate has an opportunity emphatically to put a stop to this by adopting the pending amendment. I certainly think it should be passed by a rollcall vote. I welcome the support of the Senator from Pennsylvania in this direction.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I would warn the Senator that if he continues the debate he may change my mind. I suggest that we vote right now.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thought of that possibility just as I thought of the possibility that the Senator might change his mind in conference. That is why I insist on a record vote. If this amendment is rejected—and that is a possibility—let us get our positions on record. That is the reason I want the Senate to go on record as disapproving the spending of any Government funds to finance drives to register voters. I think we should settle the issue once and for all. That is the reason I welcome the support of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I want the RECORD to show that there are more than the 15 people who were involved in the State of Pennsylvania——

Mr. CLARK. Reading—a very important city.

Mr. GRIFFIN. There are numerous places in the State of Michigan where this has been called to my attention. I have served, in both the House and the Senate, on committees that handled poverty legislation since it came into existence. It was always my understanding, and I think that of most Members of Congress, when we passed the legislation, that these funds would not be used for political purposes. These funds have been used for political purposes. Whether we call them nonpartisan or anything else, it is for a political purpose.

The other day I met with people involved with the Neighborhood Youth Corps projects who told me how they had young people working last year. The question was asked, "What were they doing?" The answer was, "Well, we had them out registering voters."

I think this is the kind of thing that undermines the confidence of the American people in this whole poverty program. I have supported it. I just voted against an amendment to cut it back. But it is hard to explain it to the people back home and the voters when they say, "Yes, but look what they are spending the money for. They are not spending the money to train people in useful work, not for jobs in the future, but they are doing political work, registering voters, which does not train them for earning a livelihood."

True, it may help them in understanding something about citizenship, but this has always been done on a voluntary basis in our country. We do not pay people to become good citizens.

I hope that not only will the amendment be adopted but that it will be kept in the bill when the conference committee meets.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has been used or yielded back. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from California, offered for himself and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], and the Senators from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL and Mr. TALMADGE], are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senators from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL and Mr. TALMADGE], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] is absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 85, nays 3, as follows:

[No. 281 Leg.]

YEAS—85

Aiken	Fannin	Magnuson
Allott	Fong	Mansfield
Anderson	Fulbright	McClellan
Baker	Gore	McGee
Bartlett	Griffin	McGovern
Bayh	Gruening	McIntyre
Bennett	Hansen	Metcalf
Bible	Harris	Miller
Boggs	Hart	Mondale
Brewster	Hartke	Monroney
Burdick	Hatfield	Montoya
Byrd, Va.	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Byrd, W. Va.	Holland	Murphy
Cannon	Hollings	Muskie
Case	Inouye	Nelson
Church	Jackson	Pearson
Clark	Javits	Pell
Cooper	Jordan, N.C.	Percy
Cotton	Jordan, Idaho	Prouty
Curtis	Kennedy, Mass.	Proxmire
Dirksen	Kennedy, N.Y.	Ribicoff
Dominick	Kuchel	Scott
Eastland	Lausche	Smathers
Ellender	Long, Mo.	Smith
Ervin	Long, La.	Sparkman
Spong	Tower	Yarborough
Stennis	Tydings	Young, N. Dak.
Symington	Williams, N.J.	
Thurmond	Williams, Del.	

NAYS—3

Hayden	McCarthy	Morse

NOT VOTING—12

Brooke	Hruska	Randolph
Carlson	Morton	Russell
Dodd	Moss	Talmadge
Hill	Pastore	Young, Ohio

So Mr. MURPHY'S amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield myself such time as I need from the time allotted on the bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] on September 28, 1967, appearing on page 27154 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which amendment was accepted by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], and agreed to by the Senate on that date, be changed to read as follows:

On page 118, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following new subsection:

"(d) Persons serving as volunteers under this section or under section 821 shall provide such information concerning their qualifications including their ability to perform their assigned tasks and their integrity as the Director shall prescribe and shall be subject to the same procedures, to the extent practicable, for selection and approval as the Director requires under part A of this title. The Director may fix such procedures for the selection and approval of persons who are low-income residents of the area to be served by the project and who wish to become volunteers as he determines will contribute to carrying out the purposes of this title."

Mr. President, this change would direct that the amendment appear in a different section of the bill. As agreed to, as I understand it, the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky would apply only to the special so-called hometown VISTA volunteers. The change I am proposing would assure that the amendment apply to all VISTA volunteers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from West Virgina state whose time is being used?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes on the bill.

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, would the Senator explain what his amendment would do?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The amendment of the Senator from Kentucky, as I understand it, would apply only to the special so-called hometown VISTA volunteers. My amendment would be applicable to all volunteers who are related to the VISTA program, regardless of capacity or length of service. It would apply to the full-time, all-year VISTA volunteers, as well as to the summer volunteers. I think that the able Senator from Kentucky is in favor of this, and intended that his amendment so apply. But it is my belief that his amendment did not do everything he intended. My amendment seeks to close

the gap and cover those VISTA volunteers not covered by the amendment offered by the able Senator from Kentucky and adopted by the Senate.

I talked to a member of the Senator's staff and he indicated that the Senator would have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. COOPER. I want to have an explanation of it stated in the RECORD.

Mr. President, may the amendment be stated again?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 118, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following new subsection:

"(d) Persons serving as volunteers under this section or under section 821 shall provide such information concerning their qualifications including their ability to perform their assigned tasks and their integrity, as the Director shall prescribe and shall be subject to the same procedures to the extent practicable, for selection and approval as the Director requires under part A of this title. The Director may fix such procedures for the selection and approval of persons who are low income residents of the area to be served by the project and who wish to become volunteers as he determines will contribute to carrying out the purposes of this title."

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I shall tell the Senator and the Senate what my amendment proposed to do. If it did not accomplish that fully, I would like to have the Senator tell me.

My amendment arose from reports I had received from citizens in my State. In talks with the Director and people from the VISTA program of the OEO here in Washington, I found that they followed certain procedures in the selection of their volunteers.

I point out that I was informed there were several categories of volunteers.

The first were those that are recruited and selected by VISTA in Washington. I was informed that these volunteers were required to submit applications similar to those required of all civil service applicants, and were examined and processed accordingly.

I was further informed that where applications reported circumstances indicating a criminal record or subversive activities, the matter would be referred to the FBI before the application would be approved.

The purpose of my amendment was to reach all other volunteers. The second class of volunteers are those who are recruited by sponsoring organizations funded by OEO, such as the Appalachian volunteers. The Appalachian volunteers received a grant of some $15 million. The Appalachian volunteers recruit individuals who perform services similar to those performed by the VISTA volunteers. But OEO told me that they could not say whether or not that type volunteer was required to prepare an application similar to the civil service applications required by VISTA and whether these applications were properly screened and reviewed.

My amendment was designed to reach them, by placing the responsibility on the Director, Mr. Shriver, through the Director of VISTA, to require the same application procedures and the same screening of applications and the same referral for FBI investigation, if appropriate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY of New York in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Kentucky may proceed for 5 minutes, and that the time not be charged to either side on the bill.

Mr. COOPER. I believe this is a rather important matter.

Mr. CLARK. I suggest that the time be taken from the bill, because there is sufficient time.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I modify my request, and ask that the time be taken from both sides.

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

Mr. COOPER. My amendment would have placed the responsibility on Mr. Shriver and his delegate, the head of VISTA, to see that every organization that receives money from OEO and recruits volunteers shall require the same procedures of application and approval as are required in Washington.

There is one other group of volunteers. There are some volunteers recruited, say, in Kentucky or West Virginia or any other State, who do not have the educational qualifications that are required for regular VISTA volunteers. They are the low-income residents of the area to be served.

Of course, those men and women do not have the educational and work experience qualifications such as the regular volunteers have, and my amendment prescribed that the Director could establish special qualifications for them. That was the purpose of my amendment. It provided a means of assuring that these people had some qualifications, and had not engaged in criminal activities or subversive activities.

We had an unfortunate incident in Kentucky—involving the Appalachian volunteers who had employed a man named McSurley, who had been fired in Washington by OEO and was later fired by the Appalachian volunteers. He went into eastern Kentucky, passing himself off as an Appalachian volunteer, and he used the name of Appalachian volunteers on his literature. I read this literature, not all of it, but a considerable part of it—and he was advocating the overthrow of the Government. Of course, people were outraged by this, because they thought he was on the payroll of the Federal Government in the poverty program. He was not then but he had been.

Activities such as these cause great trouble and dissatisfaction with the program.

My amendment was aimed at seeing that OEO had some responsibility in setting the qualifications and passing on and approving the people in this program. It is a good program. It brings into play the work and helpfulness and idealism of young people, but it should not be destroyed by the activities of a few destructive individuals, and I wanted some assurance that it will not be destroyed. That was the reason for my amendment.

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

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. MURPHY. I believe the Senator has raised a very important point, one that has disturbed me from the outset—the matter of selection and screening.

I know that the purpose of the program is to pick up fellows who are in deep trouble, fellows who have had really bad backgrounds, to see if they can be straightened out, rehabilitated, and helped. But along the line there have been many instances of this sort of thing. Not long ago, in California, a group walked into the legislature with guns.

Mr. COOPER. I recall the incident.

Mr. MURPHY. With submachineguns. The leader of the group was at that time on the OEO payroll as a family counselor. He was later removed.

This sort of situation occurs continually, and I have become tired of saying, "Please, let us step up screening."

With respect to the Job Corps, I have objected to mixing hard-case, criminal types with some poor kids who just could not learn to read and therefore were dropouts at school. These really tough kids, tough guys, go in there and scare the other youngsters to death.

I have an amendment in the bill this year, which was agreed to, to set up a pilot program. These two ingredients should not be mixed; it is not proper.

I believe the Senator from Kentucky has made a very important point.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the Senator from California.

May I ask the Senator from West Virginia in what way his amendment would change the situation that I tried to reach by my amendment? Would it require the same strict qualifications for these poor people?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I believe that the Senator from Kentucky and I see this matter almost alike. We want to get at the same aspect.

We have had problems in my State with some of the VISTA volunteers, and I am seeking to be sure that this amendment covers all the volunteers.

I should like to ask the Senator a question, if he will yield to me for that purpose.

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Does the Senator's amendment cover the full-time, full-year volunteers?

Mr. COOPER. Yes.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I believe the Senator is mistaken. This is part of what I am trying to accomplish. I do not believe the Senator's amendment does that. I may be in error, but I do not believe it does that, and this is what I am seeking to do.

The Senator's amendment was only to section 820, paragraph (a), part (B), which deals with auxiliary and special volunteer programs. I believe the Senator desires to do what my amendment would do, but I do not believe his amendment carries out the purpose. My amendment directs itself also to VISTA volunteers covered in other sections and parts of the bill.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator's conten-

tion is that my amendment covers those who are called VISTA volunteers, who make application and are approved by VISTA in Washington. Is my understanding correct?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. COOPER. My amendment was drawn to include the categories of volunteers about whom I have been talking: the one employed in Washington, directly under the VISTA program, and the one employed by organizations funded by OEO.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. But there are full-year volunteers and there are summer volunteers, both of which I feel are not covered by the distinguished Senator's amendment to which the Senate agreed a few days ago.

Mr. COOPER. I have no objection, except that I do not want the strict qualifications to apply to volunteers of the poor who could not meet the educational requiremens. If the Senator can assure me that it does not apply to that group, I have no objection.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I am advised by the subcommittee counsel that it would not.

Mr. COOPER. I will agree, on the grounds that the amendment will reach volunteers who are recruited by VISTA in Washington and recruited by organizations that are funded by OEO——

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Such as Appalachian volunteers.

Mr. COOPER. But that it does not prescribe the same qualifications for volunteers who assist in menial chores. Then I agree.

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

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I have no desire to include that group.

Mr. COOPER. Yes.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I have been advised by the subcommittee counsel that the amendment offered a few days ago by the able Senator from Kentucky and accepted by the Senate, does not reach the full-time, full-year volunteer, and does not reach the summer volunteer; and I believe the Senator joins with me in wanting these volunteers included.

Mr. COOPER. I want them. That is what my amendment intended.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, is there an amendment pending at the desk?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is pending the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. CLARK. I would suggest to my good friend from West Virginia that he withdraw his unanimous-consent request and propose an amendment.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, may I repeat my unanimous-consent request?

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I am concerned about the parliamentary procedure on this matter. I do not want to prolong the matter, but there has been objection made by the Senator that this is not a good way to legislate, and I agree.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Unanimous consent would be required for the Senate to strike the amendment which has already been agreed to by the Senate.

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

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I am now informed that this amendment has again been submitted to legislative counsel, and it would achieve my purposes. I have no objection.

Mr. CLARK. For the record, in view of this very unusual parliamentary situation, I shall not object to the unanimous-consent request because counsel for the subcommittee has discussed this amendment with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and find it entirely unobjectionable. I think it is perhaps a little peculiar way to legislate, but the parliamentarian said that it was all right, so I have no objection to the unanimous-consent request.

On behalf of the committee, I am prepared to accept the Byrd amendment to the Cooper amendment.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I wish to repeat my unanimous-consent request.

I ask unanimous consent that the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], at page 113, previously adopted, be deleted, and that I be permitted to offer another amendment to replace it at another point in the bill——

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, inasmuch as I proposed the measure, I hope the Senator will permit me to join therein.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. And that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] be joined as a cosponsor.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is agreed to, and the suggested amendments are agreed to.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I wish to confirm my understanding of the last amendment.

The amendment would be applicable to all volunteers who are related to the VISTA program, regardless of capacity or length of service. It would apply to full-time all-year VISTA workers as well as summer volunteers. It would require that persons wishing to work in VISTA and related programs furnish to the Director evidence of their ability to perform the work in question as well as of their integrity. From this information the Director shall determine their suitability.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the Senator is correct. That is my understanding of the amendment.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment on this issue?

Mr. CLARK. I yield time on the bill but could we get to third reading first?

Mr. President, there are no further amendments. Could we get to third reading?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield such time as he requires on the bill to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I shall only take a few minutes. I wish to address a question which relates to the volunteers and I would like to have the Senator's judgment about the question I am going to ask.

First, I ask if political activity on the part of volunteers is in any way restricted under the OEO program?

Mr. CLARK. Yes; there are strict restrictions against the activities which we wrote into the bill a year and a half ago.

Mr. COOPER. That is what I thought. I receive many complaints—and to be honest I do not know how accurate all of them are—that in Kentucky the volunteers are engaged in political activities. I know that can be interpreted in several ways. A person engaged in political activities could go out through the country and support or oppose candidates. Another type of political activity could be interpreted from their support or opposition to certain operations of government in that community.

I have talked to some of these volunteers. They were Appalachian volunteers and came to my office. They told me that they felt it was one of their duties to help the people who had been isolated, in rural and mountain areas, for such a long time. I know all of these people in these areas. I have been through all of these areas more than any VISTA volunteer ever will.

They told me that it is their duty to orient those people in political ways and to arouse their political consciences, so that they can form their own political judgments. They said flatly that to direct the attention of the people toward what they call "the establishment" or "the power structure" was one of their duties.

I, too, believe that people should have the opportunity to be better able to form judgments about political issues and even political candidates or officials. However, as a practical matter, it seems to me that the chief function of these volunteers, as it is of the poverty program, to try to correct the circumstances which have kept them down, economically, socially, culturally, educationally, and in many other ways. I have thought that if these volunteers have the idea that their chief function is to arouse everybody politically, then their job is really not being done, because that is not the chief purpose of their job. I would be interested in knowing the Senator's position.

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

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I support the position taken by the VISTA organization within the OEO, which has issued to each VISTA volunteer a handbook. I shall read from page 22 of that handbook under the title "Political Activities":

A. POLITICAL ACTIVITIES

Because of recent amendments to our act, you as a VISTA Volunteer are now considered a Federal employee for purposes of the Hatch

Act. As a result you may not engage in partisan political activities of any sort during your service. You may not assume a position of political leadership or become prominently identified with any political party or candidate. You may not publicly support or speak in behalf of or against a given political party or political candidate. You may, however, take positions in support of or opposition to the passage or repeal of laws and ordinances, and support or oppose issues which are not specifically identified with a political party or which are the subject of non-political elections, such as referendums, bond issues, constitutional amendments, or the like. You may participate in petitions and drives provided the petition is not associated with any political party or candidate.

Mr. COOPER. I understand generally the purpose of that language. Would the Senator consider that that section of the instructions for VISTA volunteers would approve and condone advice and suggestions to people to disobey the law?

Mr. CLARK. No.

Mr. COOPER. If these volunteers advise people to disobey the law would the Senator consider that they should be continued as volunteers?

Mr. CLARK. No. I think they should be dismissed.

Mr. COOPER. I asked the head of VISTA whether that was his position and he told me that it was and that it was the policy of VISTA not to condone volunteers advising people to disobey the law. Some of these activities have occurred and I want to condemn them. I believe that if VISTA volunteers advise people to disobey the law and to avoid the processes of law and government, then they should be fired.

One more question and I shall be through. This information came to me today from people in eastern Kentucky concerning the expenditure of certain Federal funds in eastern Kentucky. The chief source of income, perhaps, next to welfare, which is No. 2, is the coal industry. The coal industry has been improving in eastern Kentucky and, I am sure, in West Virginia, over the past 2 or 3 years. But, I am informed that 20-percent additional production could be assured and could be marketed if they had the men to work the mines.

Today, I talked to a group of people from Harlan County, and they told me that their coal production last year was 7,300,000 tons, but that production could be increased 20 percent; that is, by 1.5 million tons more, if they could find men to employ—150 to 350 additional miners.

I was told the reason they cannot find them is that there are no programs in the war on poverty or under the regular vocational programs to train men for jobs which are needed in the mining industry, such as handling, loading, and cutting machines, and shuttle-car drivers, which pay up to $24 a day and more. Yet, they cannot get the people to work in the mines.

I was further informed that, if there were adequate training programs, at least 2,000 or 3,000 more miners could be employed in eastern Kentucky right now, and at good wages.

Does the Senator in charge of the bill favor—if it is correct that there are no training programs for potential miners—the establishment of such programs?

Mr. CLARK. Yes. But, I think the Senator's question should be asked of the Secretary of Labor, Mr. Wirtz. That should be placed on his doorstep, to find out whether he does not have such programs under NDTA. I am surprised.

Mr. COOPER. This is the first time I had brought to my attention that there are no provisions for training programs for miners in the bill. Coal is still the greatest industry in this country. Would the Senator favor such a program?

Mr. CLARK. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. To train people for work in the mines, if such a program does not now exist?

Mr. CLARK. Yes. I assume that I would. I do not know all the basic facts, as the Senator said he did not either. Therefore, I would want to find out whether there are any in the NDTA program.

If the Senator has been correctly informed, the answer to his question is "yes."

Mr. COOPER. I wish to say that I have just been given these facts this morning. I think it is worthy of investigation. I intend to make my own study and inquiry concerning this problem. Considering the importance of such a basic industry to our State's economy there should be programs to train people for employment in that industry.

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

Mr. CLARK. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I have one question which I think has been corrected by regulations, but for the record I should like to point out that we had a situation in our State some time ago where an overenthusiastic group of workers of this agency were engaged in lobbying activities with the State legislature, recommending certain changes in the welfare program.

We reported that to the Washington office, and we were advised that there were regulations against it and that they had so notified these people in Wilmington. I think this problem has now been corrected, but for the legislative record I would ask the Senator this question: Is it correct that lobbying activities of such nature by such a group in a State legislature is strictly a lobbying activity and is forbidden?

Mr. CLARK. It is my understanding that the Senator is correct.

I hold in my hand a memorandum published by the community action program of OEO under date of June 10, 1967. It is entitled "Policy Guidance on Lobbying Activities." It is signed by Theodore M. Berry, director of the Community Action program. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

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

COMMUNITY ACTION MEMO

Memorandum No. 66.
Date: June 10, 1967.
Subject: Policy Guidance on Lobbying Activities.

PURPOSE OF THIS MEMORANDUM

Many of the problems which cause or aggravate poverty are bound up with harsh or outmoded laws. Others can be most effectively attacked by the passage of new legislation. Community action is thus inevitably concerned with the shape of the laws which affect the poor.

On the other hand, there are necessarily very sharp limitations on the use of project funds by grantee and delegate agencies to influence the passage or defeat of legislation. Moreover, there are certain kinds of lobbying which interfere with the work of legislatures and thus impair the basic processes of democratic self-government.

The primary purpose of this memorandum is to identify essential restrictions on lobbying activities by grantees and delegate agencies that receive OEO funds under Titles II-A and III-B of the Economic Opportunity Act. The memorandum also serves as a reminder that under federal (and many state) tax laws, private non-profit agencies may endanger their capacity to receive tax-deductible contributions if they engage in substantial lobbying activities.

A. RESTRICTIONS ON LOBBYING WITH PROJECT FUNDS

Project funds may not be used to support any of the following:

1. Any activity which is planned and carried out in such a manner as to disrupt the orderly conduct of business by Congress or any other legislative body. This includes, but is not limited to, any disruptive action carried on in the chambers of Congress or any other legislative body or in any capitol or legislative office building.

2. Any demonstration, rally, picketing, or other form of direct action aimed at the family or home of a member of a legislative body for the purpose of influencing his actions as a member of that body.

3. Any campaign of advertising carried on through commercial media for the purpose of influencing the passage or defeat of legislation.

4. Any campaign of letter writing, of other mass communications, or of mass visits to individual members of Congress or state legislatures for the purpose of influencing the passage or defeat of legislation. This restriction does not prohibit purely informational and educational activities involving target areas and groups.

These restrictions on use of project funds apply to federal and matching non-federal shares of approved program budgets under Titles II-A and III-B of the Economic Opportunity Act and include the use of equipment, material, and facilities and employee time and services which are either paid for with project funds or contributed to project funds.

These restrictions are not intended to limit the rights of individuals to express their personal views on public issues so long as they do so in their capacity as private citizens rather than employees. Nor are they intended to limit the freedom of local agencies to express their views on legislation so long as project funds are not used in violation of the foregoing limitations.

B. REMINDER CONCERNING TAX IMPLICATIONS OF LOBBYING

Under federal income, estate, and gift tax laws, gifts made to private non-profit organizations which devote a substantial part of their activities to carrying on propaganda or other activities aimed at influencing legislation, are not considered tax deductible "charitable contributions." This applies not only to federal and state legislation but also to the legislative actions of county and city councils and similar local bodies. Many state tax laws contain similar provisions.

In view of these tax laws, private non-profit grantee and delegate agencies should bear in mind that if they devote any substantial part of their activities to lobbying efforts, they may be endangering their ability to receive tax-deductible contributions.

Such contributions may represent an important means of providing the non-federal share required in programs assisted under Section 204/205 of the Economic Opportunity Act. They also enable many local agencies to carry out other programs of assistance to the poor, apart from the Act.

There are no published rules defining what is meant under the federal tax laws by the term "substantial" lobbying activities. In cases of doubt local agencies should seek private tax counsel or contact the nearest field offices of the Internal Revenue Service and state tax authorities.

EFFECTIVE DATE

Part A of this memo is to take effect ten days from the official date of issuance shown above.

Part B of this memo merely serves as a reminder concerning existing law.

THEODORE M. BERRY,
Director, Community Action Program.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator. That was my understanding from my conversations with the department, that this lobbying activity was not permissible and that they have so advised the group. I have heard no further complaints from that area, but I thought it best to establish the record so that all would understand that this kind of operation is prohibited.

I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on final passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

Mr. CLARK. How much time does the Senator from Ohio want?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Five minutes.

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

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

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, recently, when I was in Cleveland, I met with a delegation of women who had worked at one of the Job Corps centers in that city. They related to me conditions in one of the institutions which was allegedly helping the development of the ability of girls to get jobs and adjust themselves to life.

The story that was told to me I did not willingly accept. It was of a nature that caused great concern to me.

Subsequent to the meeting with those women, some of whom had been employees at the girls' institution, I received a letter from a lady who was connected with the institution but had left it and no longer lives in Ohio.

The letter reads:

DEAR SIR: I am writing to you about the Cleveland, Ohio, Job Corps for girls, in hopes that something can be done before girls' lives are destroyed or corrupted before they can be educated.

My daughter enrolled in Job Corps and we were told what a wonderful place it was. When my daughter arrived in Cleveland, she then realized that the place was nothing like what she had been told. The article in *Glamor* that dealt with the Job Corps had not one picture nor illustration which is quite understandable for who would send their daughter to such a place if they knew what it truly was like.

We are a white family, but if we were Negro, I would still feel as I do now. I believe in equal rights for everyone, but I do not believe in inter-marriage nor inter-dating for my family.

The people who run Job Corps are trying to do a good job with what they have to work with. They are able to see what is going on inside, but once the girls leave on a pass for the evening no one knows what is happening. During the few weeks that my daughter spent at the Job Corps Center, she met the most interesting people who live near the Job Corps Center. She met pimps, dope pushers, homosexuals of both sexes, and had an offer to become a prostitute at night after classes were over.

My daughter was more fortunate than some, because I had told all four of my children about sex, drugs, homosexuality, and their effect on an individual. I feel sorry for the girls who were never told and therefore had to find out the hard way—through experience.

We are not from a slum area, but if we were that doesn't mean I would want my daughter sent into another slum area and to be exposed to the happenings within a slum district. I brought my daughter home until something can be done to either relocate the Job Corps or until she can be transferred.

Thank you for reading my letter and I sincerely hope that with your influence something can be done about this deplorable happening within our United States. Surely you must agree with me when I say that no good can come from placing teenagers in a slum district to be educated. I, myself, fear the type of education they may be receiving.

That is about the end of the letter.

The charges made in this letter are more than substantiated by the women with whom I spoke in Cleveland and who were connected with this institution. The conditions about which complaint was made are that girls have been brought in from all over the country to the Cleveland area, from as far west as California. The complaint was also made that there was a program of developing socialization——

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

Mr. LAUSCHE. I ask for 1 more minute.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, there is no time left.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield time to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Of developing socialization. And so the enrollees of an institution in Pennsylvania are brought to Cleveland for a night or two nights of socialization, and then they go back home to where they came from.

I mention this matter today because it is one of grave importance, and the officials administering this program should give heed to what has happened.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 5 minutes?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, we come now to the end of the road for Senate action on S. 2388, the bill to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act.

I want to thank all my colleagues in the Senate for their courtesy and consideration during the long and somewhat tedious process of considering this bill. It reached the Senate floor on September 22. Here we are on October 5, about to, I hope, pass it by a resounding majority.

I think it is a good bill. I regret very much that title II has been stricken, but whoever fights and runs away lives to fight another day, and we will be back on another day in reasonably short order.

I would like particularly to thank the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] for his courteous consideration of all matters, sometimes in dispute, but always he dealt with them with the great degree of courtesy for which he is known.

I want to pay tribute to counsel for the subcommittee, William C. Smith, and to the director of the poverty study program, Howard W. Hallman, for the long and dedicated service they gave in preparing memorandums and their help in the many changes made in the bill.

I would like to pay tribute to Bob Patricelli, minority counsel for the subcommittee.

We could not have succeeded as we have without the splendid cooperation of the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], and the other Members of the Senate who serve on the subcommittee, and the full Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which has had this bill in charge.

I am particularly grateful to the KENNEDY brothers from Massachusetts and New York for the splendid assistance they gave; to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON]; to the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL]; to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]; and to all the members of the subcommittee and the full committee.

The Office of Economic Opportunity has given us splendid cooperation in responding to inquiries. The staff of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, particularly Mr. Stewart McClure, chief clerk, and Mr. John Forsythe, counsel for the committee, have been most helpful, as have the staffs of Senators KENNEDY of New York, KENNEDY of Massachusetts, and PROUTY of Vermont.

Finally, I would like to say I think the President of the United States sent us a good bill. I think we have improved it. I think there is nothing we have done which cannot be considered as an endorsement of what the President proposed, with some additional authorizations for new programs, which I believe the Senate and the committee were justified in putting into the bill.

I hope very much, if this bill is passed—and I hope it will be—we will be able to persuade our friends in the House of Representatives to accept the bill at least in major extent, so that in coming out of conference we can have a bill of which all Members of the Congress can be proud.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 1 minute?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I want to commend my colleague, the Senator from Pennsylvania, for his conscientious efforts in presenting this legislation. I do not think there is any member of the committee who has not been impressed with the knowledge and the dedication of the Senator from Pennsylvania. Nobody has worked hard-

er or with greater understanding of the problems involved than has the Senator from Pennsylvania. So I did not want this legislation to come to a final vote without acknowledgment of that fact.

I also want to say how impressed I have been with the work of the members of the staff of the committee.

Also, if I may take 15 more seconds, I would like to say what a pleasure it has been to work with the Republican members of the committee, who have been so conscientious, the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], who has always been present, and whose contributions to this legislation have been immense. They have been extremely impressive. The Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], who is present on the floor, has also been most impressive and has contributed much to this legislation.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, first of all, I would like to express appreciation to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], for his kindness in accepting the amendment cosponsored by Senator COOPER and me.

Second, I want to congratulate him for his dedicated effort and hard work, and his fine presentation and managership of this bill. He has done a good job. I also express appreciation to the members of his staff who have been so cooperative with me.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute to applaud the efforts of members of the committee on our side of the aisle, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. JAVITS, and Mr. GRIFFIN. All have been remarkably assiduous in pursuing this work, and this "high rise" of hearing transcripts which graces every senatorial desk is probably the best tribute I know to the long and arduous labors involved in this bill.

At the same time, I salute the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], manager of the bill.

Now I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, there is much merit in many of the programs in this bill, and I support many of them. However, I call attention to the fact that last year's authorization for this same program totaled only $1.75 billion. The fiscal 1968 budget as submitted to the Congress asked that that amount be increased this year by $310 million, or an increase of 17 percent, bringing the total to $2.060 billion.

The Senate committee has added another $198 million on top of the previous 17 percent increase. This bill's authorization is about 10 percent more than the amount requested by the Budget Bureau and more than they can efficiently use.

At some point the Senate is going to have to stop this continuous escalation of increased expenditures.

Even though I support individual programs in the bill but as one who feels we have reached that point, I shall vote against the bill, just as I voted against other proposals planning to increase expenditures far beyond last year's and also far beyond what the administration itself requested.

Certainly this Congress cannot, with all good intention, vote for these increases on individual programs and then, after all appropriation bills have been passed, expect to soothe their consciences by passing resolutions and passing the buck to the President by demanding he cut $5 billion from the budget expenditures. We should have the courage to vote against such expenditures or be willing to accept our own responsibility.

Senate approval of this bill adds over $500 million to last year's expenditures and around $200 million above budget requests.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the bill before us now is the product of exhaustive study and careful thought. Under the sure leadership of its distinguished chairman [Mr. CLARK], the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty undertook a thorough examination of the war on poverty to see how the present Economic Opportunity Act is working and what legislative changes should be made. I think the subcommittee is to be especially commended for taking its hearings beyond the District of Columbia into nine States to gather the thoughts, criticisms, and recommendations of the people. I think S. 2388 reflects the sort of responsiveness, creativeness, and flexibility that good government demands and that the people of this country hope for.

One of the most important conclusions to be gleaned from the subcommittee's extensive study is that the incidence of poverty is still very much—indeed, too much—a part of the American picture. The Bureau of the Census recently released information revealing that "the number of U.S. residents with incomes below the poverty level decreased from 39 million to 30 million between 1959 and 1966." These figures indicate two things: First, we are making progress toward our goal of eliminating poverty in America, but, second, poverty continues to be a most serious national problem deserving high-priority attention. Even accepting the rather low poverty levels applied by the Census Bureau to their sample survey, something over 15 percent of our nearly 200 million citizens remain in the shadows of American abundance. Clearly there is much work to do, and recent history reveals the cost of neglect.

Mr. President, the amendments presently under consideration represent a significant advance in the development of this Government's economic opportunity endeavor. Through them, our past experience in this field has been related to our present needs and actions. This bill contemplates both procedural and substantive changes which are designed to bring up to date the original Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. If I may be allowed to generalize about the thorough revisions capably undertaken and set before us here, I think that there are two exceptionally fine threads of improvement woven throughout the fabric of these amendments: first, there is a very appropriate stress on local initiative and responsibility; second, there is established in practically every phase of this program the means for continuing evaluation of its operation.

Mr. President, I submit that the former improvement is essential to the success of this program, and that it might well be taken as a model for future governmental activities. It seems to me that one of the great needs with which government must cope is the need of an individual citizen to feel a positive relationship with his society and his government. I speak, Mr. President, of the Jeffersonian, Jacksonian, and Lincolnian concepts of government "by the people." In an age of bigness and complexity, I am afraid that too few are concerned with the little man, who finds himself drifting with no oar to grasp for steerage. In short, the individual is not personally involved and loses a sense of control over his destiny. We can and must begin to help him regain this control by positively involving him and, as this bill does, by placing an oar in his hands. I do not imply here, nor does this bill intend, any merely negative tearing down of big government; rather I am calling for a creative endeavor and flexibility, such as this bill provides, to respond to the very real needs of the individuals of this Nation.

Whether he is a farmer on poor land, a businessman in Dallas, or a Mexican-American laborer in San Antonio, these economic opportunity amendments place much of the initiative and responsibility in local hands. The focus is on community, neighborhood, and individual self-help. As the brief summary of S. 2388, prepared for the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, stated the intent of just one phase of the program:

> The focus of such programs would be upon opportunity and self-help. The ultimate goal is to enable low-income persons to achieve self-sufficiency. In short, the community action program would move poor people through their own efforts into the mainstream of American life (Sec. 201).

The committee went on to conclude that—

> Not only does local initiative need to be emphasized but also to be built into the processes of the community action program. Therefore, the bill contains a provision which seeks to balance the national interest and local initiative by reserving 50 percent of Title II funds for locally selected programs (Sec. 220(d)).

Mr. President, I am in total sympathy with this intent, and I commend and support the subcommittee's perceptiveness and their responsiveness to this need.

At the very least, the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 has been controversial and has stirred new thinking and creative ideas. I think these amendments are a worthy product of that controversy. If our skirmish with poverty has had failings, they have been largely failings of commitment. It seems undeniable that this Nation has not yet committed sufficient resources nor developed all the programs needed to eliminate poverty. The subcommittee has made one worthy response to this need by proposing the

adoption of an Emergency Employment Act.

Mr. President, I endorse the general spirit and direction of the 1967 Economic Opportunity Act Amendments and the Emergency Employment Act, and I will speak to some of the specific provisions later.

Mr. PROUTY. I rise to state my support for the proposed amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act, as it appears that we are now approaching the vote on final passage.

The proposed legislation which we reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was, by and large, a good bill, and I believe that it has been materially strengthened by amendments which have been adopted on the floor of the Senate. Although I still have reservations in certain areas, the overall package to amend the poverty program is one which I can fully support.

Many important changes have been made in our commitment to fight poverty. However, I am convinced that my amendment calling for a truly representative, unbiased, and objective investigation for all the poverty programs on a national basis by the Comptroller General is the most important change we have made in this bill in terms of securing the long-range success of the war on poverty. The results of this investigation will provide a real basis for the sound evaluation of all these programs by the 91st Congress.

I have certain feelings of regret and disappointment, Mr. President, that the Senate did not see fit to adopt the Prouty-Scott substitute for the Emergency Employment Act. However, I would like to thank all my colleagues who supported our proposal for amending title II of the bill, and I am especially gratified by the substantial support which this amendment received from my fellow Republicans.

It is clear that the closeness of the vote on this amendment is indicative of the soundness of our approach, particularly when we take into consideration the administration's strong opposition to the Emergency Employment Act in any form.

If there is one significant fact which emerges from the debate of the last few days concerning enactment of an Emergency Employment Act, Mr. President, it is that, by our actions yesterday, we have merely postponed the time when programs such as these must be considered and acted upon in an affirmative manner. When that time arrives, and it must not be too far away, it is essential that we act constructively to insure that these programs train our poverty-afflicted citizens for meaningful and productive jobs in the private sector of our economy where there are actual employment openings and opportunities.

As I have said before, I favor make work employment only to the extent that this type of program is necessary to provide employment for our disadvantaged poor who have reached a point in life where further education and training programs are incapable of permitting them to qualify for positions needed in private enterprise.

Finally, Mr. President, I should like to commend the distinguished chairman of our Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty, the Senior Senator from Pennsylvania, for his willingness to consider my amendment on its merits and for his subsequent support. In addition I want to express my personal appreciation for the long hours of hard work put in on this bill by both my Republican and Democratic colleagues on the full committee.

Finally I would also like to take this opportunity to thank Bill Smith and Howard Hallman, of the majority staff, and Robert Patricelli and Peter Benedict, of the minority staff, for their hard work on this bill. I also appreciated the able assistance of Richard Murphy, from the staff of Senator HUGH SCOTT, and Eugene Jenkins, Arthur Dufresne, Mary Hoag, Paul Molloy, Betty Collins, Margaret Blackstone, and Suzan O'Neil from my own staff.

Again, Mr. President, I thank all my colleagues who supported my emergency employment amendment.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I should like to take 15 seconds of my time to thank the Senator from Vermont for his kind words, and to express my appreciation of the cooperation we achieved together in our unsuccessful but nonetheless significant efforts.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, in connection with the Senate's continuing discussion of the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an excellent report which appeared in the Nashville News on August 11, 1967, on the success of an Operation Headstart program in Nashville, Ark.

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

HEADSTART SUCCESS OPENS NEW WORLD TO YOUNGSTERS

A whole new world—bright with challenge and promising better health and education—opened this Summer for some 142 pre-school children, mostly from lower income families.

And closed Friday with the promise fulfilled.

Operation Headstart, under the aegis of the Office of Economic Opportunity, provided for the underpriviliged just what the name predicted, a jump into the school world and a better chance to avoid dropout status and the entrapment of minimum reward for unskilled adult labor later.

Nashville's Headstart program for 124 of those children came off as a striking example of the willingness of white and Negro races to face a 20th century challenge with respect for others.

The last two weeks of Headstart, with its special trip to Hope and a picnic at the fair ground, was in startling contrast to violent events elsewhere in nation undergoing integration.

Teachers and officials are all in agreement. Headstart worked, and proved itself of value.

Youngsters were divided. There were about 10 more white children than Negroes in the 124 attending Headstart classes at Nashville's elementary building during the eight weeks. Absenteeism was rare. Parents often came with their children just to observe, and went away, pleased according to Mrs. Herman Stavely, county director for Headstart. She directed the Nashville and Dierks schools.

Teachers and aides were both white and Negro. There were seven teachers and seven aides, including two Negro teachers, four Negro aides and one Negro social worker.

Little was overlooked in the program for the 5 and 6-year oldsters who will enter their first classroom this Fall. It all began with health.

Mrs. Stavely said that every child was given a thorough examination. That included eyes, ears, nose, teeth and heart. A tubercular test showed four positive and they received second x-rays. The child needing dental care was given up to $40 from federal funds for that work. Federal funds paid the doctors who gave physical examinations.

New state laws requiring five inoculations prior to school days were followed. The county health nurse gave most children their required five shots.

Food was provided. Children received a mid-morning snack. Usually this was fruit, crackers or cookies and milk. "Some of the children rode the bus without any breakfast," the teachers learned. The US provided 40c per day for the food, and the noon meal was served without charge.

Primarily the children were introduced to the world of knowledge.

The kindergarten program provided educational materials such as blocks, flash cards, picture number information, art work, and even music. A rhythm band was formed and homemade instruments put to play.

"A big change was noticed in the children after the first week," one classroom teacher said.

The objectives of classroom work were varied. One teacher listed these:

1. To help children adjust socially and physically;
2. To give them an insight to education via instruction;
3. To teach the child discipline;
4. To improve eating habits and food selection.

Teachers were unanimous in giving a high rating to Headstart here.

Here is what one teacher from the Tollette faculty had to say: "The children seemed to adjust all right. They liked the play period, they liked art work."

She recalled that early in the schooling one little girl cried to return home with her mother. No more. She conquered her fears and had no problems.

Headstart, she said, was quite a help to children. "They adjusted to other people, and I enjoyed working in the integrated situation. I certainly hope Headstart is continued."

Mineral Springs furnished a teacher for the faculty. She too praised the program.

She had 18 in her Headstart class and her estimate of the program:

Attendance was good, most of the children didn't miss a day;

There was improvement from every child;

Visitors were amazed at the improved ability of children to communicate;

Food? One little girl had never seen celery.

This teacher compared a pupil with an older brother who is a likely drop-out. The boy knew little about school but a lot about profanity. That changed, and he isn't the potential drop-out his brother is.

"The youngest boy is starting almost on an equal footing with other children, and this is good. Otherwise he would be held back and this would be expensive to taxpayers as well as lead to a social problem," she commented.

At their innocent ages, they knew no color lines.

"There just was no color difference," one white teacher noted. "They are just children. If they find another boy who wants to play cowboy, he doesn't care if he's polka dot. They are too busy to be conscious of racial differences."

Teacher rapport was the same. "There was

no difference in teacher-pupil relationship because of race."

One teacher pointed out that "the white students had a great need too."

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, for very good reasons, I cannot support S. 2388, the proposed Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967. I only wish I could do otherwise—and do so with the conviction that I would be helping to improve the lot of the many Americans who do need help to break through the barrier of poverty.

I realize, as presumably does each Senator who will cast a similar ballot, that a vote against the so-called antipoverty bill will in some instances be interpreted as a vote for poverty. And that is precisely the conclusion many supporters of the measure hope Americans will draw. Nothing would please them more than to tar-and-feather us with the stigma that we are unsympathetic with the plight of the economically disadvantaged, or that we are indifferent to the Nation's needs. Very well. But that certainly is not the truth. Almost to a man, we have supported, and will continue to support, every realistic antipoverty measure, whether in the field of education, health, or welfare. But this bill, S. 2388, is not realistic—and primarily because it is based on a false assumption, namely that our problems are wholly economic. They are not. But even if they were, even if the Government now had the money to fight costly wars on two fronts, even if public spending were superior to private investment in solving these problems—even if you assume all these things, what reason is there for believing that we can buy our way out of poverty. Certainly, the present poverty program does not warrant such confidence, such hope. At best, with the exception of Headstart, it has achieved only mediocre success. And even that has been expensively purchased.

Therefore, what we object to in the antipoverty program is not its aim, which we also share, but its excesses, its failures, its unfulfilled dreams—and the frustrations they in turn produce. Specifically, what I object to in the program are its high administrative costs; its paying for programs that encourage one group of Americans to hate other Americans; its reliance on measures that are throwbacks to a depression era; its practice of ignoring and bypassing State and locally elected officials; and its almost total exclusion of the resources that private industry could bring to bear.

Furthermore, there is no logical reason why many of the new poverty programs cannot be funded through and administered by existing Federal agencies. Why must we forever establish new bureaus, new sections, to deal with problems and programs that clearly are within the province of a functioning agency, whether it is HEW or HUD or whichever? The practice produces great duplication and waste.

Another concern, of course, is whether we—whether taxpayers—can afford so expensive a program, at least now when our spending for national defense is at such a high level. State and local taxes have been increased throughout the Nation, social security taxes soon will be raised, the administration is urging a 10-percent surtax—where will it end? How much of a burden must the average taxpayer be asked to shoulder? How much can he shoulder? The only thing we can accomplish by this foolishness is not to raise the poor out of the depths of poverty, but rather to tax countless more Americans, those who work and pay a large share of the costs of government, into that position. We must find the moral courage to admit that we cannot afford to do everything at once, no matter how much we might think it needs doing. We cannot purchase instant affluence.

We must find an answer to the problems of poverty, Mr. President. But this bill is not it.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, at this time when the poverty program in America is coming under attack from all sides for its failures in some instances and its cost in all instances, a very timely study has been reported by the Wall Street Journal of the pockets of poverty, where people remain desperate and starving. As noted in this article of October 3, "The problem is how to break the cycle of deprivation." And only slowly is this cycle being broken, through education and training for the children, through decent living conditions provided for the families.

This very thorough study goes from the "dogpatch" areas of south and west to "Uptown" Chicago where thousands of poor Southern whites have been stalemated in their search for self-betterment in the more prosperous north. Everywhere are found those characteristics which make poverty self-perpetuating—poor education, poor health, and, an important quality which the article points out, "almost uniformly, they lack political muscle." Time and again, throughout this article, it is pointed out that local officials do not help and do not care to help in the solving of local poverty problems. It is such an attitude that the poverty workers must fight in localities throughout America, and it is such an attitude that we in Washington who care must fight if headway is to be made.

Standing out in my reading of the article, "Living in Poverty," was a short review of the situation in Starr and Hidalgo Counties in Texas:

Poverty workers are desperate. "Officials don't believe it," says one volunteer. "They say we're only pointing out the exceptional cases. But people are literally starving to death here."

And bear in mind that these very people are presently faced with the new difficulties of Hurricane Beulah and her aftermath—are homeless, helpless, and without jobs, for the crops which most of them pick for a living are wiped out.

Mentioned are the efforts of a great man, Mayor Leo J. Leo of La Joya, Tex., whom I know well, to find a program which would assist these people. I insist, as he does, that something must be done here, for in Texas, where more people live below the poverty level than in any other State, where child welfare payments are the lowest in the Nation, there is not yet even a State minimum wage law. The situation is urgent.

I commend the Wall Street Journal on the concern shown in this article, and by this excellent reporting of a condition which America cannot ignore. Perhaps these reports should read, "Thousands of people lost today in the war against poverty—lost to starvation, to lack of medical treatment, to unsanitary conditions, to unheated tenements, to poor skills and low pay." Perhaps then our consciences would demand that these lives and these people be saved.

Today we in the Senate have an opportunity to show our interest and concern, in the passage of the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967, S. 2388. In our Nation something must be done about poverty, and we must remain alert to the necessity of congressional action and interest, without which the greatest war of our times would be lost.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article from the October Wall Street Journal, "Living in Poverty: How Some People Exist at the Bottom of the Economic Ladder," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Wall Street Journal, Oct. 3, 1967]

LIVING IN POVERTY: HOW SOME AMERICANS SCRAPE BY AT BOTTOM OF ECONOMIC LADDER—SOUTHERN WHITES IN CHICAGO, ARIZONA INDIANS, ESKIMOS SHARE COMMON PROBLEMS—JUST A DEAD MAN WALKING

The five of Mrs. Lillie Harrison's 14 children who still live at home, in rural Madison County, Miss., have never talked on a telephone, been to a movie or ridden a bicycle. The Negro family gets $66 worth of food stamps a month, enough for two meals a day.

John Seczizinski, 76, gets old age assistance of $104 a month. It buys a plate of stew each day and covers the rent on his 12-foot-by-7-foot room in a north Philadelphia flophouse. But, clad in a sweat-stained undershirt and rumpled trousers, he looks up bleakly and says, "The living isn't so good. Sometimes I just sit down and cry."

Twinsburg Heights, Ohio, isn't far from a number of affluent suburbs, and a tall water storage tower belonging to Chrysler Corp. looms within view. But this enclave of Negroes outside Cleveland has neither water nor sewage facilities, and the residents make do with wells and outhouses.

In a migrant labor camp outside Stockton, Calif., William Burns stretches out on a thin, soiled pallet in the single males' barracks. Food and lodgings cost $1.75 a day, and contractors charge $1 or $2 a day for the privilege of working. Even in the best of times, when the tomato crop comes in, Mr. Burns seldom makes much more than expenses.

HIDDEN POVERTY

That some Americans live in poverty has been public knowledge for some time, of course, and lately more than ever. Bloody riots have pinpointed deprivations in the big city ghettos, and a Senate subcommittee recently heard testimony that displaced sharecroppers in Mississippi were starving. But Wall Street Journal reporters around the country find that there still exist pockets of poverty scarcely noticed by society, let alone attacked, although the "war" on poverty officially is three years old. For some families in these localities, the $3,000 annual income generally recognized as reaching the poverty barrier would be a fortune.

Between Independence and Kansas City, Mo., for instance, is a dreary "Dogpatch" city of wooden shacks that is disowned by both municipalities; most residents are unemployed. On a Passamaquoddy Indian reservation in Washington County, Maine, unemployment is 97%. Up to 13 persons sleep in one room at the Gallardo labor camp in Stanislaus County, Calif. Among the poorly housed Eskimos in the hinterlands of southwest Alaska, the average life span is 34.3 years.

The catalogue of difficulties among the people at the very bottom of the economic heap—poor nutrition and housing, inadequate medical and dental care, menial jobs or none, and a prevailing lack of hope—tends to be perpetuated when their children don't finish school, as is often the case. Although antipoverty programs are making inroads in some areas, some of the very poor are beyond the reach of social programs, too suspicious or proud to ask for help, ignorant of their rights or simply apathetic. Almost uniformly, they lack political muscle.

DISBELIEVING OFFICIALS

All the problems are on view among the Mexican-American farm workers in Starr and Hidalgo Counties, Texas, in the Rio Grande valley, and local poverty workers are desperate. "Officials don't believe it," says one volunteer. "They say we're only pointing out the exceptional cases. But people are literally starving to death here."

A survey by the Starr County antipoverty program of several impoverished communities showed 71% of 3,339 families with annual incomes of less than $3,000. About 1,000 of those families had incomes below $1,000. Only 4% of children 14 and 15 years old still were in school, and 90% of the men over 14 were unemployed.

The problem is how to break the cycle of deprivation. In the one-room shack of Carlos Ramirez, in La Joya, in Hidalgo County, three generations of poverty are represented. Mr. Ramirez, 70, became a widower two years ago. The chief income for himself, four of his children who usually are at home and a six-year-old granddaughter, is $94 a month in state welfare. Lately this has been supplemented by $50 a month sent from an Idaho Job Corps camp by Carlos Jr., 19.

Carlos Jr. left school after the third grade. Julia Anne, 26, has a fifth grand education. Last summer she worked hoeing cabbage on a truck farm. Otelia, 22, who was burned badly in a kerosene fire several years ago, still lives in the 12-foot-by-20-foot shack. Juan, 16, has a fourth grade education. Dominga, the granddaughter, was left at the shack by her parents five years ago and never retrieved.

DIFFERENT BUT THE SAME

Equally resistant, although 1,200 miles distant, are the problems of a poverty pocket in metropolitan Chicago. Much has been said about the migration of Southern Negroes to Northern Cities, but little of migration north by Southern whites. "Uptown," a 120-square-block section five miles north of downtown Chicago, contains about 33,000 poor whites from the rural South.

They came from economically depressed areas to make a new start. But Uptown, the port of entry, tends to become the last stop. "You never have enough to get ahead," says one resident. "It takes all your income just to live." An Office of Economic Opportunity study showed that 51% of heads of households either were unemployed or had jobs that paid less than $3,000 a year.

The men get day labor or other short-lived jobs, and the families live in tiny furnished apartments, with the rent paid weekly. A 14-year-old from Tennessee says his father made $35 in the first week in Uptown; $20 went for rent, leaving only $15 to cover other expenses for their family of eight.

The newcomers can't adjust to big city life, social workers say. Some aren't sufficiently literate to fill out an employment application. Others are frightened of such big city appurtenances as buses. An Uptown resident of 10 years standing, one poverty worker says, is still likely to list his residence as "Pike County, Ky."

Services to help them are meager. "Southern whites have no Martin Luther King or Stokely Carmichael," notes Tom Nolan of the Catholic Poverty Committee. Another social worker says: "They get the crumbs of the relief pie." Welfare officials also say the Southern whites often are too proud to ask for help. Typically, a Tennessee mother who finally did go on relief complains: "They question you to death."

Amidst such difficulties, why do they come north? A poverty official who has visited eastern Kentucky, a prime source of Uptown immigrants, says, "Sure, slums in Chicago are bad, dirty and depressing. But a kid can bust out if he's sharp and lucky. Down there it's utterly hopeless. People live in shacks and sit around with blank looks on their faces."

But life in Uptown is poorly geared to "busting out." Changes of residence are so frequent, school officials say, that one grade school reports annual student turnover of 150%. One girl had moved 23 times before her 13th birthday. And education officials say parents are prone to take their children out of school frequently for visits to relatives or to help around the household for a few weeks.

HARD-CORE APPALACHIA

The poverty worker's assessment of Appalachia would seem to be borne out by the Mark B. Smith family in Cremona, Ky. "I'm just a dead man walkin'," says Mr. Smith. Once a coal miner and construction worker, he hasn't been able to work since 1965.

Mr. Smith's disabilities, ranging from back injuries to a nervous condition, don't qualify him for public assistance. He, his wife Clara, and their six shoeless children subsist on a Salvation Army stipend which allows purchase of food stamps worth $82 each month.

The Smiths had a four-room shack, but it burned down during the summer, and they now live with his mother. His children, aged 16 months to 17 years, use pebbles and twigs as makeshift toys while Mr. Smith, thin and unshaven, says, "About the future? I just couldn't tell you. If something doesn't turn up soon, it's a hopeless case."

Poverty workers in the area are stymied. Antipoverty programs, they say, don't get the needed cooperation from local officials or the poor. Edwin J. Safford, director of an OEO community action program, bemoans what he considers meager antipoverty resources and says, "There's no answer for this area until new industry moves in." But, he adds, there is little to attract industrial investment.

Other poverty workers assail what they consider a lack of concern for the Appalachian indigents. "How do you compete with riots in the cities?" asks an OEO volunteer. At a recent meeting of unemployed men at the abandoned mine workers' union meeting hall in Hazard, Ky., a wife rose, and shaking her fist said, "You men oughta go marching like niggers, and tear everything to hell as you go."

A POLITICAL ORPHAN

Another kind of political impotence blights life in Twinsburg Heights, Ohio, a curious community of 200 Negro families that has no government. Seventeen miles from both Cleveland and Akron, it is a backwater amidst explosive urban and suburban growth (there are at least seven such poverty pockets in Ohio, social workers say).

Technically, the Heights is part of Twinsburg Township, but the 1,200 Negro residents say they have been excluded from representation in local government. Although water lines from both Cleveland and Akron run nearby, the Heights has no water system. Twinsburg Township zoning restrictions forbid commercial establishments, residents say, preventing development of local businesses.

"Most people are apathetic and indifferent," a poverty worker says. In the Heights, crumbling homes occupy tiny plots along dirt streets with no sidewalks. Nearly 40% of the adults don't have an eighth grade education. Their children attend a nearby suburban school, but a social worker says, "There is a stigma attached to the children of the Heights that can't help but affect their school work and outlook on life." Other children make fun of the outhouses in the Heights.

The mold was cast in the 1920s when a real estate developer bought farm land, subdivided it and sold to Negroes, over the objections of local residents. Politically and psychologically, the Heights has been an orphan ever since, and the Negroes are convinced other communities would like to ease them out to make way for industry. "It is a poverty of the spirit more than economic," a social worker thinks.

THE ELDERLY

A poverty of the spirit perhaps even more desolating afflicts the indigent elderly, like Mr. Seczizinski, the man who leads a flophouse existence in north Philadelphia. The 76-year-old Mr. Seczizinski, who came to this country from Poland in 1912, has no friends or relatives.

A large wall clock ticks oppressively in Mr. Seczizinski's room, and a single light bulb hangs on a cord from the ceiling. The linoleum on the floor is wearing thin, and the walls are stained by steam from exposed pipes. The furniture includes four straight chairs, a small bed and a sink.

Rent takes $35 of his $104 monthly income. When other necessities are subtracted, he has about $1 a day for food. Mr. Seczizinski occupies his time wandering about the Market Street area or listening to his small transistor radio.

Mrs. Effie Stokes, a 71-year-old Negro widow who lives about 10 blocks from Mr. Seczizinski, has the same income but remains resolutely cheerful and active. She budgets carefully, but coal bills in winter throw her finances out of kilter. When the money runs out, she sifts the ashes for unburned lumps. "You have to know how to make things last," she says.

POOR MEDICAL CARE

Mrs. Stokes and Mr. Seczizinski share with many of the poor an aversion to doctors and dentists, often found even when they are eligible for Medicare or other help. "I don't go to see no doctor," he says, although he speaks of rheumatism in his legs. Mrs. Stokes says, "I can't recall the last time I've been to a doctor." Nor does she have a dentist. When her teeth hurt, "I rub salt on them and swab them with alcohol. This helps for a while."

Welfare officials can't explain this attitude. A spokesman for the Philadelphia County Board of Assistance says it will pay medical bills for such persons over 65 years of age if the treatment is essential. But many doctors won't accept the Board's $4 payment for an office call. And nursing homes are reluctant to take elderly indigents, for whom the Board will pay only $225 a month.

Other poverty pocket families are equally lacking in medical and dental care. In the Mexican-American town of Lariat, Colo., Richard Naranjo, 13, concedes that he never has brushed his teeth. Dr. William Bradley, a physician who has opened a clinic to help Lariat's adobe dwellers, talks sadly of untreated cases of hepatitis, dysentery, encephalitis and syphilis. "What can you do when the ambulance to Denver costs $125?" he asks. "The medical profession is defeated because there is nothing we can do."

TB AMONG THE ESKIMOS

In the impoverished Hinsdale County area of southern Colorado, there is no hospital. The Dogpatch area between Independence

and Kansas City doesn't get public health services from either city. Emil Notti, an Eskimo leader, says 80% of Eskimo children in remote sections of Alaska have active tuberculosis, but few get treatment.

In some poverty pockets, health is being improved. The 2.8 million-acre reservation of the Papago Indians, in the mesquite and cactus-studded Sonoran desert of Arizona, got a 50-bed hospital in 1961, erected by the U.S. Public Health Service. Now 80% of the reservation's babies are born in the hospital, and infant mortality, which was 60 per 1,000 live births in 1955, has declined to about 40 per 1,000 (the national average is about 25 per 1,000).

The USPHS says also that half the Indians now have adequate water and waste disposal facilities, compared with 10% in 1955. But the life span of the Papago still is in the low 40s, at least 20 years less than that of the general population.

The panoply of Federal OEO programs, augmented by local welfare efforts and initiatives by some religious groups, is showing tentative results in some poverty pockets. In Twinsburg Heights, 30 Negro children are in a preschool Head Start program, and 23 teen-agers are in Upward Bound classes at nearby colleges, hopefully in preparation for higher education.

FORMER NUNS HELP

The OEO has brought preschool, parent-child and remedial reading programs to the Papago Indians, along with instruction in legal aid, community development and youth opportunity. In Chicago's Uptown, former Catholic nuns who left the Glenmary order and formed their own group are winning the confidence of the Southern white migrants.

But social workers complain elsewhere of a lack of funds, of disinterest among local governments and of an inability to overcome deep-seated problems. Peter Louwerys, director of the Farm Workers Opportunity Committee of the American Friends Service Committee, says antipoverty programs haven't measurably bettered living standards of agricultural workers in California.

In Detroit, welfare officials note that a year's residency is necessary to become eligible for relief, and then a migrant has to produce birth certificates for each member of his family. Employers often demand birth certificates, too. In the case of immigrating Negroes, this means a request to a Southern county courthouse. "They're not too anxious to help us," one welfare official says.

In the village of Abram, in Hidalgo County, Texas, the Vega family lives on about $800 a year, the amount daughter Adela, 37, makes on citrus and vegetable farms. Juanita, 22, is a polio victim. Their 56-year-old mother is a widow. Leo J. Leo, mayor of nearby La Joya and a sort of unofficial one-man war on poverty, can't find a single public assistance program for which the family qualifies.

"If ever there was poverty, these people have it," he says heatedly. "My God, something should be done."

DO THINGS COST MORE?

Among the poor, a common complaint is economic exploitation, Mrs. G., a Negro mother who lives in the Detroit ghetto, claims the local supermarket raised prices sharply after this summer's riots (although the city passed, and enforced, an antigouging ordinance). "They wanted $1.78 for a package of six neckbones," she says. "Everything was really high."

The California Farm Labor Office says migrant farm workers get an average wage of $1.40 an hour, but Tom Williams, vice chairman of an OEO program in Ventura County, reads a different story into check stubs supplied by the workers. One man, he says, got $10.37 for nine hours of lemon picking. But after a local growers' association deducted for transportation, glove rental, housing and other matters, net income for the day was $1.12. Such cases aren't unusual, he says.

The poor and uneducated may be vulnerable through lack of information. In Lariat, Colo., a worker for VISTA, the domestic Peace Corps, says Spanish-speaking residents are making instalment payments they can't afford at exorbitantly high interest. "People are signing contracts they don't understand," he says.

Like anyone else, the poor person has extravagances, too. Mrs. Lillie Harrison and her five children in Madison County, Miss., have an income of only $75 monthly, in the form of two relief checks. But this spring she squandered almost 7% of the annual income on her daughter Lena Pearl—$28 for a peach-colored party dress for a school dance and $32.60 more for a class ring. But it was a symbolic event. Lena Pearl probably will be the first of her 14 children to graduate from high school.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I have been critical of some aspects of the antipoverty program. At the same time, however, I have expressed support for other aspects thereof. I want, as much as anyone, to help the poor, especially those persons who will try to help themselves.

As we now approach the final vote on the bill before us, I would have preferred to see the Senate reduce title I by $198 million so as to make the authorization for that title conform to the administration's request. I voted for the Williams amendment which would have brought about a reduction in the title I authorization, but that amendment was defeated.

Nevertheless, in view of the Senate vote on yesterday deleting title II, and thus eliminating the authorization therein amounting to $2.8 billion, and in view of other refinements which have been made during floor debate, I am willing now to vote for the bill. I supported the amendment by Senator PROUTY, which was adopted, to require a thorough investigation of the poverty programs by the General Accounting Office. Moreover, the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] has accepted the amendment which Senator COOPER and I cosponsored to place tighter restrictions and controls over the selection and activities of VISTA volunteers.

Without these improvements which have been made on the Senate floor, and without the deletion of title II, which would have authorized an additional $2.8 billion, I could not have voted for the bill on final passage.

I hope that the Office of Economic Opportunity will exercise greater care in, and control over, the selection and activities of poverty workers so as to avoid, in the future, some of the criticism which I and others have voiced.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I rise in support of S. 2388, the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967.

I believe that the bill as reported by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with the committee amendments together with the amendments that were adopted on the floor will make for an improved bill.

I believe that these amendments will insure certain procedures and safeguards necessary to make the poverty program more effective and responsive to the efforts of our communities in assisting the poor.

In voting for final passage, I am pleased to note that the manager of the bill [Mr. CLARK] accepted four of my amendments which I called up on September 28, and which are incorporated in the final text of the bill. The main thrust of my amendments is to provide for greater participation and responsibilities in the poverty program at the State and community levels and to establish procedures for the selection of applicants serving as volunteers in the VISTA programs where no procedures exist today.

First, the present law provides that the assignment of VISTA volunteers shall be under such terms and conditions as the director may determine but volunteers shall not be assigned to duties or work in any State without the consent of the Governor.

Where an assignment of volunteers has been consented to by the Governor and, at a subsequent time, he does not feel that the volunteers are carrying out their duties in the best interests of the program the present law does not specifically authorize the Governor to request the withdrawal of such volunteers. I have been informed by the Office of Economic Opportunity that in the absence of explicit statutory authorization it is the policy of the agency to withdraw volunteers at any time at the request of the Governor. My amendment would write this policy into the bill so as to avoid any misunderstanding as to the individual responsibilities of the Governor and the Director.

My second amendment requires that the chief elected official or officials of a community have the opportunity to serve on their community action board and if such official desires not to serve, to designate a person to serve in his place. In addition, the amendment specifically provides for membership on community action boards of representatives of business, labor, religious, or other major groups and interests in the community.

It is my belief that if community action programs are to be successful the support of all the community is necessary, not only its private citizens and organizations, but the governing officials of the community, as well. Further, it is necessary to mobilize local resources, including funds, and, we would hope, the abilities and capacities of the community's officials.

The language of the reported bill provided that in assisting in the provision of legal services to the poor, the director shall make arrangements with the principal bar associations in the area. A third amendment I introduced provided that, in addition, they shall seek the advice and comments of the State bar association. I believe that State bar associations are more broadly based, and they usually have a staff which is better able to provide helpful assistance.

My last amendment requires that the Director of OEO employ the same procedures and information of all volunteer applicants in the VISTA programs as is required of those who are selected as representatives of VISTA. In securing its applicants to serve as volunteers in its programs VISTA uses application forms substantially the same as those used by

the civil service. Where such applications reveal circumstances indicating criminal activities, subversive activities, or other forms of misconduct, VISTA then refers the application to the FBI for further investigation.

However, with respect to volunteers who are selected by other agencies funded by OEO, there are no similar procedures or requirements. For example, the Appalachian volunteers have received several million dollars from OEO, but as far as OEO is aware the Appalachian volunteers have no procedures to screen and select their applications, and the Director of OEO has no control over their selection or approval.

My amendment would make applicable to all categories of volunteers the same procedures so as to assure the selection of persons with proper qualifications and good character. At the same time, my amendment would authorize the Director to prescribe other qualifications for those volunteers selected from the poor and low-income residents of the area to be served who cannot meet the educational qualifications of the VISTA applicants.

Today, Senator BYRD, by unanimous consent, introduced an amendment to my amendment which I agreed to and was accepted by the manager of the bill [Mr. CLARK] which makes certain that these procedures apply to volunteers in all of the VISTA title programs.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I would like to call the Senate's attention to an amendment I offered in committee to the Job Corps section of S. 2388. This amendment is incorporated in section 113(c). The amendment provides for the establishment and the operation of a model combination vocational school and skill center. The center will be located in an urban area having a high dropout rate, a large number of unemployed youths and a need in the area for a combination vocational school and skill center. The amendment will attempt to "determine whether upgraded vocational education schools could eliminate or substantially reduce the school dropout problem and to demonstrate how communities could make maximum utilization of expensive educational and training facilities."

The assigned task of the center will be to prevent or reduce the dropout rate of the area schools and secondly, to train those in the community who have previously dropped out of school or who are in need of remedial education and training. Under the amendment, the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, in cooperation with the Commissioner of Education, will enter into one or more agreements with State educational agencies to pay for the establishment and the operation of such centers. The amendment requires that any agreement entered into contain provisions to assure that, first, a job survey be made of the area; second, the training program of the school and skill center reflect the job market needs as reflected by the survey; third, an advisory committee composed of representatives of business, labor, education, and community leaders be formed to follow the center's activities and to make periodic recommendations regarding its operations; fourth, arrangements have been worked out with schools in the area and the administrator of the skill center for maximum utilization of the center both during and after school hours; and, fifth, such accounting and evaluation procedures as the Director and the Commissioner of Education deem necessary to carry out the purpose of this project will be provided.

A few observations regarding these requirements may be useful. First, requirements of a job survey be made available to the area and that the training program of the school and skill center reflect the job market needs as reflected by the survey. While this may seem so elementary that one would wonder why it is necessary to write such a requirement into the statute, the facts are that, in all too many cases, this fundamental step has not been taken. As a result, we often find the training and skills taught have little if any relation to the local and State job markets. As a result, at the end of their training, graduates frequently find frustration, not jobs. These requirements will help to assure that jobs are available by requiring that the center be geared to the present and projected job opportunities. By further insisting as the third requirement does that "an advisory committee composed of business, labor, education, and community leaders be formed to follow the center's activities and to make periodic recommendations regarding its operation," we will make certain that there will be a continuous following of the center's activities to assure that the centers will respond to changes in the job market and that there will be the needed interaction between the centers and industry, labor, education, and the community.

The Chamber of Commerce of the United States in a task force report, entitled "The Disadvantaged Poor: Education and Employment," underscored the need for these requirements by noting:

> (One of the reasons) why vocational-technical education suffers is that courses are insufficiently related to actual labor market conditions; courses often prepare people for jobs that either do not exist or are disappearing. As John H. Fischer, President of Teachers College, Columbia University, points out, "schools have adhered too long and too closely to concepts of [vocational] curriculum and organization developed forty years ago." In some places, courses are still centered around woodworking and mechanical drawing at a time when the economy needs—and compensates well—mechanics, computer operators, electrical appliance repairmen, welders, tool and die makers, carpenters, lathe operators and a host of other highly respectable skills.
>
> As Dr. Swanson points out and as the Task Force learned first hand during field trips, schools do not generally know what jobs are available in a community. Schools do not generally know of the changing skills and knowledge requirements of many job opportunities. Less is known about the number and kinds of job opportunities that may be available in the future when today's younger students complete their educations. Without current and projected information about the labor market, schools cannot design and carry out effective vocational-technical education programs. To the extent the schools fail to prepare their graduates for jobs, the image of vocational-technical education deteriorates. A vicious circle effect emerges. As one panelist told the Task Force, the single most effective way to uplift the prestige of vocational-technical education and promote incentives for people to enroll is for vocational education to demonstrate success in leading people to well paid and respectable jobs.
>
> Effective vocational education is pivotal to the alleviation of poverty. Few jobs remain that require no training or skills. For every scientist and engineer half a dozen or more technicians and craftsmen are needed. And the men who build, test, try out, adjust and repair equipment are as vital in an industrial economy as the scientists and engineers who create. Graduates of vocational-technical training are in great demand by industry and business. In a recent survey by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 90 percent of the local chamber of commerce executives reported that their members have been voicing concern about the shortages of skilled manpower.

An advisory committee assigned the responsibility to continually review the center's activities and to make periodic recommendations thereto should prove mutually beneficial to the center and to labor, industry, and the community. The chamber's task force discussed the benefits that may result therefrom in the following manner:

> To achieve this, educators should take the initiative, inviting the interest and involvement of business and industry. Businessmen can help design vocational-technical education programs by keeping education officials thoroughly informed about current and anticipated job markets and about changes in the skills and knowledge needed by the economy. Businessmen can help by lending their own experts to help the school system train vocational-technical teachers. Businessmen can help by providing up-to-date equipment to schools or advising school officials about new equipment being introduced in industry. Businessmen can help by taking an active interest in placing graduates of vocational-technical training in jobs immediately upon graduation. Businessmen can help by insisting that vocational-technical schools publish periodic reports on their graduates' success in finding jobs for which they were trained or in entering apprenticeship and advanced training programs for which the schools qualify them. Finally, businessmen can help by promoting more and better vocational-technical training high schools and junior colleges wherever they are needed.
>
> It is in the interest of businessmen to involve themselves actively in public school vocational-technical education. To the extent that public schools can turn out people ready for employment, businessmen are saved training expenses. In many cases businessmen are saved taxes that would be necessary to meet welfare and law enforcement problems often associated with undereducation and unemployment. Remarkable progress has resulted where business has taken an active part in vocational-technical education.
>
> Labor leaders can also make a contribution to improved vocational-technical education. Craft unions can open their apprenticeship programs to graduates of vocational programs, without regard to race or minority affiliation. Labor leaders can cooperate by making people available to speak to young people and acquaint them with various aspects of different jobs and with expected on-the-job behavior. And labor leaders can consult with businessmen and educators in designing programs that prepare graduates adequately to cope with on-the-job conditions.

The fourth requirement "that arrangements be worked out with schools in the area and the administrator of

the skill center for maximum utilization of the center both during and after school hours" is aimed at demonstrating how communities may make maximum utilization of an expensive facility. American citizens across the Nation have a tremendous investment in educational facilities. Yet, anachronisms from our past linger in American education.

Today, as in our past, at the end of our typical schoolday, which generally continues to run from 8:30 to 3:30, and at the close of the school year, which generally runs from September to June, the schools are deserted. I have even read cases where playgrounds have been locked, thus preventing youngsters from using them. There are, of course, places where the schools are used to a greater extent and summer programs are coming into vogue in more and more areas. This, however, is not the general picture nationwide. These customs originated in our agrarian past. It allowed students an opportunity to assist with the chores in the evening and the 3-month interval in the summer enabled the gathering of the harvest.

For today's urban Johnny, the reasons and rationale for the customs no longer hold true. This is particularly the case in some of our schools located in urban areas serving a large number of disadvantaged youngsters. Here the youngsters need extra help, extra time. Particularly, then, for these youngsters carryovers from our past need reexamining. Schools should be the work horse of the community. They should be the hub of community activity. They should be used as nearly as possible around the clock, around the year. Thus, requirement 4 attempts to demonstrate how an expensive facility with expensive equipment may be used to the maximum feasible extent.

The fifth requirement assures that accounting and evaluating procedures will be provided. Educational level of the participants, vocational skills, placement records, and the number of dropouts along with other matters are critical if we are to make a judgment as to the success of a program. I have been insisting that the poverty program provide the data necessary for Congress to evaluate its programs. This requirement will see that the information is provided for this pilot program.

Mr. President, 750,000 young Americans drop out of school each year. For these dropouts a difficult road lies ahead. Today's technological society demands educated and skilled workers. Job opportunities for the unskilled and the poorly educated continue to diminish. In reading the Nation's newspapers, one can see daily the evidence of the mismatch between the job openings and the workers. There are jobs available. Unfortunately, lack of education and training prevent many from filling them. These 750,000 dropouts must be the target. For lack of education and training are the root causes of many of our problems.

The amendment I offered has the potential of reaching these root causes. I am most excited about its potential. I intend to follow the pilot projects most closely.

Unlike the Job Corps, which is a repair job and an expensive one, the purpose of this program is preventive. We have heard testimony before the Subcommittee on Education expressing concern over the imbalance of Federal funding going to treat the problem—Job Corps—and Federal funds going to prevent the problem before it occurs—vocational education. We spend $295 million for Job Corps to repair and rehabilitate the dropout, but we are investing only $230 million of Federal funds on vocational education.

Mr. Johnson, president of the American Vocational Association, put it this way:

> It seems to me that there is today at the federal level an imbalance of expenditures for various levels and types of educational programs. For higher education, federal expenditures are $4.5 billion. For elementary and secondary education, $3.2 billion; for occupational training of various types, including Office of Economic Opportunity programs, MDTA, $1.8 billion. Of the $1.8 billion, only $280 million was authorized for vocational training in high schools, other vocational schools, community and junior colleges, and technical institutions.

Yet, Mr. President, presently there are 7 million youngsters enrolled in vocational educational programs and by 1970, this number is expected to reach 9½ million. Even if the Job Corps were successful with all of the youngsters it has served—and it clearly is not—it would still be a "drop in the bucket." It seems rather clear that vocational education must be our frontline in our battle against the dropouts. It is further clear to me, Mr. President, that preventive programs are less costly and more effective than programs which attempt to rehabilitate and repair a youngster after he has already departed from the public school system. The number-of-dropouts rate makes it imperative that we mount an attack. It is my hope that this pilot program will be a significant step in that direction.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, if I have any to yield back, I yield back the remainder of my time.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, it may be that the distinguished acting majority leader can be responsive to the question I have in mind.

I believe on yesterday we determined that after action on this measure had been completed, we would proceed to the Department of Transportation appropriation bill.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is that still the plan?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. That is still the plan.

Mr. DIRKSEN. And following that, we were to take up State, Justice, and Commerce?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I believe that has been changed, and it has been determined that NASA will follow Transportation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. And then State, Justice, and Commerce?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. In the Senator's judgment, are we likely to get beyond NASA today?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. No.

Mr. DIRKSEN. So State, Justice, and Commerce would go over, probably, until tomorrow?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Or Monday.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What is the plan about coming in tomorrow?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I have not discussed that with the majority leader. I see he has returned to the Chamber. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in response to the question asked by the distinguished minority leader, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I had intended to ask the distinguished majority leader about that schedule, but I believe the changes have been noted: that NASA will follow Transportation, and State, Justice, Commerce probably thereafter, and then finally public works?

Mr. MANSFIELD. With one minor correction. Transportation appropriations will be laid before the Senate following the pending business. It will be followed by NASA, which, in turn will be followed by public works so that, if possible, we will get to that Monday, and give those who are interested a chance to proceed on that bill, to be followed by State, Commerce, and Justice. The last two items are subject to change, if extraordinary circumstances develop.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, from this colloquy, I think every Senator can satisfy himself as to what lies ahead for the remainder of the week and Monday.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The leadership should point out that there may be arguments relative to the SST on the Transportation appropriation bill, and there may be some questions raised during the discussion of NASA. There will be considerable debate on the public works appropriation bill, and there will be discussion and debate on the State, Justice, and Commerce bill.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wanted to give the leadership this information on the appropriation bills: There will be at least one vote on the Transportation appropriation. On NASA, we have four items different than in the House bill, so there could possibly be

three or four votes on those items, but that is about all. I do not think there will be many more amendments on NASA, because the disagreement involved only four items.

Mr. MANSFIELD. At least that is enough to give the Senate notice that there may be votes tomorrow.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If we do not finish NASA tonight, there will undoubtedly be a vote on NASA tomorrow, and a vote on final passage, naturally.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, adding to what the distinguished majority leader has said, there probably will be some controversy about the item of the appropriation for the Subversive Activities Control Board.

I shall resist, as best I can, every effort to diminish, to reduce, or to cut out that appropriation; and, along with it, I propose to follow up and enlist the aid of every one of the veterans' organizations in this country, which are firmly behind the bill that is now on the calendar; and accordingly, since there has been indication of a possible little filibuster to prevent action, I have filed a motion to suspend the rules, and if we preserve the appropriation, I shall ask to have that bill considered.

It will have to be done under a suspension of the rules, because it is legislative in character, and I am not unmindful of the fact that it requires a two-thirds vote. But every endeavor will be made, under that motion to suspend, to have that added, and to complete this action once and for all.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2388) to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, and for other purposes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All remaining time having been yielded back, the question is, Shall the bill pass? On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BENNETT (after having voted in the negative). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withdraw my vote.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG]. If he were present and voting he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

Mr. MANSFIELD (after having voted in the affirmative). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]. If he were present, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withdraw my vote.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia (after having voted in the affirmative). On this vote I have a live pair with the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. Were he present, he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." I withdraw my vote.

Mr. SPARKMAN (after having voted in the negative). On this vote I have a live pair with the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE]. If he were present, he would vote "yea." If I were privileged to vote, I would vote "nay." I withdraw my vote.

Mr. SPONG (after having voted in the affirmative). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. Were he here and voting he would vote "nay." Were I to vote, I would vote "yea." I withdraw my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], and the Senators from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL and Mr. TALMADGE] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA].

If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut would vote "yea" and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS] is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON].

If present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "yea" and the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] is absent on official business.

The pair of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE] has been previously amended.

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD].

If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay" and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] is paired with the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay" and the Senator from Utah would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 60, nays 21, as follows:

[No. 282 Leg.]

YEAS—60

Aiken	Bible	Church
Allott	Boggs	Clark
Anderson	Brewster	Cooper
Baker	Burdick	Cotton
Bartlett	Cannon	Dirksen
Bayh	Case	Fong
Fulbright	Long, Mo.	Nelson
Gore	Long, La.	Pearson
Griffin	Magnuson	Pell
Gruening	McCarthy	Percy
Harris	McGee	Prouty
Hart	McGovern	Proxmire
Hatfield	McIntyre	Ribicoff
Inouye	Metcalf	Scott
Jackson	Mondale	Smathers
Javits	Monroney	Smith
Kennedy, Mass.	Montoya	Symington
Kennedy, N.Y.	Morse	Tydings
Kuchel	Mundt	Williams, N.J.
Lausche	Muskie	Yarborough

NAYS—21

Curtis	Hartke	Miller
Dominick	Hickenlooper	Murphy
Eastland	Holland	Stennis
Ellender	Hollings	Thurmond
Ervin	Jordan, N.C.	Tower
Fannin	Jordan, Idaho	Williams, Del.
Hansen	McClellan	Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—19

Bennett	Hill	Russell
Brooke	Hruska	Sparkman
Byrd, Va.	Mansfield	Spong
Byrd, W. Va.	Morton	Talmadge
Carlson	Moss	Young, Ohio
Dodd	Pastore	
Hayden	Randolph	

So the bill (S. 2388) was passed.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. MORSE. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to make technical and clerical corrections in the engrossment of S. 2388.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Senate has witnessed the outstanding skill and ability of the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]. He directed this authorization for the war against poverty with the same articulate advocacy that has characterized his many notable achievements in this body. The Senate deeply appreciates his efforts on this measure; those who shall continue to benefit from the poverty program are forever in his debt.

Joining Senator CLARK to assure this overwhelming success were the two senior committee members from the other side of the aisle, whose diligence and strong efforts in behalf of the poverty stricken have long been well known. I refer of course to the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY]. Both exhibited their abiding devotion to the welfare and interest of the poor; their strong efforts are immensely appreciated.

The junior Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] similarly are to be commended for helping to obtain the decisive approval of the Senate on this measure. Cooperating to make certain that the proposal would receive efficient disposition were the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] and the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY]. They demonstrated a broad and knowledgeable understanding of the poverty program, as did the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], and

the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA].

While the Senate spent nearly 2 weeks discussing this authorization, I do feel that its thorough consideration was of great value, insofar as it highlighted much of the constructive work being accomplished by the poverty program, noting also some of the mistakes that have occurred. In any event, the authorization adopted will permit the war on poverty to continue as a viable and effective program.

The Senate may be proud of another great achievement.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION APPROPRIATIONS, 1968

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 557, H.R. 11456. I do this so that the bill will become the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. An act (H.R. 11456) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

Mr. HOLLINGS obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS] has finished with his remarks, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the chairman of the committee handling the bill, be recognized.

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

OUR NATIONAL INTEREST IN VIETNAM

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I rise today to address myself to one specific portion of a much larger question—the question of Vietnam. It is not my purpose to debate the origin of our involvement there nor do I intend to comment on the conduct of the war. I support our involvement there. I disagree in part with the way the war is being conducted.

But my purpose today is to answer what I believe is the question uppermost in the minds of the citizens of this country: What is our national interest in Vietnam? Recently, this question has been asked on the floor of the Senate. Twice I have heard it said that our national security is not dependent on our stand in Vietnam. This assertion came from two of the most distinguished Members of this body—the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. President, I do not pretend to have the experience of either of these gentlemen in foreign affairs, nor do I presume to place my judgment over theirs. But I do not agree. I believe our national security is at stake, and I believe that we do, indeed, have a great national interest in Vietnam.

I do not mean to imply that if we do not prevail in Vietnam, the battleground tomorrow will be Los Angeles County, because that is not so. However, in my opinion, our national interests in Vietnam are just as great as if this were the case. I believe our interest there is twofold.

First, we are fighting in Southeast Asia for the credibility of this Nation and her commitments. The belief that the United States means what she says in her international commitments is the keystone to freedom and is by necessity, the cornerstone of our foreign policy.

By continuing to honor our commitment in Vietnam, we are proving this credibility in three ways:

First. We are telling the Communist nations that aggression and the use of force against free nations shall be met with force by this country.

Second. We are telling our allies that we keep our word, that they can believe what we say, that this country fully intends to stand behind NATO, SEATO, CENTO, ANZUS, or any other common defense pact to which we are party.

Third. We are telling the uncommitted nations of the world that our commitment to freedom and self-determination is much more than a policy line—we are saying that it is a living, breathing, viable doctrine—and the very essence of the democratic system.

The second part of our twofold purpose for fighting in Vietnam is the autonomy of Southeast Asia. And guaranteeing this autonomy is inextricably bound to our national interest.

The aggression of the Communists in South Vietnam is not the only example of aggression in Southeast Asia.

Today we have Communist cadres in Laos, in Thailand, and more recently in Cambodia.

These countries are already earmarked for Communist takeover if we do not prevail in Vietnam. There is no question about this in my mind. There is no doubt about it in the minds of the leaders of Southeast Asia.

Recently, Lee Kuang Yew, of Singapore, said:

> If we can prevail, all of eastern Asia will be closer to stability than at any time in this century. If you do not hold out, we are finished.

Similar sentiments have been voiced by President Marcos, of the Philippines, and Thanat Khoman, Foreign Minister of Thailand.

Charles de Gaulle may sulk over his lost colonialism. After defeat in Vietnam, he may find the stand of other nations for peace in the Far East a threat to peace.

But the nations immediately involved know who is who and what is what.

They know it is aggression in Vietnam—not civil war.

They know the ultimate goal of the Communists.

They know, as I know, that South Vietnam is merely the opening play of an attempt to subjugate all of Southeast Asia through "national liberation."

Other than a continuing desire for world conquest, the motivation behind the Communist aggression in this part of the globe is not difficult to fathom. Southeast Asia is one of the richly endowed areas in the world.

This is why the French fought so hard to maintain their hegemony there.

The area known as the "rice bowl of the world" has the potential to feed the hungry of India and Red China combined.

It contains over 250 million people, or some 10 percent of the world's population.

It produces 80 percent of the world's natural rubber and 60 percent of the world's supply of tin.

Additionally, large amounts of oil, copra, bauxite, and sugar are produced in this region.

Is there any wonder that the Communists deem Southeast Asia such a prize—a prize to be taken by sheer force if this country does not stand as we are standing in Vietnam and providing the shield against aggression?

This brings me to the final point of my remarks, and my answer to another question which I believe the American people deserve to have anwered:

And what will be the result of this Nation's stand in Vietnam?

What do we hope to achieve?

The first and most obvious desired result would be the end of aggression against South Vietnam. I would hope that with the end of this aggression, the United States could bring its troops home and proceed with the business of assisting Vietnam in building a strong and stable economy and the type of representative democratic government that I am convinced they want. If we are successful in this effort, then I believe we would realize an additional and even greater benefit in that we would acquire as allies many of the now uncommitted Southeast Asian countries.

On Tuesday, the Senator from Arkansas pressed the Senator from Illinois, questioning:

> What does the Senator say is the objective of our war in Vietnam? What is it that we wish to achieve that is worthy of what we are doing? Does he want a colony?

Would the Senator from Arkansas have argued in World War II that our goal was to make a colony of Germany or of Italy? When we prevailed over Japan, did we make that a colony? When we assisted the Nationalist Chinese, did we make colonies of Quemoy and Matsu? When we defended South Korea, did we give her colonial government or free government? When we intervened at the Dominican, did we acquire a colony or did we give her people freedom? When we flew the blockade and President Kennedy proclaimed "Ich bin ein Berliner." Did he mean that the people of Berlin were American subjects—or symbols of a free people for the world to behold? Who gave Cuba her first and only freedom? Who gave autonomy to the Philippines? Who took possessions and gave them statehood and citizenship? No, my colleagues, to suggest that our stand in

Vietnam is tinged by any other than a hope for world peace and freedom belies the history of this Republic and her people.

It has been said that in political discussion, heat is in inverse proportion to knowledge, and the debate on Vietnam proves the point. The torrent of argument has completely obscured the greatness of the battle. This greatness lies not in destroying the enemy but in building a nation. General Westmoreland calls it "the work of a generation." This is the first time in history that men engaged in war are at the same time building a free society. The eyes of over 1 billion people *in the Far East* watch with interest. Since the emergence of Red China, Peking has told these people that the white man was not interested in the yellow man; that rich America had no concern for the poor lands of the Pacific; and that communism was the wave of the future. Now 38 nations are actively engaged in the support of South Vietnam. And the greatest Asian effort to preserve its own freedom is underway. The real issue is not between those who want to escalate and those who want to come to terms. The fundamental issue is whether America, the world's richest and most powerful nation, possesses the greatness of heart, the tenacity of spirit, and the moral strength to give what communism has failed to give the nations—a great and satisfying purpose for living as well as the means for livelihood. In other words, the issue is not the escalation of the military, but the escalation of the spirit of man. We have already taken significant steps down that road. A new constitution has been promulgated and a representative government chosen in free elections. American aid has brought to the people of South Vietnam health care, and agricultural technology. But far more important than money, machines, and materialism—we have brought them hope. Hope that a war of 20 years duration might finally come to an end—hope that they might be permitted to live in peace and prosperity.

If we can do this for Vietnam, we can do it for the millions of Asia. And, unwittingly, for the first time, we would have a Far East policy—a policy with which we can all agree. And even more significant, we will have come one step closer to the end of Communist aggression and one step closer to world freedom and world peace. If we can make that step, then we will have indeed served our national interest well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. BYRD of Virginia in the chair). Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the Senator from Mississippi was to have been recognized. Since he is not in the Chamber, the Chair recognizes the Senator from Illinois.

VIETNAM—A RESOLUTION

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, on behalf of Senators BENNETT, BOGGS, BYRD of Virginia, CARLSON, CLARK, COTTON, CURTIS, HANSEN, HATFIELD, HRUSKA, JAVITS, JORDAN of Idaho, MORTON, PEARSON, PROUTY, RANDOLPH, RIBICOFF, SCOTT, TALMADGE, THURMOND, and YOUNG of North Dakota, I am submitting the following resolution:

S. RES. 173

Whereas a solution of the Vietnam war can best be found through regional cooperation in military, diplomatic, economic and psychological efforts; and

Whereas pending negotiations for a just settlement of the war, the non-Communist nations of Asia must work together; and

Whereas the leaders of these nations insist that prosecution of the war is of vital concern to their peoples; and

Whereas the leaders of South Vietnam insist that prosecution of the war is essential to the security of their country,

Resolved, in the hope that it will promote more Allied cooperation in bringing an end to the war, it is the sense of the Senate that—

(a) The Armed Forces of the United States should not continue to bear an ever-increasing proportion of the fighting in Vietnam; and

(b) The non-Communist nations of Asia, including South Vietnam, should contribute substantially more manpower and resources to share the military diplomatic, economic and psychological tasks in Vietnam; and

(c) The President of the United States should move with greater determination to obtain commitments of such manpower and resources in support of the effort in Vietnam.

Mr. President, less than 3 months before his death, President Kennedy said of the Vietnam war and of our South Vietnamese allies:

> 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 . . . .

At that time Asian troops still carried the burden of the war. There were only 15,000 American forces in South Vietnam.

Today the United States carries the burden of the war. More than half a million American men are involved there now. Asian troops, other than the South Vietnamese themselves, number fewer than 50,000. In some periods, American casualties have surpassed South Vietnamese casualties.

Despite President Johnson's 1964 warning that "We don't want our American boys to do the fighting for Asian boys," we are tied down in a land war in Asia and we have taken over the major burden of combat from the South Vietnamese. In other words, it has become our war.

I think this is as much a mistake today as it would have been in 1963, when President Kennedy spoke, or in 1964, when President Johnson spoke. U.S. domination of the war is a mistake because American men and money are being sucked into the quicksand of Vietnam in extravagant numbers, and the end is nowhere in sight. It is a mistake because it is the Asians' freedom and right to self determination that presumably will be endangered if South Vietnam falls. The war is already costing the United States almost $30 billion a year, yet failure threatens Asian security far more than our own.

It is long since time that Asian nations did their part by contributing greater economic and military aid to the effort in South Vietnam. They should be involved also in the psychological tasks of pacification and in diplomatic initiatives toward negotiations. By our presence in Vietnam, we have saved these nations millions of dollars they otherwise might have had to spend on national security. It is time they invested a portion of that saving in the support of South Vietnam.

By this I do not mean that the war should be escalated. Rather, I would hope that fresh incoming Asian troops and pacification teams would gradually lighten the load borne by our men. Instead of American manpower soaring to 600,000 and more, we might gradually decrease the necessity for more American troops. Although we might help to equip new Asian contingents, our own share of the bill in Vietnam would be somewhat smaller. We could thus afford to attend better to some of our domestic problems, particularly the urban crisis.

Most of the non-Communist Asian nations have considered helping South Vietnam. But why should they risk the lives of their own young men or spend their own national treasure when the United States seems willing to do it for them, and do it alone?

The United States appears anxious to police the entire world. Well, let it, they may say to themselves; we will build up our own nations, and leave the United States to save the world.

Perhaps that sounds harsh, but I have no doubt that there is truth in it. What possible incentive is there for other nations to assist South Vietnam when the United States has so massively and completely taken over the war? After all, who for a moment thinks the United States needs help in fighting its wars? We forever boast of our unmatched power. We seem willing and able to pour in men by the hundreds of thousands wherever they are needed. We have announced that North Vietnam and the Vietcong have been stopped. So why should any other nation, wisely putting its own self-interest first, expend its resources in Vietnam?

They would not, and generally speaking, they do not. And as long as we persist in making this our war, they will not.

Until we notify them that our commitment in Southeast Asia is by no means open-ended, our potential allies will feel they have little to gain and much to lose by participating in this struggle. No one is anxious to enter a war that others seem willing and clearly capable of handling themselves.

I think we must make it clear, especially to our Asian friends, that we have no intention of indefinitely protecting their interests without their full cooperation and participation.

Some of these nations can be expected to object strenuously as we urge them to do their part. Their objections will be primarily political and economic. Politically, some will say, we cannot afford the risks of doing more in Vietnam; many of our people are opposed to the war. We might remind them that many people here are vigorously opposed to a war in which our national self-interest seems far less at stake than that of Asian nations closer to the conflict.

Economically, they will protest, the war

in Vietnam deserves low priority—we cannot afford to help the Vietnamese and still do all that we want to do in our own lands. In reply, we might remind them of our estimated budget deficit of $29 billion; we might show them the front page of any American newspaper: stories of riots, slums, crime, poverty, and pollution indicate that we are sacrificing many urgent projects at home to help Asians half-a-world away. Surely they can sacrifice as much to assist their own neighbors.

The primary purpose of the resolution I am introducing today is to indicate to our Asian friends that the United States wants and needs their help, and to bolster the hand of the President in getting that help. Whether we feel our country is doing too much in Vietnam or too little, I think most of us agree that our Asian allies are not doing enough. This resolution indicates just that.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. PERCY. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. McGEE. The Senator from Illinois and I had a rather protracted dialog on several questions affecting our foreign policy in Asia earlier this week. The point raised here is a part of the pattern of that dialog. Thus, I hesitate to repeat some of the things said on that occasion. The real burden of it comes down to this: That the governments in Asia know that their fates are hanging in the balance as to how the war comes out in Vietnam.

Where I believe the Senator from Illinois misses their point, as one candid enough to say so, is that when the breakthrough began a little over 2 years ago, they did not have the resources or the trained manpower ready to move that fast in order to stop it. The only alternative facing them at that time, in their opinion, was to knuckle under, to learn to live under an umbrella held over them by the Chinese. They say so, in all bluntness. The Philippines, Malaysia, Thailand, Indonesia now all say that. Indonesia came very close to such a demise.

It seems to me that our first priority, in our national interest, leaving them out of it for the moment, is to try to prevent that from happening. I think that this is the difference, in the national interest of our country, that Southeast Asia not come apart, that it not go under, that it not come under the domination of mainland China.

Therefore, it puts this matter in a different order of things. As we said the other day in colloquy, we all want more help from everyone, from our friends in Europe, in Latin America, and in Asia. But I think we have to bear in mind that these people are already contributing a great deal. This is an area which makes a difference to them. When I say "a great deal," we are talking in relative terms, because of what our disproportionate capability, sometimes, can do to diminish what they, in fact, are doing.

Suffice it to suggest that the total non-American, non-ARVN manpower contribution in South Vietnam is larger than was the total non-American, non-Korean contribution in the Korean war, that some headway is being made, that this has been a rather steady growth of participation by the Southeast Asians themselves. I think the highest point reached in the Korean war was 48,000 troops outside of the ROK's and the Americans. The present non-American, non-Vietnamese manpower commitment in the field right now is approximately 60,000—59,000-plus.

They are moving in the right direction. I think that, when we add to that the varied kinds of contributions made by the Asians, it is an injustice to them to cast aspersions on their efforts, and particularly for us to appear to be—I guess we could say—blackjacking them into greater participation. Their efforts have been going on, if I may say so to the distinguished Senator from Illinois, vigorously, and they have been continuing at every level through every source and through every kind of official and nonofficial channel at all times to try to get them to mobilize all of which they are capable.

It is important that we be mindful of the difference between Americans persuading friends and allies to participate, and a totalitarian regime commanding satellites. There is a difference between allies and satellites. I think that the process of negotiating with allies who are equals, in the international sovereignty sense, requires a great deal more finesse, sophistication, and understanding on our part to try to bring it about.

The fact that the participation of the Asian countries has steadily risen rather than declined, as the Senator suggests in part (a) of his resolution, should suggest to him as well that we are moving forward on this front.

The Koreans have more men committed there, in proportion to their population, than does the United States. The ARVN groups have multiplied their troop commitments in the past 6 months at a greater rate—again, in line with the proportional manpower commitment statistics.

They are not shying away from an effort. They are not reneging on an obligation. I could take the time to go nation by nation, but I will not take that time. I will put it in only as a matter of record from a whole collection of between 30 and 40 nations which are doing something. But, in particular, the breakdown on the Asian nations and what they are doing, I think, belongs in it as part of the picture.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the material and facts covering this subject.

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

FREE WORLD ASSISTANCE TO VIETNAM AS OF OCTOBER 1, 1967

Thirty-one nations besides the United States are assisting Viet-Nam under the Free World Assistance Program. Six other countries not considered part of the FWA program and the United Nations also assist, and promises of help have come from three other nations. Five Asian countries now have almost 60,000 troops on the ground in Viet-Nam. A detailed listing by geographic area follows:

FAR EAST

Australia

Australia is providing a wide and substantial range of aid to Viet-Nam under the Colombo Plan and by direct bilateral assistance. Economic aid since 1964 is valued at more than $10 million.

Military aid consists of:

1. Approximately 5,750 combat troops including a brigade and support, and a squadron of 8 Canberra bombers. In addition, they provide naval assistance and a guided missile destroyer.

2. 100 combat advisors (primarily specialists in jungle warfare).

3. A 73-man air force unit at Vung Tau with six Australian caribou planes which fly daily logistical transport missions in support of Vietnamese military forces.

Economic and technical assistance includes:

1. Three surgical teams, totaling 37 personnel, in 3 provincial hospitals. These teams, in addition to performing major operations, have established a blood bank and are giving lessons in nursing.

2. A group of civil engineers working on water supply and road construction projects.

3. Three experts in dairy and crop practices and radio techniques.

4. Training of 130 Vietnamese in Australia.

5. In goods and materials: 1,250,000 textbooks in Vietnamese for rural schools; 3,300 tons of corrugated roofing for Vietnamese military dependents' housing; 6 large community windmills; 15,750 sets of hand tools; 400 radio sets and 2,400 loud-speakers; 16,000 blankets and 14,000 cases of condensed milk.

6. A 55 kilowatt broadcasting station at Ban Me Thuot.

The Australian Government decided on February 1 to increase its non-military aid to Viet-Nam during FY 1967 to $2 million. This will permit substantial enlargement of current medical and civic action programs and the undertaking of new projects such as providing equipment for refugee resettlement centers.

Republic of China

The Republic of China has provided:

1. An 80-man agricultural team.

2. An 18-man military psychological warfare team.

3. A 34-man electrical power mission under the leadership of Taipower.

4. A 16-man surgical team.

China has also provided training for more than 200 Vietnamese in Taiwan. In the way of goods and materials, they have provided 26 aluminum prefabricated warehouses, agricultural tools, seeds and fertilizers, 500,000 copies of mathematics textbooks and an electrical power substation.

Japan

Japan has provided over $55 million worth of economic assistance to Viet-Nam, chiefly through reparations. Japan has sent two medical teams, considerable amounts of medical goods (4,544 cases), 20,000 transistor radios and 25 ambulances. It has provided technical personnel and funds for the construction of a large power dam across the Da Nhim River and electrical transmission line. A new medical aid agreement ($1.1 million) was signed in June 1967.

Korea

Korea has sent approximately 48,800 troops including:

1. 2 combat divisions and 1 combat brigade.

2. A 130-man Mobile Army Surgical Hospital (MASH).

3. 10 military instructors in Korean karate for training Vietnamese military in hand-to-hand combat.

4. A 2,200-man Task Force Unit composed of the following elements: 1 Army engineer

battalion, 1 Headquarters group, 1 Army Transportation company, 1 Marine Corps Engineer company, 1 Infantry battalion, 1 LST and 2 LSMs, 1 Composite Support unit (communications, medical supplies, etc.).

Korean military medical personnel are providing some medical care to the local population in areas where ROK troops are stationed. In addition, 7 civilian medical teams totalling 118 doctors, nurses and support personnel are working in provincial health programs.

Laos

One million *kip* ($4,167) for flood relief in 1965 and a small cash donation for refugees in 1966.

Malaysia

Since 1963, Malaysia has trained over 2,000 Vietnamese military and police officers. Groups of 30–60 are regularly sent for about a month's training in counterinsurgency with Malaysian Special Constabulary. Malaysia has previously provided substantial amounts of counterinsurgency materials, primarily military and police transport such as armored behicles. Medicines and relief supplies have also been donated.

New Zealand

New Zealand has sent an artillery battery and an infantry company (approximately 350 men) and provided a 25-man army engineer detachment.

In *non-military aid*, New Zealand has sent a 15-man surgical team, and a professor in English language for the University of Saigon. A second 16-man medical team will be sent to Binh Dinh province. They are presently training 83 Vietnamese in New Zealand and have provided NZ£7,500 ($21,000) for equipment for a technical high school. They are also assisting by providing approximately $600,000 for a science building at the University of Saigon.

Philippines

The Philippine Government has sent a 2,000-man military engineering unit with security support personnel, a station hospital, and rural health and civic action teams.

In *non-military aid*, approximately 60 Philippine civic action personnel including military and civilian medical teams have been working in Viet-Nam for several years.

Thailand

Thailand has sent a total of approximately 2,200 men including a recently arrived combat brigade. A 150-man Thai naval group manning an LST and PGM patrol craft arrived in Viet-Nam in December 1966. A 35-man air force contingent has been flying operational transport missions for the Vietnamese forces. The Thais have also been providing jet training for Vietnamese pilots in Thailand.

In *non-military aid*, the Thais have provided rice for refugees and cement and zinc roofing materials. At the Manila Conference, the Thais offered the Vietnamese a $20 million rice credit. The Thais have also announced they will send a medical unit to Viet-Nam.

MIDDLE EAST

Greece

Greece has contributed $15,000 worth of medical supplies.

Iran

Iran has contributed 1,000 tons of petroleum products to Viet-Nam and has despatched a 20-man medical team to Viet-Nam.

Turkey

Turkey has provided medicines and also offered to provide a substantial amount of cement.

EUROPE

Austria

Austria has offered to supply medical supplies, blankets, tents, through the Austrian Red Cross.

Belgium

Belgium has provided medicines and an ambulance and has given scholarships for 15 Vietnamese to study in Belgium.

Denmark

Denmark has provided medical supplies and has offered to train 12 Vietnamese nurses in Denmark.

Germany

Personnel in Vietnam

A 3,000-ton hospital ship, the "helgoland" with 8 doctors, 30 other medical personnel and 145 beds is on duty in Viet-Nam.

Seven Germans, a director and six instructors, are teaching at the new Vietnamese-German Technical High School at Thu Duc near Saigon. At Hue University there are five Germans: three physicians in the Medical School, a professor of music, a professor of German language, and one expert in forestry is working at the Department of Rural Affairs, Saigon.

Vietnamese in Germany

Forty Vietnamese are studying in Germany and the Germans have agreed to accept 30 more primarily for training as future instructors in the technical high school. A considerable number have previously been trained.

Goods and Materials

The Germans have provided the following credits:

(1) DM 15 million ($3.75 million) for import of German products such as machine tools, fertilizer, etc. The piastre funds generated go to the National Office of Agricultural Credit to aid farmers, particularly with loans;

(2) a credit of DM 50 million ($12.5 million) for development of the major industrial complex at An Hoan-Nong Son;

(3) a credit for DM 20 million ($5 million) for construction of an abattoir at Saigon-Cholon, and three coastal vessels;

(4) a credit of DM 500,000 ($125,000) for equipment at the Vietnamese-German Technical High School at Thu Duc.

In April 1966, the Germans announced a gift of DM 17.5 million ($4.4 million) worth of pharmaceuticals, the first shipments of which have arrived. Also in the medical field, they have provided two mobile dental clinics and 30 ambulances for the Ministry of Health.

In June 1966, the Cabinet voted DM 25 million (US $6.25 million) for new aid to Viet-Nam including:

(1) sending 25 experts to establish a refugee center;

(2) building a home for wayward youths;

(3) expansion of eight social centers and construction of a ninth, and

(4) establishment of a training center for social workers. The Germans have also donated 260 tons of rice for refugee relief programs.

Italy

The Italians provided a 10-man surgical team and have offered science scholarships to 10 Vietnamese to study in Italy.

Luxembourg

Luxembourg has provided plasma and blood transfusion equipment.

The Netherlands

The Dutch have undertaken to build 5 tuberculosis centers in Saigon; sites for 3 have been selected. In August, the Netherlands announced a contribution of $355,000 for a 4-year UN project in social welfare, part of the $1 million they have earmarked for UN projects in Viet-Nam. In 1964, the Dutch gave antibiotics and 4 scholarships for Vietnamese. They previously provided a dredge.

Spain

Spain has sent a 12-man medical team to Viet-Nam and has provided 800 pounds of medicines, medical equipment and blankets.

United Kingdom

The United Kingdom has supplied economic aid valued at more than $2 million in the past three years. It has provided six civilians for the British Advisory Mission and a Professor of English at Hue University. Twenty-one Vietnamese are receiving training in the United Kingdom. A pediatric team of four British doctors and six nurses went to Viet-Nam in August 1966.

In 1963–64, the United Kingdom provided the following goods and materials: Laboratory equipment for Saigon University; a typesetting machine for the Government Printing Office; a cobalt deep-ray therapy unit for the National Cancer Institute; various equipment for the faculties of Medicine, Science and Pharmacy at Saigon University, the Meteorologic Service and the Agricultural School at Saigon, and Atomic Research Establishment at Dalat and the Faculty of Education at Hue. In 1965–1966, British economic aid totalled $226,800 for roadbuilding equipment, diesel fishing boat engines, and portable anesthetic machines. Total aid in British FY 1967 was $515,200 and it is estimated $666,400 will be expended in FY 1968.

LATIN AMERICA

Argentina

Argentina is contributing 5,000 tons of wheat.

Brazil

Brazil has sent a substantial quantity of medical supplies which was carried to Viet-Nam by a Brazilian Air force plane and has also provided coffee.

Costa Rica

Costa Rica is contributing an ambulance for use in Viet-Nam.

Dominican Republic

Cement has been offered by the Dominican Republic for use in Viet-Nam.

Ecuador

Ecuador has sent medical supplies to Viet-Nam.

Guatemala

Guatemala has sent 15,000 doses of typhoid-paratyphoid serum for use in Viet-Nam.

Honduras

Honduras has contributed drugs and dry goods for refugees in Viet-Nam, flown there on a Honduras Air Force plane.

Uruguay

Uruguay has contributed $21,500 for relief supplies and medicine for Viet-Nam.

Venezuela

Venezuela has provided 500 tons of rice for refugee relief, and two civilian doctors are working in Viet-Nam.

AFRICA

Liberia

A contribution of $50,000 has been made by Liberia for the purchase of hospital equipment and other medical supplies for Viet-Nam.

Tunisia

Tunisia has made available 15 to 20 scholarships for Vietnamese.

NORTH AMERICA

Canada

Almost $6 million of development assistance to Viet-Nam has been provided by Canada.

1. Since 1964 Canada has supplied more than $4.5 million in economic aid. It increased its aid to South Viet-Nam this fiscal year allocating $1 million for medical assistance including providing ten 200-bed emergency hospital units. The first two units have arrived and have been installed at Phan Tiet and at Phu Tho near Saigon. A Canadian doctor and technician visited Viet-Nam

in the fall to inspect potential sites. Canada has sent 650,000 doses of polio vaccine for Vietnamese school children and offered additional vaccines against polio, TB and smallpox. Consideration is being given to establishment of a children's rehabilitation center in Viet-Nam.

2. Since 1958, Canada has provided $850,000 worth of food aid for Viet-Nam. Funds generated by sales are used for capital construction projects in Viet-Nam.

3. A new science building for the medical faculty at the University of Hue is being built costing about $333,000, drawn from counterpart funds generated by sales of food supplied by Canada. Construction has passed the half-way mark.

4. The Canadians have also agreed to construct an auditorium for the Faculty of Sciences at Hue University which will cost about $125,000.

5. Canada is printing half a million copies of a social sciences textbook for Vietnamese grade school children.

6. *Personnel in Viet-Nam.*—A Canadian Supervisor has been at Quang Ngai supervising construction of a small TB Clinic which the Canadians are funding. The Canadians have sent two doctors and four nurses to staff the clinic. A professor of orthopedics is working at Cho Ray Hospital, Saigon, and there is a Canadian teacher at the University of Hue.

7. *Vietnamese in Canada.*—380 Colombo Plan trainees and a total of 463 trainees under all programs, including those sponsored by other agencies and third countries (as well as Colombo Plan), have been trained in Canada. There are currently 231 Vietnamese students in Canada.

OTHER ASSISTANCE

Six other nations whose help does not fall under the Free World Assistance Program have provided valuable assistance to Viet-Nam in economic and humanitarian fields.

France

Since 1956, France has contributed about $115 million in assistance to South Viet-Nam. Present aid is running at a rate of about $4 million per year, largely in the cultural field.

In 1965 France had nearly 500 persons serving in South Viet-Nam. Among them were 65 experts under France's program of economic and technical assistance, including 32 physicians, professors and other medical personnel. Under its cultural programs, 471 professors (350 French and 121 Vietnamese) were teaching at 9 French-teaching institutions, and 30 French professors are at Vietnamese institutions. France provided in 1965 for Vietnamese to study in France, 55 fellowships for technical training and 85 academic fellowships. These programs are continuing on a somewhat reduced scale.

France has provided low-interest credits of 100 million francs ($20 million) for financing imports of French equipment for Vietnamese industry, a grant of 500,000 francs ($100,000) for equipment for L'Ecole Nationale d'Ingenieurs des Arts Industriels.

In 1960 France extended a low-interest credit of 70 million francs ($14 million) to aid construction of the major coal and chemical complex at An Hoa Nong Son south of Da Nang which is underway. It also provides a low-interest, five-year credit of 60 million francs ($12 million) for construction of Viet-Nam's largest cement-producing complex with plants at Hatien and Thu Duc. In 1964, France provided a 930,000 francs ($186,000) grant for the installation of a training center for electrical technicians and in 1965 a gift of 1.25 million francs ($250,000) for teaching equipment, primarily in the medical field.

Ireland

The Irish people have contributed £1,000 ($2,800) for Vietnamese flood victims through their Red Cross.

Israel

Israel made a gift of pharmaceutical supplies for flood victims and will train five Vietnamese in irrigation and animal husbandry.

Norway

Norway sent a contribution through the International Red Cross for flood victims in February 1965.

Pakistan

Pakistan made a financial contribution for assistance to flood victims and donated clothing for them.

Switzerland

The Swiss have provided microscopes for the University of Saigon. The Swiss Red Cross has sent an 11-man medical team through the International Committee of the Red Cross to work in a provincial hospital in the Central Highlands of South Viet-Nam.

U.N. aid to Vietnam

The United Nations and its specialized agencies are also making a significant contribution to the social and economic development of Viet-Nam. Under the Expanded Program of Technical Assistance of the U.N. Development Program, 15 technical assistance projects are scheduled for 1967 and 1968 at a cost of $724,475. These projects range across such varied fields as maternal and child health, labor administration, educational planning, telecommunications, meteorology and civil aviation. Among the participating agencies are ILO, FAO, UNESCO, WHO, ICAO, ITU, WMO, and the Department of Economic and Social Affairs of the U.N. In addition UNICEF has substantially expanded its health and child care programs with the 1967 program totalling $562,000, an increase over the 1966 level of $226,000.

Several major projects financed by the Special Fund of the U.N. Development Program are about to get underway. A National Technical Center (total international contribution approximately $1.5 million), with UNESCO is becoming operational. The Special Fund in January approved a Fisheries Development Project including exploratory and experimental fishing in the waters of the South China Sea, to be executed by FAO at a cost of $1.3 million. Also being negotiated is a Social Welfare Training Center to be executed by the Bureau of Social Affairs of the U.N. ECAFE is pressing ahead with regional projects of benefit to the nations of the Mekong Basin and has undertaken surveys of irrigation, hydro-electric facilities and bridge construction projects in Viet-Nam.

While we hold the line, the Asians are busily at work trying to get new programs off the ground that they themselves will be responsible for—all aimed at making Eastern Asia better. These programs include six points:

1. Asian Development Bank—which was launched at the initiative of a Burmese by the name of U Nyun.

2. The Mekong Basin Commission—with blueprints for power development as vast as the TVA.

3. Asian-Pacific Council—formed one year ago in Seoul is preparing for its second session.

4. Association of Southeast Asia—has been reactivated.

5. The Southeast Asian Ministers of Education—are now organized.

6. Conference on Asian Economic Development.

These and other groups like them include cooperative efforts on hydroelectric power, transportation, resource development, scientific and technical research, trade, finance.

Additional facts:

1. Korea is furnishing 48,000 troops out of a total population of 29,000,000.

2. Free World troops have more than doubled over the last year and a half, now total 59,650.

3. Incremental troop increase of 65,000 announced by GVN in July equates a 700,000 increase in U.S. armed forces.

4. Philcag (Philippines force) represents 15% of Philippine Army.

5. Comparison:

Korean War.—Non-U.S./ROK forces amounted to 48,000 (approx.).

Viet-Nam War.—There are now almost 60,000 non-U.S./GVN forces.

6. Total Asian contribution in Viet Nam far greater than in UN force in Korea.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, finally, let me say to my good friend from Illinois that, much as appreciate and have seriously weighed and studied the proposal he had to make, I have come to the conclusion that it cannot contribute to the goal we would all like to see where we still get more and more. Instead it poses a hazard.

The hazard is that it is premised on the assumption that there is nothing going on; that there are no efforts being made.

Part (c) of the resolution says that the President, if I may read it exactly, should move with greater determination. These are relative terms. I do not know how to define "greater determination." Greater than what? Great determination is already a matter of fact. Great efforts are exerted even right now. It seems to me we might run the very risk that some thrust from the floor of the Senate at this particular moment might well upset long negotiations that have been underway for some time.

A big power negotiating with a sovereign equal in a sensitive area of the world is a very, very sensitive operation at best. It would seem to me that if the Senate were to proceed to act on this proposal at this moment, it could well place in jeopardy those efforts which have been underway for a long time to bring even more participation on the part of Southeast Asia.

So I would question the wisdom of seeking to enter the channels of diplomacy by pressure from the floor of the Senate without being fully mindful of what was already moving ahead and underway. I think that does not speak well of the more sophisticated position that the United States of America, as a leader of a major portion of the world, has to learn to live with, and accommodate itself to, the great patience that big nations have to exert, if they are going to be responsible for the consequences of their acts, in trying to understand the movements of the smaller countries which are so overwhelmingly overshadowed by the large ones.

I would say, when all this is added up, that the peoples in Southeast Asia are making steadily increasing efforts as their own capabilities are increasing, as their own mobilizing efforts are intensifying. Let us not sell them short, whether we are talking about the Thais on the one hand, or, on the other hand, the Filipinos or Koreans or Austrians, or even the Indians. Do not leave out the Indians, for they have, in contrast to the days of Mahatma Gandhi, 465,000 Indian troops mobilized today on the frontiers with China. That is another element which belongs in the overall

picture of Asia now and the commitments that have been undertaken there. Likewise, the presence of the Indian troops, it seems to me at least, inhibits the freedom of action which might otherwise lead to a reckless commitment of troops from the north into Vietnam.

It is that kind of equation that adds itself to the balance of forces in dealing with the scale of relative power balances in eastern Asia.

I am reluctant to mention Taiwan at all, because there are those who recklessly suggest, "Why don't you get the Taiwanians?" I know the Senator from Illinois stands as one of those who recognizes that that would be suicidal in terms of committing the mainland Chinese. But even the presence of the Taiwanians should not cause misapprehension because they involve troops directly across the Strait of Formosa. That, too, is a restraint. That, too, lessens the kind of pressure that could be brought from the north.

So I think it is important that we keep all of this in balance. I think it is important to remember that there is more there than meets the more sensational headlines about commitments.

Furthermore, I think what we would be doing in the Senator's resolution would be to downgrade or to impugn the role of the President in a very active field in ways that are better not talked about or realized in terms of improvement in participation and in policy positions in general; and the refinement of this factor in itself is not best achieved on the open floor of the Senate of the United States.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, so that we do not delay the proceedings of the Senate this afternoon, I should like to comment for just a moment on my distinguished colleague's remarks and then insert in the RECORD the analysis I have made on the amount of assistance being offered by foreign countries, including our own friends in Southeast Asia, and other countries, to indicate my concern that they do have the potential for contributing substantially more.

I would like to say this is not at all an attempt to blackjack. As the distinguished Senator knows, I have carried on conversations with the State Department and Defense Department over a period of a year and a half, and with other Members of this body, about my deep concern that the American people have felt, and I have felt, that the sacrifice being asked of us is considerably greater than the sacrifice being asked of those whose security and well-being is very much at stake.

Mention has been made of the contribution by the South Koreans. I think we have to take into account that whereas they have 45,000 of their forces in Vietnam, we have 50,000 of American forces today still in South Korea, so that their net is not very great as a contribution, though we deeply appreciate it.

But it is my feeling that they could contribute 30,000 more South Korean forces. I would much prefer them to do it than to have a further escalation with 30,000 more American forces.

When we come to the question of what countries could do, while I recognize the delicacy of negotiations, I think we can be frank with Australia and New Zealand, for example, who have been our allies and who recognize that their territorial integrity and political freedom could be endangered, particularly when we have, with respect to New Zealand, 150, to be increased to 360. It is a small country, but I still feel they could do more. I would say Australia could step up its support by two or three times.

I would appreciate permission to put in the body of the RECORD, by unanimous consent, the contribution being made by these countries, all of which is appreciated, to indicate the level of continuing support.

I hope to strengthen the hand of the President by this resolution to indicate that a number of those in Congress believe, as the Senator has reiterated on this floor, that every chance we have to indicate that we have asked them for more help, we should do it. I think the fact of 25 of our colleagues being added to the voice of the administration would be an important addition.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President——

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, will he yield to me while the Senator has the floor?

Mr. PERCY. Yes; with the understanding that the Senator from Mississippi has precedence then.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I wish only to make a concluding comment. Then I shall be glad to yield the floor to the Senator.

Each country, deciding in the light of all of its commitments, its local problems at home, its economic capabilities, its political stability, knows best where it can make its meaningful contributions and where those are to be negotiated. I doubt that we here in the Senate of the United States fully can evaluate all the considerations that President Marcos has to experience before determining what his country can best contribute. I doubt that from the floor of the Senate of the United States we can understand the political and economic questions that likewise have to be weighed and balanced in Australia in regard to its contributions.

The same way with the Koreans or the Thais. All of them would fit this same pattern.

What I call into question, Mr. President, is the use of the floor of the Senate to tell those countries, in very complex situations, what they ought to be doing or not be doing in this regard. This is underway; it has been going on for a long time, and it has already yielded results. But I think if my friend were to recheck with all those with whom he has had conversations in the Pentagon and the State Department, he would find them in agreement that this especial moment is not the most propitious moment for this kind of a declaration coming from the floor of this body.

Whatever the other factors may be, these smaller nations are especially sensitive over their disproportionate size, and for understandable reasons, they do not like to get the idea. I am sure, that somebody is trying to shove them around, that the big guy is going to use them or force them to do something.

Thus it seems to me that we have to lean over backward, at the moment, right now, in order not to play into the hands of thwarting or obstructing that which may be on the verge of yielding real dividends at this time. All I am saying to my friend from Illinois is that this is not the moment to run that risk.

Given the record of increasing contributions, given the things that must be underway at this very moment, I would hope that the Senator would not act precipitately or in a too promiscuous way in this particular exercise.

I thank my friend from Illinois for his indulgence.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, my only motive is a desire to work closely with the administration in this regard. As recently as yesterday, an Assistant Secretary of State indicated that he had no objection to a declaration by a Senator or a group of Senators, and I have indicated that I would not press for hearings or a vote until such time as it seemed in the national interest to do so. But I have been talking about this subject for a year and a half; I have been as patient as I could be, and I have not seen results. I am gratified to hear it, if there are going to be results forthcoming.

Mr. McGEE. Yes; I think the Secretary's position would be that a very broad resolution, without barbs and spikes, would be a little more in order; that the suggestion that somehow this was a club that was going to be held over Asians—which is a part of the implication—and the fact that the President was moving with greater determination, are the things that detract from the Senator's declaration of his wishes to try to get something helpful out of the Senate.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, and read to me the portion of my resolution he thinks is a club?

Mr. McGEE. Yes. Let me read two sections. The first is section (b):

> The non-Communist nations of Asia, including South Vietnam, should contribute substantially more manpower and resources to share the military, diplomatic, economic, and psychological tasks in Vietnam;

Mr. PERCY. Does the distinguished Senator disagree with that?

Mr. McGEE. Yes; as I just spelled out in the RECORD. I think the margin has been moving in the other direction. It is not enough, I agree with the Senator, but I think the effort is being made, these gaps are being closed, and the point is that now, in the face of the efforts that have already been made a matter of record, this thus becomes a question of high pressure being applied to them for still more, when this is already the subject of very considerable discussion.

Point (c) of the Senator's resolution reads as follows:

> The President of the United States should move with greater determination to obtain commitments of such manpower and resources in support of the effort in Vietnam.

That, it seems to me, is a very specific thrust at the President, without recog-

nition, not only of what has been done, but of what is underway even at this time.

I think, in the context of those factors, that the proposed resolution could be submitted with much more restrained language, and still contribute to achieving the goal which it would be my hope that we commonly share.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 173) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I would like to insert in the RECORD at this point a summary of other nation's assistance to South Vietnam, as well as a summary of U.S. assistance to those nations.

I do not cite America's generosity to these many nations in the spirit of Shylock demanding his pound of flesh. I cite it as a reminder that freedom has survived in this century because free men have helped each other in hours of danger and need.

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

JAPAN

Has provided over $55 million worth of economic assistance to VN, chiefly through reparations. This is repayment of debt and should not be included as aid in the war effort.

Has sent two medical teams, 4,544 cases of medical goods, 25 ambulances and 20,000 transistor radios.

Has provided technical personnel and funds for construction of a power dam across the Da Nhim River, an electrical transmission line, and agreed to participate in the construction of a bridge across the Mekong near Vinh Long. Funds for power dam from reparations; remainder from $7.5 million loan.

U.S. foreign aid to Japan, 1946–66

	Millions
Military	$1,073.1
Economic	2,899.8
Total	3,972.9

KOREA

Has sent about 45,000 troops including two combat divisions, a 130-man mobile army surgical hospital, 10 karate instructors, and a 2,200-man task force.

Korean military medical personnel provide some medical care for local civilians. Seven civilian medical teams (118 Koreans) work in provincial health programs.

U.S. foreign aid to Korea, 1946–66

	Millions
Military	$2,416.6
Economic	4,260.1
Total	6,676.7

In addition, the total U.S. cost of the Korean war is officially estimated at $18 billion. And today the U.S. has 50,000 military personnel and 1,316 civilian military employees (as of Mar. 31, 1967) in Korea.

MALAYSIA

Has trained about 2,000 Vietnam military and police officers. Has previously provided military and police vehicles.

U.S. foreign aid to Malaysia, –1966

	Millions
Military	$3.8
Economic	43.7
Total	47.5

PHILIPPINES

Has sent a 2,000-man military engineering unit with security support personnel, a station hospital, and rural health and civic action teams.

U.S. foreign aid to the Philippines, 1946–66

	Million
Military	$489.5
Economic	1,435.5
Total	1,925.0

THAILAND

Has sent 2,000 to 2,500 ground forces to Vietnam. A 200-man naval group mans an LST and PGM patrol craft. A 35-man AF contingent flies operational transport missions for the VN forces. Some Vietnamese pilots get jet training in Thailand. Will send a medical unit.

Have provided some rice for refugees, and some cement and zinc roofing materials. At the Manila Conference offered Vietnam a $20 million rice credit.

U.S. foreign aid to Thailand, 1946–66

	Million
Military	$612.2
Economic	477.0
Total	1,089.2

AUSTRALIA

Has sent 6,300 combat troops, 100 combat advisers, a 73-man AF unit with six caribou planes which fly logistical support missions for Vietnam forces.

Has given a total of nearly $10 million in economic and technical assistance. On Feb. 1, 1967, decided to increase non-military aid during fiscal 1967 to $2 million.

U.S. foreign aid to Australia, 1946–66

	Million
Military	$125.9
Economic	149.4
Total	275.3

NEW ZEALAND

Military personnel (150) to be increased to 360 in Vietnam. Also provide an 8-man surgical team, a 16-man medical team to arrive shortly, and a professor of English for University of Saigon. Sent $21,000 for equipment for a technical high school and $600,000 for a science building for the University of Saigon.

U.S. foreign aid to New Zealand, 1946–66

	Million
Military	$4.7
Economic	23.0
Total	27.7

DENMARK

Has provided medical supplies and is training Vietnamese nurses in Denmark.

U.S. foreign aid to Denmark, 1946–66

	Million
Military	$618.7
Economic	301.8
Total	920.5

ITALY

Has provided a 10-man surgical team and offered 10 science scholarships for Vietnamese to study in Italy.

U.S. foreign aid to Italy, 1946–66

	Million
Military	$2,312.4
Economic	3,780.5
Total	6,092.9

NETHERLANDS

Will build five TB centers in Saigon. Has contributed $355,000 for a 4-year UN project in social welfare as part of a $1 million they have earmarked for UN projects in VN. In 1964 they gave antibiotics and four scholarships. Previously provided a dredge.

U.S. foreign aid to the Netherlands, 1946–66

	Million
Military	$1,240.6
Economic	1,229.8
Total	2,470.4

SPAIN

Has provided 800 pounds of medicines, medical equipment and blankets. Has sent a 12-man medical team.

U.S. foreign aid to Spain, 1946–66

	Million
Military	$608.6
Economic	1,395.7
Total	2,004.3

ARGENTINA

Has contributed 5,000 tons of wheat.

U.S. foreign aid to Argentina, 1946–66

	Million
Military	$92.2
Economic	666.4
Total	758.6

BRAZIL

Has sent medical supplies and coffee.

U.S. foreign aid to Brazil, 1946–66

	Million
Military	$298.6
Economic	2,887.1
Total	3,185.7

COSTA RICA

Has contributed an ambulance.

U.S foreign aid to Costa Rica, 1946–66

	Million
Military	$1.9
Economic	147.1
Total	148.0

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Has offered cement for use in VN.

U.S. foreign aid to Dominican Republic, 1946–66

	Million
Military	$17.1
Economic	303.0
Total	320.1

ECUADOR

Has sent medical supplies to VN.

U.S. foreign aid to Ecuador, 1946–66

	Million
Military	$44.9
Economic	234.7
Total	279.6

GUATEMALA

Has sent 15,000 doses of typhoid-paratyphoid serum.

U.S. foreign aid to Guatemala, 1946–66

	Million
Military	$11.1
Economic	198.1
Total	209.2

HONDURAS

Has contributed drugs and dry goods for refugees.

U.S. foreign aid to Honduras, 1946–66

	Million
Military	$5.3
Economic	83.2
Total	88.5

URUGUAY

Has contributed $21,500 for relief supplies and medicines.

U.S. foreign aid to Uruguay, 1946–66

	Million
Military	$37.4
Economic	82.0
Total	119.4

VENEZUELA

Has provided 500 tons of rice for refugee relief and two civilian doctors.

U.S. foreign aid to Venezuela, 1946–66

	Million
Military	$103.9
Economic	288.3
Total	392.2

LIBERIA

Has contributed $50,000 for purchase of hospital equipment and medical supplies.

U.S. foreign aid to Liberia, 1946–66

	Million
Military	$6.2
Economic	235.4
Total	241.6

TUNISIA

Has made available a number of scholarships for Vietnamese.

U.S. foreign aid to Tunisia, 1946–66

	Million
Military	$19.8
Economic	468.1
Total	487.9

IRELAND

The Irish people have contributed $2,800 for flood relief through their Red Cross.

U.S. foreign aid to Ireland, 1946–55 (ended in 1955)

	Million
Economic	$146.5

ISRAEL

Has sent drugs for flood victims and is training five Vietnemese in irrigation and animal husbandry.

U.S. foreign aid to Israel, 1948–66

	Million
Military	$27.6
Economic	1,076.9
Total	1,104.5

NORWAY

Sent a contribution for flood victims through the International Red Cross in February 1965.

U.S. foreign aid to Norway, 1946–66

	Million
Military	$884.2
Economic	351.8
Total	1,236.0

PAKISTAN

Sent money and clothing for VN flood victims.

U.S. foreign aid to Pakistan, 1947–66

	Million
Military	Classified
Economic	$3,072

SWITZERLAND

Has provided microscopes for the University of Saigon. The Swiss Red Cross has an 11-man medical team working in VN.

There has been no U.S. foreign aid to Switzerland.

TAIWAN

China (Taiwan) has provided an 80-man agricultural team, an 18-man military paywar team, a 12-man electrical power mission, and a 10-man surgical team. Has trained over 200 Vietnamese in Taiwan. Has given 26 aluminum prefab warehouses, farm tools, seeds and fertilizers, an electrical power substation, and 500,000 math textbooks.

U.S. foreign aid to Taiwan, (1949?)–1966

	Million
Military	$2,606.0
Economic	2,293.5
Total	4,899.5

LAOS

Has given $4,167 for flood relief (Feb. 1965).

U.S. foreign aid to Laos, 1955–66

	Million
Military (Classified)	
Economic	$473.4

AUSTRIA

Has offered to supply medical supplies, blankets and tents through the Austrian Red Cross.

U.S. foreign aid to Austria, –1966

	Million
Military (Classified)	
Economic	$1,198

WEST GERMANY

Has provided 18 Germans as teachers and technicians, and a hospital ship with eight doctors and 30 other medical personnel. Forty Vietnamese are now studying in West Germany, and the Germans have agreed to accept 30 more.

Has given about $22 million in credits and a gift of $4.4 million worth of drugs. Has provided two mobile dental clinics and 30 ambulances for the VN Ministry of Health.

On June 29, 1967, the Cabinet voted $6.25 million in additional aid to VN in the social welfare sector, including 100 buses.

Has given 260 tons of rice for refugee relief programs.

U.S. foreign aid to West Germany, 1946–66

	Million
Military	$951.5
Economic	4,045.9
Total	4,997.4

UNITED KINGDOM

Has provided six civilian advisors, an English professor, and a pediatric team of four doctors and six nurses. Twenty-one Vietnamese are studying in the UK. In 1963–64, the UK provided considerable scientific equipment to VN. In 1965–66, the UK gave economic aid totalling $226,800.

U.S. foreign aid to the United Kingdom, 1946–66

	Million
Military	$1,034.5
Economic	8,010.4
Total	9,044.9

CANADA

Has provided almost $6 million worth of development assistance.

Nine Canadians are working in VN. There are currently 231 Vietnamese students in Canada. Canada allocates $1 million for medical assistance to VN this fiscal year.

U.S. foreign aid to Canada, 1946–61

	Million
Military	$13.1
Economic	23.2
Total	36.3

FRANCE

Has contributed about $111 million in assistance to VN since 1956. France has nearly 500 persons serving in economic, technical, cultural and educational programs in Vietnam.

U.S. foreign aid to France, 1946–66

	Million
Military	$4,258.7
Economic	5,150.9
Total	9,409.6

GREECE

Has contributed $15,000 worth of medical supplies.

U.S. foreign aid to Greece, 1946–66

	Million
Military	$1,854.3
Economic	1,895.1
Total	3,749.4

IRAN

Has contributed one thousand tons of petroleum products to VN and has sent a 20-man medical team.

U.S. foreign aid to Iran, 1946–66

	Million
Military	$895.2
Economic	856.8
Total	1,752.0

TURKEY

Has provided some medicines and has offered a substantial amount of cement.

U.S. foreign aid to Turkey, 1946–66

	Million
Military	$2,762.1
Economic	2,277.7
Total	5,039.8

BELGIUM

Has provided some medicines, an ambulance and scholarships for nine Vietnamese to study in Belgium. (Luxembourg has given plasma and blood transfusion equipment.)

U.S. foreign aid to Belgium, 1946–66 (with Luxembourg)

	Million
Military	$1,255.3
Economic	749.6
Total	2,004.9

VIETNAM

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in connection with my speech on August 23, appearing at pages 23773 through 23776 of the RECORD, there was recently published in the Washington Post a column entitled "GOP Role in Vietnam Debate Can Result in 'New Look' Policy," written by the distinguished columnist David S. Broder. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Broder's article be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

GOP ROLE IN VIETNAM DEBATE CAN RESULT IN NEW LOOK POLICY

(By David S. Broder)

It has taken the better part of two years, but the debate about our Vietnam policy, which began in the Democratic Party, has now become a major interest of the Republicans. The development is healthy for the country, but no one should be misled about the probable result.

The result is not likely to be the nomination of an allout "dove" by the Republican convention next August or the conversion of the presidential campaign next fall into a debate between a Republican advocate of disengagement and a President who insists the struggle must go on, no matter what its cost or consequences.

No one can say such an outcome is impossible, of course, but another result is much more likely. Before speculating, however, let us look for a moment at the national advantage that is gained by shifting the Vietnam debate to the minority party.

So long as the Vietnam argument was centered among Democrats it was subject to two distortions.

First, the Democratic critics of the President's war policy were always accused of operating from personal motives, making it difficult to distinguish personal antipathies from policy differences. Sen. J. W. Fulbright was suspected of harboring grievances over presidential slights to his role as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. Sen. Robert F. Kennedy, it was widely held, was out to "settle an old score" with Mr. Johnson and to serve his own ambitions in the bargain.

Second, the internal Democratic debate on Vietnam has been stunted by the political reality that the critics could force a change in policy only by defeating the President for renomination. That is a task which Kennedy, Fulbright and all but the rankest amateurs in the peace movement recognize is impossible.

Thus, the Democratic debate on Vietnam has been twisted by circumstances into an unseemingly personal squabble whose outcome is a foreordained victory for the President. Mr. Johnson has further diminished its usefulness by his effort to obscure, confuse and distort the issues his intra-party critics were trying to raise.

Now, thanks to the efforts of a variety of Republicans with widely differing viewpoints, including, George Aiken, Clifford Case, Gerald Ford, Mark Hatfield, Melvin Laird, Bradford Morse, Thruston Morton, Richard Nixon, Charles Percy and George Romney, the debate has shifted to the GOP.

Each of these Republicans has taken a certain amount of criticism for "undercutting the President," "embarrassing the Party," or "creating doubt in Hanoi." But if this country is so weak, or its cause in Vietnam so fragile, that it cannot tolerate responsible debate within the opposition party on a major foreign policy question, then matters have indeed reached a pretty pass.

Actually, a Republican debate on Vietnam is likely to be of great use to the country, because it is free of the two major distortions that affect the Democratic argument. The Republican debate is less envenomed by personal feelings, for the simple reason that Republicans are not expected to give aid and comfort to an opposition-party President.

And the outcome of the Republican debate is not predetermined; in the open battle for the GOP nomination, Vietnam policy is a legitimate weapon for all contenders, and no one can say with certainty whose views will prevail.

However, the "doves" are unlikely to triumph, for three reasons.

First, the Republican tradition is one of staunch anti-communism. The Republican advocates of disengagement in Vietnam have not yet framed an adequate answer to those who contend that an American backdown in Vietnam would give the Communists a vital strategic victory.

Second, those who occupy the traditional power centers in the party—titular leaders Eisenhower and Goldwater, congressional leaders Dirksen and Ford, and the Governors of the largest states—all favor continuing or expanding the present military effort to secure the strategic objective of a non-Communist regime in South Vietnam.

Third, the three prospective nominees whose stock has been rising in recent months—Nixon, Nelson Rockefeller and Ronald Reagan—are all hard-liners on Vietnam. Those who have been slumping or standing still—Romney and Percy—are the ones who are talking of limiting the U.S. effort. In the coming primaries, one would guess, Nixon will articulate the case for continuing the war more effectively than Romney will argue for limiting the U.S. involvement.

Thus, to see the Republican Party emerging with a "dove" candidate and platform next August, one would have to imagine the successful refutation of traditional anti-communism; a policy reversal by, or repudiation of, its most influential leaders; and a complete upset in the present odds on the prospective candidate.

All of this may occur, of course, or even be forced on the GOP by a marked shift in public sentiment against continuing the war, a shift which Morton and others think may already be under way.

But more likely, in my view, is the prospect that the Republican urge for "unity" will assert itself and prospects in Vietnam. And that promises a "new look" at Vietnam strategy, without rejecting either the present military effort or the value of winning the struggle.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION APPROPRIATIONS, 1968

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11456) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I propose, now, to bring to the Senate an explanation of the appropriation bill for the Department of Transportation. Before doing so, however, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield for the purpose of a quorum call, without losing my right to the floor.

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

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

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

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, may we have order, please?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is H.R. 11456.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, H.R. 11456 is the appropriation, for fiscal year 1968, for the Department of Transportation.

The Appropriations Committee's recommendations for the Department of Transportation appropriation for fiscal 1968 totals $1,651,407,272 from the general fund of the Treasury, and $3,770,945,000 for the Federal aid highway programs, to be derived from the highway trust fund.

Mr. President, I say by way of introduction that this is the first year that the funds for these programs have been in a separate bill, and the reason is that we now have a Department of Transportation at the Cabinet level, of which Mr. Boyd is the first Secretary; and, therefore, the items over which that Department exercises jurisdiction are collected here, now, and put in this one Department of Transportation appropriation bill.

Mr. President, the members of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations which considered this measure include the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG].

I have the privilege of being the chairman of that subcommittee. I named the membership because they have given unusual attention to the pending bill. Furthermore, the list includes membership on the legislative committee that has handled much of the legislation for which funds are provided in the pending bill. The Members are unusually well-versed in their field, particularly with reference to aviation.

We have the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE]—who is now the chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy—and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], who has been the ranking minority member on the committee dealing with this subject for a long time. We have other Senators who have worked in the field.

I am particularly honored to be chairman of this group and have been very pleased and impressed with the fine knowledge the Members have on the subject matter.

We have all been impressed with the way Mr. Boyd is trying to get the Department started on a sound basis. I believe the Department is doing splendid work.

The general fund appropriations are $67,211,500 less than the budget estimates for fiscal year 1968. That is largely because of substantial reductions in the estimates for the civilian supersonic transport of some $54 million in what is called the payback reserve fund, an action concurred in by the House and the Senate committee.

Another substantial reduction, $60 million, is attributable to an allowance of $40 million in lieu of a requested $100 million for the State and community highway safety program. I will go into that in more detail later.

In considering the pending bill, the details of which will be found covered in their entirety in Senate Report No. 572, it might be well to begin with the SST item.

The recommendation of the committee is $142,375,000.

The amount of the House allowance would finance the Federal Government's portion of the 1968 costs of the prototype construction phase of the SST development program. That is the big SST that has been under research for a good while now. It is now in the development stage.

This appropriation should be sufficient to continue the program at the planned rate through fiscal year 1968 when combined with the carryover funds avail-

able and $52 million of the U.S. airlines' contribution.

The two prototype aircrafts that are provided for are estimated to be available by the end of the calendar year 1970.

These funds are not questioned in any way as to the manner in which they are apportioned, but I understand the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] is going to offer an amendment to strike out all funds for this fiscal year except $1 million.

For the sake of continuity, I hope that we will get to that amendment first. I say in passing, however, that we are right at the peak of the development of this program. We are passing this year beyond the half-way mark. The amount in the pending bill is some $54 million less than the budget request.

As I say, that is due to the deletion of the pay-back reserve.

With respect to the FAA operations and facilities that come under the pending bill, in the course of the hearings the subcommittee was concerned with the rapidly increasing rate of aviation activity and what appeared to be inadequate resources for manpower and equipment to meet the current and foreseeable future requirements.

Mr. President, this is a well-known story to those of us on the committee. However, I do not think the public has had a chance to really get the facts that are so impressive to us with respect to the absolute demands—not merely the needs—and the urgent necessity for more trained men to operate the towers and the centers. These men have to be trained for a period of 2 years. We also need extra funds for additional overtime payments.

Even more pressing than that in a way was the absolute necessity of having a stepped-up program for the equipment that enables these known safety practices to be actually carried out.

That includes radar and other equipment in connection with landings and takeoffs.

In view of this, the recommendation here presented contemplates the provision of $20 million above the original budget estimates for the operations account of the FAA to provide this additional manpower.

That includes air traffic controllers and others. More personnel have to be recruited and put into training now. I believe more than this amount of money could be used, but we did not want to go too fast.

Further, the committee recommendation provides $30 million over the original budget estimates for facilities and equipment to provide such essential equipment as airport surveillance radar, terminal automation to receive and process altitude information on radarscopes, instrument landing systems, and approach lights.

As I say, the total amount contained in the bill is under the budget request. However, this item is over the budget request.

The committee went into this matter very carefully and thoroughly on its own responsibility. No one in the Transportation Department tried to come around or talk to us on the side about this matter. We raised the issue ourselves.

We did what we could to get sound features, and we are certain that this is a conservative figure.

The committee recommendation was unanimously adopted by the full committee. Everybody on the committee voted for it.

Mr. President, I do not have a long statement, and I hope that the Senators on the floor will join in the debate later.

In connection with the Coast Guard and its construction program, the committee has recommended increased funds in order to permit the construction of an oceanographic vessel. The total amount provided will also permit the construction of two high-endurance cutters approved by the House.

In the budget there was provision for one regular cutter and for one oceanographic cutter or ship. The House took out the oceanographic ship and put in two endurance cutters.

We think that the oceanographic work is far behind and that a larger part of it that needs to be done at the present time can be done by the Coast Guard.

When the bill goes to conference, we will have all three items in conference, and we will be able to work out something. That was only an $14.5 million increase, which is the approximate cost.

With respect to Federal aid to highways, the recommendations for the Federal Highway Administration include the funds requested for the construction activities of the Federal highway aid program to be derived from the highway trust fund. As Senators will recall, this is a special fund into which money is automatically paid, which originated when the Interstate System was adopted. All these funds go in there, and all the highway aid funds are financed out of the trust fund. It is tax money, and it is spent in the course of the year, just as any other money, and should be included in the consideration of what we call the spending budget; but it is not reflected in the ordinary columns of appropriations out of the general treasury.

In the course of the hearing, the committee was informed that an additional $450 million will be required to permit the Federal aid highway program to go forward at the authorized level for the ABC and the interstate program. These recommendations include $40 million of the requested $100 million liquidating cash fund for the State and community highway safety program.

I should like to say one further word about the $450 million in the supplemental appropriations bill, before we leave this subject. Unanimously and consistently, we have discouraged requests being brought back to the Senate for consideration with respect to the supplemental bill, because we believe that these requests should come through the regular channels, at the regular time, to the regular subcommittees, so that they can be considered in line with other requests for those departments.

Last year, we had a supplemental bill involving $8 billion, and it did not come to the Senate until approximately 1 week before adjournment; and despite everything that the members of the Committee on Appropriations could do, including the hard-working chairman, there was little opportunity for consideration of the measure.

I believe they should be required to bring requests in on time. The $450 million was an exception. It is almost a set requirement, anyhow. So we just note this and move on.

The committee believes that the highway safety program, with matching requirements from the States to participate in approximately 13 areas for which standards have been approved, would appear to be developing more slowly than the $100 million budget estimate assumed. The bill under which this program operates did not become law until October 1966, and the program at the State level did not develop as fast as anticipated. Some States required legislation; some required appropriations. Time is required to initiate these programs. We have included $40 million for these highway safety programs for the current fiscal year, which we believe is all that will be necessary to meet the requirements of the programs filed by the States. That is our best estimate.

The House put in $20 million, but we considered it later, when the State program had matured more, and we put in $40 million—intending to keep faith with the promises made to those States in connection with the preparations they have made, to match them on a requirement basis and to get the program started at every level possible. There is a great deal of interest in this matter throughout the country, and I believe that this sum—if the House will agree to it—will meet the requirements.

We have in the bill an item for railroad research, which pertains principally to passenger travel on the railroads, under the new condition that has developed. This is for research and development.

In closing, I should like to point out to the Senate that we have restored the full budget request for the vitally important railroad research project in the northeast corridor—that is, the rapid transit, ground-level train transportation experiments—and have provided $2 million of a requested $3.5 million to continue work on a demonstration project involving an auto-on-train service from Washington to Florida.

That is a piggyback operation. A man and his family would get in their car and drive their automobile onto a special railroad car in Washington and get off in Jacksonville, Fla., the next morning. The fare would be relatively small for the family and the automobile. This only involves an experiment. A prototype train—engines, cars, and everything else—is to be built. If it proves successful, the railroad will buy it from the Government at what it cost, with depreciation allowance. It will cost about $7.5 million. Depreciation allowances are figured now at $1 million, perhaps. So the Government will get back its money, except for the $1 million, if the railroad decides the train is successful and purchases it. If it is successful, the presumption is that the

operation will spread to other areas. I believe the strongest point that can be made for this matter is that if it is successful, it will relieve highway traffic in the future.

Two other experiments are the one from New York to New England, which is the rapid transit experiment, and the one from New York to Washington.

The committee has also recommended the deletion of the general provision which would have had the effect of an overall 5 percent expenditure reduction. In other words, we made our own reductions on the individual item that we were considering, and that came out all right, so we struck out the overall 5 percent across-the-board expenditure reduction.

Before concluding, I should like to pay tribute to the Honorable Alan S. Boyd, our first Secretary of Transportation. He brings to this post a distinguished career of public service in the field of transportation. I was impressed by his candor and frankness, as evidenced in our discussions prior to the hearing and during the course of the hearing, and I look forward to a pleasant and productive association with him and the committee in working out the transportation problems that currently afflict us.

I hope that other Senators will speak on this matter.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I shall be glad to yield shortly to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc, and that the bill as thus amended be regarded as original text for the purpose of amendment, provided that no point of order shall be considered to have been waived by reason of agreement to the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Mississippi? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The amendments agreed to en bloc areas follows:

On page 2, line 3, after the word "determine," strike out "$6,985,100" and insert "$7,800,000".

On page 2, line 13, after the word "statistics", strike out "$5,950,000" and insert "$6,200,000".

On page 2, at the beginning of line 25, strike out "$339,992,500" and insert "$344,429,500".

On page 4, at the beginning of line 17, strike out "$107,014,000" and insert "$121,514,000".

On page 5, line 22, after the word "snowshoes", strike out "$593,326,000" and insert "$618,400,000".

On page 6, line 11, after the word "aircraft", strike out "$30,000,000" and insert "$65,400,000".

On page 7, after line 2, strike out:

"OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NATIONAL CAPITAL AIRPORTS

"For expenses incident to the care, operation, maintenance, improvement and protection of the federally owned civil airports in the vicinity of the District of Columbia, including purchase of seven passenger motor vehicles for police use, for replacement only, which may exceed by $300 the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year; purchase, cleaning and repair of uniforms; and arms and ammunitions; $8,500,000."

On page 7, after line 12, insert:

"OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT

"For expenses incident to the care, operation, maintenance, improvement, and protection of the Washington National Airport including purchase of two passenger motor vehicles for police use, for replacement only, which may exceed by $300 the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year; purchase, cleaning, and repair of uniforms; and arms and ammunition, $3,971,000."

On page 7, after line 21, insert:

"OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DULLES INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

"For expenses incident to the care, operation, maintenance, improvement, and protection of the Dulles International Airport, including purchase of five passenger motor vehicles for police use, for replacement only, which may exceed by $300 the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year; purchase, cleaning, and repair of uniforms; and arms and ammunitions, $4,529,000."

On page 8, after line 5, strike out:

"CONSTRUCTION, NATIONAL CAPITAL AIRPORTS

"For necessary expenses for construction at the federally owned civil airports in the vicinity of the District of Columbia, $160,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the unexpended balances of the appropriations for 'Construction, Dulles International Airport' and 'Construction, Washington National Airport' shall be merged with this appropriation."

On page 8, after line 13, insert:

"CONSTRUCTION, DULLES INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

"For necessary expenses for construction at Dulles International Airport, $160,000 to remain available until expended."

On page 8, line 21, after "1969", strike out "$65,000,000" and insert "$75,000,000".

On page 10, after line 6, insert a new section, as follows:

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

On page 10, at the beginning of line 20, strike out "$59,833,000" and insert "$60,000,000".

On page 11, line 11, after the word "expended", strike out "$3,770,778,000" and insert "$3,770,945,000"; and in line 15, after the word "and", strike out "$3,012,687,270" and insert "$3,012,854,270".

On page 12, line 16, after the word "with", strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$1,400,000".

On page 12, line 23, after the word "expended", strike out "$20,000,000" and insert "$40,000,000"; and in line 24, after the word "exceed", strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$1,400,000".

On page 13, line 4, after "(80 Stat. 939–40);" strike out "$1,670,000" and insert "$1,780,000".

On page 14, at the beginning of line 20, strike out "$4,000,000" and insert "$8,000,000".

On page 15, after line 5, strike out:

"GENERAL PROVISION

"SEC. 401. None of the funds provided in this title shall be available for the planning or execution of programs the obligations for which are in excess of $20,000,000 in fiscal year 1968 for 'State and Community Highway Safety'."

On page 16, line 4, after the word "transportation," strike out "$10,300,000" and insert "$16,632,000".

On page 18, line 12, after "(5 U.S.C. 5901; 80 Stat. 299);", strike out "$4,000,000" and insert "$4,291,000".

On page 18, after line 17, strike out:

"SEC. 702. Money appropriated in this Act shall be available for expenditure in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968 only to the extent that expenditure thereof shall not result in total aggregate net expenditures of all agencies provided for herein beyond ninety-five percent of the total aggregate net expenditures estimated therefor in the budget for 1968 (H. Doc. 15)."

Mr. STENNIS. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire. He is the ranking minority member of the committee. He has a fine knowledge of the subject matter and has a special interest in it, and he has contributed greatly to the makeup of the bill.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished chairman of our committee for yielding. My purpose in asking the Senator to yield was not to supplement his very lucid and complete discussion of the contents of the bill. As the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, I wanted to join the Senator from Mississippi in every word he said about Secretary Boyd. I also wanted to say that in the years I have served on the Committee on Appropriations and on subcommittees and listened to the testimony I have never known an appropriation bill to be more fairly or better handled that this bill under the leadership of the distinguished Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. President, I think that perhaps in his career on the bench, the Senator from Mississippi must have learned the art or solved the art of keeping school without offense, because while every witness was treated with the utmost courtesy and consideration, as was every Senator on both sides in the committee. The Senator from Mississippi somehow managed to imply that what we could say in 5 minutes might be just as effective as if we said it in 1 hour and 5 minutes. The result was that I came out of these hearings and out of these deliberations in executive session of the subcommittee less tired and less weary and with as great a satisfaction as I have ever gotten out of any session of any of the various subcommittees, and this does not reflect in any way on the very able chairmen of other committees.

This is a good bill. It has been carefully screened, thanks not only to the chairman of the committee, but also to the members of the committee, and probably to a great extent, the full committee, which is practically in unanimous accord on the provisions of the bill.

Mr. President, the bill is a good job well done, and for that job, much of the credit goes to the distinguished chairman.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I certainly thank the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, for his overgenerous thoughts for my small effort. This has been a team job altogether, and the Senator from New Hampshire certainly contributed more than his share.

Mr. President, I do not intend to try to retain the floor, except to maintain continuity.

Does the Senator from Washington wish to speak in connection with this matter now?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I merely wish to reiterate what has been said by the Senator from New Hampshire with respect to the chairman and the other members of the committee. This was a new subcommittee and it brought together, into the new department, a great variety of agencies dealing with transportation in many of its phases.

I think the committee did a remarkable job in that this was a new bill and we were dealing with a subject that greatly and virtually affects the public. This bill was reported as swiftly as we could while at the same time hearing all the testimony and considering carefully each item.

Witnesses were heard fully, intelligent questions were advanced and responsible debate within the committee took place. It is a pleasure to see on the desks of Senators hearings on an appropriation bill which is one concise volume instead of a great number of volumes. I think we may all take satisfaction in that.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator for his very fine remarks.

These funds were once handled by a subcommittee of which the Senator from Washington was chairman, and he did an outstanding job in that respect and as chairman of the legislative committee. The Senator from Washington was the father and contributed greatly to a major part of this legislation, as did the Senator from New Hampshire and other Senators.

Mr. President, of course, whatever is the pleasure of the Senate is satisfactory to me; but the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] had an amendment that is a major proposal. The amendment to be proposed by the Senator from Wisconsin has to do with the supersonic transport. I trust that the Senator will be here shortly to offer his amendment, if that is still in keeping with his wishes. I wish to mention that there are other Senators who wanted to be present.

Mr. President, I wish to make the following statement for emphasis. There is no question about the matter of the supersonic transport. The committee went into the matter fully this year, and heretofore committees have gone into the matter, both the authorizing the committee and the Appropriations Committee.

This matter has been curried, combed, and dissected by committees in the House of Representatives and committees in the Senate. The matter originated with a request by the late President Kennedy that we have to go into this field. Briefly, it is that public financing and long research and development projects are needed to create a supersonic transport.

I have been on the Committee on Armed Services for a long time. One of the things that has impressed me since World War II, as we went from plane to plane in the military, commercial aviation, and the public, as a whole, have gotten the benefit or the fallout from that research and development in the military. We were able to develop the fine passenger planes that we have now. For instance, the first large jet was a tanker, a B-47, and then the B-52. From that was developed one of the large modern transport planes, now the Boeing 707. In fact, they are the same. The Presidential plane today is converted over from one of the KC-135 tankers.

In the past we have gotten the benefit of all of this research and development, but that time has ended. There are no more big bombers on the production lines. This matter is too big an undertaking, it is thought, and it was in those years that it started to be financed by airline companies that America did lag and fall behind.

All proposals as to private financing and public financing of the entire project have been gone over, and that is all explained fully in our official records.

In financing, so far we have appropriated $511 million; this bill carries $142 million.

So that shows that we are passing the hump—that is, $653 million, including what is in the bill, and we will have to spend, then, between $400 million and $500 million to complete the research, development, and building of two prototype planes.

With that brief summary, I shall yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 374 and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 9, line 3, it is proposed to strike "$142,375,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,000,000."

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, my amendment to cut the appropriation for the supersonic transport would do two things. First, it would drastically reduce spending in fiscal 1968 on a major Federal project at a time when a reduction in Federal spending is an urgent necessity. It would do so, I emphasize, not by killing the SST program, but simply by slowing it down. The substantial funds remaining from the previous appropriation for the SST—a total of $124.5 million—would provide adequate support, in my view, for a more gradual development program in fiscal 1968.

The second effect of the amendment, if approved, would be to buy time—time needed to restudy the wisdom of the continued predominance of Federal financial participation in the project; time needed to search for solutions to the sonic boom problem, which is the fatal flaw in this venture—at least, the fatal technological flaw. It would provide the time needed to reexamine with thoroughness and objectivity the relative costs and benefits to the Nation as a whole of a federally developed SST.

Specifically, the amendment would reduce the amount appropriated for the SST for this fiscal year from $142,375,000 to $1 million.

The question I am putting before the Senate by proposing the amendment is: Shall we spend $142 million of the taxpayers' money this year on a project that will directly benefit only a handful of Americans; a project having a potential to impose enormous social and economic costs on every one of us, in order to provide unneeded protection for our thriving aviation industry and a highly uncertain defense for our balance-of-payments position and our national prestige against the grossly overblown threat of an overrated foreign competitor, the Concorde—and this at a time when the President is calling for a 10-percent tax increase in an effort to reduce what is likely to be one of the largest budget deficits in our history?

Are we going to spend $142 million on a supersonic transport that nobody but the aircraft manufacturing industry really wants and nobody but the jet set would use, and then give in to the growing pressures to cut spending on some less glamorous but vital program which lacks the powerful backers the SST has, but which actually offers a solution to some one of our pressing national problems?

Are we going to spend $142 million on a program that in this year of the big deficit is conspicuously absent from every reasonable list of national priorities?

How could anyone place the SST anywhere near the top position the priorities of this Nation warrant?

Are we going to spend it even though cutting it out will not jeopardize at all the ultimate objectives of the program and in the long run could result in a far better SST?

I have said repeatedly that we must cut Federal spending this year before we consider increasing taxes. The House Ways and Means Committee led by its very able chairman, WILBUR MILLS, has, in effect, said the same thing by voting this week by an overwhelming and, I can say, an irreversible vote of 20 to 5, to shelve the tax surcharge proposal. Congressman MILLS has called for a $7 to $10 billion cut. Some weeks ago I called for a $9 billion cut. I am convinced the President must lead the way in making these reductions but we can provide some guidance by cutting the most nonessential, the most obviously deferrable expenditures such as on the SST, the space program and public works. Admittedly, the $142 million involved here is not large compared to the total spending cut we need to make, but it is a beginning.

Let me say at this point, to defend myself against misinterpretation, that I recognize supersonic flight is inevitable and, if freed of some of the more objectionable liabilities it now carries with it, even quite desirable. I am as enthusiastic as anyone in this body about the prospect of being able to fly from Washington to London in 3 hours instead of 7½. I welcome as much as anyone the prospect of flying from Los Angeles to Sydney in 7½ hours instead of 15½. Pacific flights, in particular, would be made far less grueling with the introduction of SST's. Bringing the Pacific nations closer to us is likely to have significant effects on trade, on tourism, on international understanding—although, I would add, the likely effects can easily be overdrawn.

But, is the duration of the average commercial flight between Washington and London or between Los Angeles and Sydney a national problem of such magnitude that it deserves to be treated with as much concern and have as much pub-

lic money contributed to it as the crisis in our cities, the education of our children, or the pollution of our air, and our lakes and streams?

Even in the unlikely event your answer to that is "Yes," there is still this question: Will the SST really have much of an impact—in the short run—on door-to-door, city-to-city travel times? Every minute gained in the air seems likely to be all but canceled out by a growth in traffic congestion on the ground and in the holding patterns over our major airports. Furthermore, as planes grow bigger and increasingly noisy, airports will be moved farther and farther away from the central city, adding to the transportation problem.

We have plunged ahead in a hell-for-leather rush to build an SST for one overriding reason: the economic threat of the Concorde. The Russian TU-144 has also been touted as a major threat.

Our SST program has thus been driven by fear of competition rather than by reason. It bears all the marks of undue haste—an inequitable financing plan, loosely drawn contracts and a willingness to overlook, or at least not to meet head-on, serious obstacles such as the sonic boom problem.

Fearful predictions of the serious economic damage the Concorde and the Russian TU-144 will do to our aviation industry have been excessively alarmist.

Our response to this excessive alarm has been a project that, in effect, is a protectionist measure of the sort American administrations of both parties have sought to avoid since the mid-1930's.

What is worse, the protection is unnecessary. Why defend from foreign competition a thriving industry which does not need the protection? Why create more jobs when nearly all of those created by this project demand highly skilled workers for whom the demand already far exceeds the supply?

For example, the Boeing Co.'s backlog of orders for subsonic jets and space and defense items increased from the $3.2 billion of over a year ago to in excess of $5 billion. United Airlines placed an order with Boeing during last summer for 61 subsonic jet transports. That order was worth $520 million. Boeing is in the process of building the world's largest manufacturing plant at Everett, Wash., for construction of the 747 jumbo jet which, in its own way, promises to revolutionize air travel as much as the SST will. To illustrate Boeing's financial prowess, the 747 program was funded by a $700 million financial package the company put together during a period of tight credit in 1966.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield at that point?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I want to associate myself with what the Senator has said as to the lack of urgency for this project. I can say the same thing about the urgency of a manned trip to the moon. Boeing, I think, also participates in the program for going to the moon, does it not—or in one of the space programs—aerospace; is that not true?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am not sure whether it is. I know that it is an enormous force in the aircraft industry. As I have said, Boeing has a vast backlog of orders at the present time; greater, I think, than any aviation manufacturer has had in history.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I join in supporting the Senator's comments as to the urgency for the SST. Last week, I came back from Arkansas in a 747. I think we were an hour and a half in the air from Memphis to Washington, and then we had to circle just under an hour—58 minutes, I believe—after we reached Washington. Thus, even though these planes are quite adequate——

Mr. JACKSON. Will the Senator from Arkansas yield at that point for a correction?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. The 747 is yet to be built.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I mean the 727.

Mr. JACKSON. The 727; that is right.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I apologize. There are so many of these planes with fancy numbers that no one can keep them straight except those who are closely associated with Boeing.

Mr. JACKSON. What does the Senator mean by that?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is obvious.

Mr. JACKSON. I think the Senator——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Boeing is located in the Senator's State. It is the largest employer in the State of Washington.

Mr. JACKSON. That is right. They are heavily engaged in——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There is no secret about it. I did not know the Senator was so sensitive about that.

Mr. JACKSON. I am not sensitive about it. But I want to point out to the Senator that from time to time he has made some comments about the military industrial complex.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes——

Mr. JACKSON. As the Senator should know, about 85 percent of Boeing's business in the State of Washington is nondefense—it is commercial. The Senator apparently is not familiar with that.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There is very little, if any, distinction between the political influence of those associated with aerospace, or going to the moon, or the SST, because it is all one large industrial-military complex. It now influences, certainly, the financial operations in the Congress, because the Senator from Wisconsin is making, and has made before, an unanswerable case. Under present conditions in this country, to be spending this money on these projects that have no immediate urgency, and then to be asking for a tax increase on top of that, with a deficit of $28 billion, makes no sense at all. If this country is that stupid, it will get what it deserves.

I think the Senator from Wisconsin is absolutely right. I cannot understand why the President or the Congress should insist on this except for the pressure from the enormously influential forces that are interested in this irrational program dominating the Congress. They dominate them through their employees and through their influence back home. I have had people here tell me, "You know, the largest employer in my State makes modules," or makes this or that, "and I cannot afford to take a position which would undermine the jobs of the people there." It is political suicide to do so, it has gotten so big.

The size of the space program is perfectly ridiculous, when there is no sense in getting a man on the moon under present conditions, when we are fighting in Vietnam, when there have been riots in Detroit, and there will probably be other riots.

There is a priority here of putting aside the problems of the cities and other domestic needs and going ahead with this kind of project, which to me is utterly indefensible.

I realize the Senator from Washington has great influence. If he wants to make a correction of what I said as between 747 to 727, he is correct. I do not know how many airplanes or submarines Boeing makes, but it does not make any difference. It is one of the largest single prime contractors in the whole world, certainly in the United States. If it were in my State, I probably would be subject to a different set of ideas, myself, or I would not be here. That is all right. He is perfectly entitled to represent his State. He does it most effectively.

I have traveled on the 722. It brought me here from Arkansas. It took me an hour and a half to get here, and then it circled in the air for an hour. What good would it do to get me here in half an hour and then have to circle for an hour? In fact, it would probably take longer than that, because it would bring so many more people in the air. The congestion in and around the airport is terrible. I am going to Arkansas this afternoon. I will probably have to have a seeing-eye dog to get me through the airport. The jets make so much noise that they make life unbearable for people who live along the Potomac River. Anybody who lives there will tell us that. I do not live there, but I know many people who do.

Nobody knows what they are going to do about the sonic boom. Gene Black, who was the head of a group that looked into this problem, told me they did not know what to do about the sonic boom. They do not know what they are going to do about it, but they are going ahead with the plane. They do not have the airports to handle the airplanes, but they are going ahead.

Mr. PROXMIRE. If I may just say a word at this point, Boeing has been involved very substantially in the space program. It is completing, or has already completed, part of the Minuteman program. It is a part of the very important management team on the Apollo program. So the Senator's statement is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator. The Senator from Washington corrected me on the number of the 727. I had no intention to refer to him or any other Senator. I know Senators react to their constituencies in a proper manner. I do, too. I do not criticize the Senators from Washington. I only envy them their influence by which they have been able to benefit their State. I wish I could do half as much for my State. I am sure their constituents are proud of them.

I do not criticize them. I only point out the truth. If it is not true that the SST has a sonic boom problem, if it is not true that perhaps only one-half of 1 percent of the people would use the SST in the foreseeable future, because it has a restricted use, and it is not going to remake the economy or modes of pleasure, I wish they would show me how it is not true.

I take this opportunity to say this particularly because of the pressures being brought to bear for a tax increase. Pressure is being brought to bear from the administration to cut other programs.

I have in my hand an article written by Joseph R. Slevin, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Oct. 1, 1967]

BIG SPENDING CUT BACKERS DISREGARD PAINFUL LESSONS

(By Joseph R. Slevin)

Congressional backers of big Federal spending cuts are disregarding some 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.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The article reads, in part:

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—

Urban transportation, when everyone knows the traffic conditions in Washington—

Waste disposal, agricultural extension activities, and a broad range of other programs.

It states that there will be no new starts. It sounds like it did under the Eisenhower administration. It continues:

New construction of dams and Federal buildings is prohibited.

Yet we are going to vote to go to the moon. We have already spent many billions on the NASA program, and another appropriation for NASA will come before the Senate soon. Now we want to continue this program, which can cost anywhere from $1 to $5 billion. Invariably the cost turns out to be four or five times what the original estimates were, and that undoubtedly will be the case here.

What purpose does it serve? I do not understand it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a short statement on the amendment which I have prepared.

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

I wholeheartedly support the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. Proxmire. This amendment affords an opportunity to defer the expenditure of $141 million without ultimate damage to the role of the government in developing a supersonic transport aircraft. The Senator's amendment would provide $1 million to evidence the government's continuing interest in this project, but the amendment would make a needed reduction of $141 million in the present fiscal year.

There is no urgency for the development of this aircraft. Opportunities for reducing government spending are very few, and this is a non-essential activity which may be postponed. We are faced with the prospect of a $28 billion deficit—enormous incomprehensible expenditures for war and defense—and a tax increase to finance the war in Vietnam.

I read in the *Washington Post* last Sunday that the Administration has plans for a one-third cut in funds for aid to education, school lunches, child welfare, urban transportation, waste disposal, agricultural extension services, and many more necessary programs. This same article reported the possibility of 50% cuts in loans for rural electric cooperatives, disaster loans, and housing and small business loans—and a complete cessation of projects by the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation.

There is no justification for a scheme of national priorities which puts supersonic transports, trips to the moon, and anti-ballistic missiles ahead of hot lunches for school children, loans to victims of natural disasters, and aid to education.

The time may come when the nation can afford the luxury of contributions to development of a supersonic transport aircraft, but now is not the time. Let us delay this expenditure until war and defense expenditures have been reduced, until we discern some progress in efforts to purify polluted air and polluted rivers, until we have found ways at least to make progress on the problems of urban violence, unemployment, ignorance, malnutrition, and inadequate health services.

I urge the Senate to approve Senator Proxmire's amendment, and to take this first step toward sanity in redirecting the emphasis of Federal spending. Let us save $141 million now.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I congratulate the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, is the Senator through?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. One more word. The Senator from Wisconsin has stood up here making this fight. I know there are big manufacturers in his State, many of them with important contracts. He has stood here and made his case. He does a thorough research job to back him up. I have read his arguments. I have never found anything inaccurate in them.

I congratulate him on his industry and courage in revealing the facts and in at least making it possible, but not probable, that the Senate could benefit from his wisdom.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in answer——

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I thought the Senator was through.

Mr. PROXMIRE. No, I just started.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I will wait until the Senator is through. Then I will correct the RECORD.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I very deeply appreciate the statement of the Senator from Arkansas. What he says is unanswerable and completely correct. He has asked the right questions. Who is going to benefit? Why in the world should the taxpayers provide a subsidy for a private operation—which breaks all of our precedents, as has been shown—for the benefit of a very tiny fraction of the American people? Especially is it true

when there is so much pressure to reduce Government spending and spending in other fields.

Now I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I just wanted to make the observation, in light of what the distinguished Senator from Arkansas had to say, that I do not think anyone in this body is going to believe for one moment that the late President John F. Kennedy started this program on the SST because of any military-industrial complex. This is the burden of the position of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas. I think it is a very unfair assumption.

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. When the program was begun by President Kennedy, it was more of a research program, to see whether it made sense at that time. I do not think it is fair to say the Government or the executive branch of the Government was committed to going ahead with this program. In addition, a great many things have arisen since then. We are spending $30 billion a year in Vietnam. We are going to have a deficit of $29 billion. Yesterday the Senate voted for a cut of $900 million for jobs for the unemployed because we do not have enough money.

We are spending about $70 billion in the military field. I do not think that was anticipated 3 or 4 years ago, when we allocated $30 million or $40 million for this program.

I think the grave question is whether we should not postpone this matter for at least a year.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Six years.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Whether we should postpone the matter for at least a year, or even several years, to determine whether we can afford to go ahead with the program at this particular time, and whether the great demands being made on our economy and on the taxpayers of this country at the present time would not argue that to continue this program, at the moment, does not make a great deal of sense.

Mr. JACKSON. Does the Senator from New York think the late President John F. Kennedy got into this program because of some military-industrial complex?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. No, I do not think that at all.

Mr. JACKSON. That is my point.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. But if we go ahead now, may I say to the Senator from Washington, for whom I have great respect, and who always, in my judgment, decides these matters on the basis of what is in the best interests of the country, and not any selfish interest—I have found that to be true continuously, again and again, as shown by his votes in the Senate—the question I raise is not that, but just the question of whether, in view of the problems facing this country at the moment, in view of the problems which have arisen in this country during the past summer, in view of the problems that we face in Southeast Asia, Latin America, the Middle East, and all over the globe, in view of the fact that we face an expected deficit of $29 billion, with a suggested tax increase, we can really afford to go ahead with the program.

I heard Mr. Webb say yesterday that we are going to have to cut down a great deal on our space program. Perhaps that makes sense; I have asked serious questions about that program.

As I understand, this plane cannot even fly over land. I think there is a grave question, which all of us have to answer, on the issue of priorities. I cannot believe that the Senate of the United States, after acting yesterday to cut out jobs for the unemployed, which are desperately needed, with unemployment growing in our urban and rural ghettos, would today, the very next day, vote for this appropriation, which will cost the United States such a great deal, and will affect less than 5 percent of our population. It does not make any sense whatever to me, when we have just cut out an appropriation to help fellow citizens who desperately need help.

There are a number of other problems with the SST as well. There have been a number of studies, to which the Senator from Wisconsin has referred, which make it clear that the Government should not be investing at this time in the SST. It is probably not going to make money; its effects on the balance of payments will not be very large; it will be hard to avoid either getting into further regulation of airline prices or into an unwarranted subsidy to the manufacturers; most important, it will benefit a very small part of the American people and will have serious adverse effects on a great many people if the aircraft is allowed to fly in the manner that it has to if it is going to be economically viable.

The most important point is that the Government ought to enter into this type of project only if there are substantial public interests that are not private interests. This means that the program ought to benefit a large number of people in a substantial way. The SST program clearly does not do this. About 85 percent of U.S. residents have never flown, those who do fly do not always take long-haul flights, and considerably less than 5 percent of all Americans will ever fly SST's at the higher fare that will have to be charged. Except for businessmen on expense accounts, most people are going to continue to fly subsonic. Furthermore, American SST passengers will be coming from or going to a rather small number of places. Americans living elsewhere may never use an SST at all. On the other hand, the sonic boom is quite likely to affect everybody if the SST goes over land and there will be substantial nuisance value to it even if it is restricted to flying over water. The direct benefits to the public are therefore pretty small.

It has been suggested that there are indirect benefits: for example, the enhancement of national prestige and in the technological fallout from the research and development work. The first point seems to me to be too vague to justify this massive expenditure, particularly under present circumstances of inflationary pressure. The second may justify spending money on some research and development program but there is technological fallout from nearly every research and development program and it is not clear at all that that of the SST will be significantly greater than if the money is spent in some other way.

It is argued that the sale of SST's at $35 million or so each will benefit the balance of payments in the 1970's. This is not at all clear. It is certainly not the whole picture. If the United States sells SST's to foreign airlines, and this leads the foreign airlines to be better able to compete for American traffic, then some of the effects on the balance of payments will be offset by increased American tourist spending on foreign-flag transportation and possibly increased tourist spending abroad if more tourists go as a result of faster transportation. Further, the United States now exports a great many subsonic aircraft. Selling an SST abroad may result in the loss of a sale of an advanced subsonic. This would also reduce the effect on the balance of payments. The best guess of reliable experts is that over 5 years from date of sale the net balance-of-payments benefit to the United States from the sale of an SST will be no more than 5 to 10 percent of its export price, and may be less.

Turning to the pure economics, it appears that the rate of profit on the investment in the SST will be pretty low. Only under the most favorable assumptions does it turn out that such investment will earn the same rate of return as resources invested in manufacturing generally. On other possible assumptions, the SST loses money. The best available estimate is it will earn about 5 percent. This means that unless there is a special public interest in the SST, government investment in the project is an unwarranted, costly waste of resources. The resources used for the SST would be more productive invested elsewhere in the American economy. There are a number of major reasons for this.

One is competition with advanced subsonic aircraft; another is the uncertainty as to how much people are willing to pay for a relatively short decrease in speed; the SST will not reduce time in getting to airports. It will cut a transatlantic flight by a maximum of roughly 3½ hours, maybe less as faster subsonics are introduced. A third is uncertainty as to whether the SST will be permitted to fly over populated areas or allowed to get up to speed close to land, in view of the sonic-boom problem. Incidentally, the bigger you make the plane so as to carry more seats and make it pay off better, the worse the sonic-boom problem becomes.

Aside from the sonic-boom problem, there are other costs of the SST which will not be included in the direct cost to the Government and will have to be incurred to make the SST economical. Principally, sustantial expenditures will be required for improved air traffic control, solar and cosmic radiation monitoring systems, and improved meteorological forecasting. These items could run over a billion dollars from 1970 through

1990. The problem occurs because the SST moves so fast and because wind and temperature have a large impact on fuel consumption and payload.

With all of these problems, I think the Senate should vote to defer the project for the 1 year which the Senator from Wisconsin suggests.

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

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I think the record, with all due respect to the Senator from New York, ought to be clear. On June 9, 1963, President Kennedy stated:

> The Government should immediately commence a program to develop, at the earliest practicable date, a prototype of a commercially successful supersonic transport superior to that being built by any other country in the world.

That is exactly what we would provide for here. We are trying to provide the funds to complete the research, development, and production of two prototypes, in order to be first in the science of aviation.

I think it is of vital importance, not whether 2 or 3 or 5 percent of our people ride the supersonic transports, but that America still be preeminent in the world in the quality, the speed, and the performance of the greatest means of transportation that the world has, which is aviation.

Certainly, every single contribution that has yet been made in aviation research and development has been inaugurated primarily by the infusion of Government money. The greatest plane flying today, the prototype of all the large family of jet transports, including the 727 of the distinguished junior Senator from Arkansas, the oncoming 747, the jumbo jet, and all the others, was developed completely and totally with Government money, on Government contracts for the KC–135, the giant jet tanker that was procured to supply our Strategic Air Command. It was almost identical with the plane from which the 707 developed, and put Boeing first in the manufacture of air transports. Being first, they have continued to lead all the rest of the world in the quality, ability, speed, and performance of American-made planes. I do not think Boeing has any plant or any interest in Oklahoma; but I do think America must have an interest, not in the jet set and not in the few who might want to go first class, in 2 hours and 30 minutes, to England or France, but in producing, in America, the best quality of plane that we can produce. Shall we put that effort in mothballs, and cast away an investment of around $1.2 billion in the world's finest aircraft, which will probably be the parent of all the coming family of long-haul planes?

Certainly, there are a few problems that have not been solved. We have not solved the sonic boom. Nobody claims we have. The whole project is engineered, financed, and projected to fly the air routes of the world, 75 percent of which are over water. Nobody yet has produced any testimony to show that the fish will write their Congressmen, protesting against sonic booms. Anyone who has studied the matter, as I am sure most Senators have, is aware of the fact that when you approach land, you go subsonic about 75 miles away from the airport, while still over the water, and come in as quiet as today's 707's, if not more quietly. All of this talk about sonic booms, and being unable to fly over land, is merely a bugbear to prevent us from spending—not spending, but investing—in this field, in which America is superior, due to World War II research, from France, England, and other countries.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, almost everything that has been said by the Senator from Oklahoma about this supersonic transport, is completedly irrelevant to my amendment. My amendment would not kill the program, but would simply stretch it out, and would slow it down by only a few months, and it would save a very substantial amount of money on a major program.

I know that the Senator from Oklahoma is sincere in saying that private aviation has gained enormously from Government research on military aircraft. I have no objection to that. If private aviation can gain from Government research of the military on supersonic bombers, and so forth, as I am sure they have from the B–70 and the B–55, that is fine; but I say we should not pour hundreds of millions of dollars—this year $142 million—into a specific subsidy exclusively for private aircraft, which the Department of Defense says has absolutely no military value to them, and has made it absolutely clear. Under those circumstances, I think it is quite a different operation.

Furthermore, I should like to point out that whereas 75 percent of the air routes may be over water, in terms of density it is quite different. The flights are overwhelmingly over land. That means, on the basis of the implications of what the Senator from Oklahoma is saying, that you could not make a transcontinental flight in the supersonic transport; you could only use it for the relatively few flights and relatively few people flying over the Pacific or the Atlantic.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to correct the RECORD.

The Senator from New York made a comment that he did not believe that the Senator from Washington had a selfish attitude. I do not, either. I tried to make it clear that he was representing a large industry in his State.

I am very sensitive to the needs of the poultry industry. I am sure that raising broilers is in the national interest. You can call it selfish or not. I do not have any criticism, and did not mean to imply that the Senator from Washington is doing this for his own personal fortune at all.

It is a Senator's duty to represent a large industry in his State; and he represents it well. I thought the comment of the Senator from New York that he did not believe that he took the position he did on a selfish basis may have intimated that I thought he did. Of course I do not. He represents his State properly, as all of us should, and does it extremely well, as does the senior Senator from Washington.

I only wanted to add, with respect to what the Senator from New York said, that in 1963, at the time when this program was initiated, President Kennedy had not sent 500,000 men to Vietnam; we did not have a deficit of $30 billion staring us in the face; and he did not have anything like the domestic difficulties which face us today.

If we had no other burdens pressing upon us, if we were not in a war, and were suffering for lack of something to do with the money, I would say this was all right and would not raise my voice about it.

It was more or less like that. We had plans for going to the moon before we were involved in a war and before we had riots in many of our big cities and before we recognized the need for the kind of training that the poverty program deals with. These conditions are different, however.

This is one of the great troubles with our national policy, and particularly with our foreign policy. We seem unable to recognize that things are different in the world today than they were 15 years ago.

We still have the leading administrator of the executive branch, the Secretary of State, talking as if the same conditions exist today that existed in the day of Stalin. We cannot seem to make the transition from one period to another. This is clearly a matter of low priority.

The President has appealed that we save money. Efforts have been made by him to cut down on as many things as he can. He has made many efforts to save money. I will not belabor the RECORD. However, they are cutting many fundamental programs in my State, programs for water and sewage projects, simple things that any American ought to be entitled to, even in the smaller cities.

The money is not available to make needed loans and grants for water and sewer projects. The old area redevelopment projects, such as we had 2 or 3 or 4 years ago—and they did a wonderful job in my State—are limited now because the money is limited.

All that is provided for the Ozark development program now is enough planning money to barely keep it alive—a few thousand dollars to allow them to make plans.

This is what the attitude is. Surely no one denies that a great effort is being exerted to cut all important nondefense, nonmilitary, nonspace, and nonaircraft industry expenses in this country.

I do not think it is wise. I think it is against the long-term interests of the country. I do not understand why we do not see what the Concorde is like. It is supposed to be out in 1970. My guess is that it will have more bugs than our SST will have.

I do not think that any disaster will take place. I would like to see the project delayed. It would make me feel better about a tax bill.

I notice that the Secretary of Defense gave notice the other day that he has a new idea on how to save money. The Secretary said that it costs a billion dollars a year to operate the early warning de-

fense system and that by spending $4 billion more now, we can save half of that amount.

The Secretary is a very good figurer. If he could make it $8 billion, perhaps we could really get rich.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the excessive alarm generated by the Concorde is based on an extremely optimistic view of the market prospects for supersonic transports relative to subsonic jets. These fears ignore the enormous comparative advantage enjoyed by our aviation industry in international trade—an advantage so great that we provide most of the commercial aircraft for the free world. It will take more than the Concorde with its serious limitations to destroy or even damage that comparative advantage.

The jumbo jets our aircraft industry is building now will be flying long before the Concorde is introduced and they are sure to be a big factor in maintaining our trade advantage. The jumbo jets offer the very attractive prospect of much lower air fares because of their high payload capacity. Because of their great size, a few airlines are talking about turning some of these huge planes into flying luxury liners with all the comforts of the Queen Elizabeth. The SST's may have a tough job displacing them. The SST's will be selling speed. The jumbo's will be selling comfort and low fares. Which will the customers choose? It is anyone's guess. But putting all the marbles on SST's or Concordes may be a bad bet. The threat of the Concorde, which has frightened us into this venture, could very well turn out to be a myth.

The Concorde is already in a dozen different kinds of trouble. Its costs are running far beyond original estimates which projected an estimated cost-per-plane of $10 million. The cost per plane is now up to $20 million, according to Sir George Edwards, the managing director of the British Aircraft Corp., which is one of the two manufacturers in the British-French consortium building the plane. The most recent estimate of expected total development costs put it at $1.5 billion. A report just made by the British Committee of Public Accounts, a public spending watchdog, warns, however, that the total development costs by the time the Concorde takes to the air is likely to have reached $2 billion.

This, to understate it, does not please the British, who are embroiled in serious economic difficulties anyway. The Committee of Public Accounts urged in its report that both the French and British Governments immediately establish machinery to review the entire program. Newsweek magazine reported, in the latest issue out, that members of the British Cabinet have been arguing privately that the Concorde looks less and less like a productive investment and are urging the Government's participation in the program be discontinued.

Because the Concorde will have a fixed wing instead of a hinged wing like our SST, it will be able to fly economically only at supersonic speeds and thus will be highly vulnerable to sonic boom limitations. That means they will have a great deal of trouble unless they fly people from one ocean port to another ocean port, across one ocean. And there is mounting evidence that these limitations will be adopted. The city of Santa Barbara, Calif., passed an ordinance a few weeks ago prohibiting flights over the city that would produce sonic booms. Legislation is being considered in the Swedish Parliament to ban supersonic flights over that country causing booms that would be capable of waking a sleeping person. The Swiss Government, concerned about avalanches caused by sonic booms, is known to be considering similar legislation as is the Government of West Germany.

I can recall so vividly when the B-58 was making trial supersonic runs over Milwaukee, the tremendous amount of mail and calls I received, not to mention the damage charged against the Government at that time.

The only reason this boom was accepted at all by the people of my State was because they recognized the military necessity and military purpose. However, we can imagine the views of the people when these planes are flown by individuals carrying people for pleasure or for commercial purposes with no relationship whatsoever to defense or the national interest.

Let me say at this point that I think sonic boom limitations have the same serious implications for our own SST, despite the fact that it will be able to fly at something less than prohibitive costs at subsonic speeds. Why spend $4 or $4.5 billion developing a plane capable of flying at supersonic speeds when it will be forced to fly much of the time at subsonic speeds?

As was pointed out in the discussion with the Senator from Oklahoma, while 75 percent of the world's air routes are over water, most of the fights are over land, and the intensity factor is much greater over land.

The answer FAA officials would give to that, if they could speak freely, is that they have every expectation that people will learn to accept the boom. The SST's will start by flying the ocean routes. And soon the economic pressures of flying these high-cost planes on limited routes will force admission of the planes to a few scattered land routes. And ultimately they will be flying everywhere. And we will all live out our lives in an immense drop forge foundry.

At any rate, I simply do not believe the Concordes are the big threat they are reputed to be. I believe we can afford to delay our own program as much as 2 years without our aircraft trade account suffering any damage at all. The pending amendment would slow it down less than a year. In fact, the Institute for Defense Analyses, which projected potential demand for the SST to 1990 for the FAA, declared that if introduction of our SST were pushed back from the current target of mid-1974 to a new target of mid-1976, the total number of Concordes and SST's sold would ultimately be substantially identical to the number sold if there had been no 2-year slip. A 2-year delay, in other words, would make almost no difference at all. And that is just what the pending budget-cutting amendment would achieve.

If this is true, why should we appropriate $142 million in fiscal 1968 for the SST, when the Vietnam war costs continue to mount, when we are facing a serious budget deficit?

We are not really in a race with the Concorde, anyway. The Concorde and the Russian TU-144 will be made of aluminum. A plane with aluminum skin, flying at supersonic speeds for the long periods of time and with the frequency required by airlines, pushes aluminum to its very limit. Aluminum will not stand up with the friction heat that is generated. If what is necessary is a heat-resistant titanium, that puts us in an entirely different ball game, and no one is even in the ball park with us. It means we can take all the time we need to build the best plane possible. Any SST that does not incorporate some solution to the sonic boom problem will not be a good plane and is not worth spending money on, because sonic boom restrictions will make any such plane—whether it is American or Anglo-French—a commercial failure.

One of the principal justifications for undertaking the SST program is that it would make a substantial contribution to our foreign receipts. We must build the SST, we are told, because that is the only way we can defend ourselves from the severe negative impact on our balance of payments that would result from the sale of Concordes to U.S. airlines and the displacement of U.S.-built subsonic planes in foreign airline fleets.

I should like to point out, however—incidentally, this is a point that has been relied on by the aircraft industry in big advertisements in the newspapers and by proponents in the Senate, in the House, and elsewhere—that the U.S. Treasury, the U.S. Commerce Department, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and the Budget Bureau are the agencies in the Government with the responsibility for overseeing our balance of payments. They are the agencies possessing the greatest expertise on this subject. But not one of these four agencies has made public a single word of comment on the balance of payments effect of the SST program. What do the experts tell us about the balance-of-payments effect?

The public has been treated to ex parte statements. We have not heard any evaluation from responsible executive expert bodies. Since the balance-of-payments question has loomed so large in debate on the SST, the Senate cannot act intelligently on this appropriation until the whole balance-of-payments question has been subjected to expert analysis on an impartial basis.

Two economists in the Office of Business Economics, in the Department of Commerce, did submit private comments to the FAA evaluating this question; and they concluded that only if the SST did not impair our competitive position in world markets for subsonic planes could the balance-of-payments effects of the SST be favorable. I believe this is a highly questionable assumption. It seems clear to me that if we produce the SST, it will be in competition with our own subsonic jets that we would otherwise sell overseas.

The Institute for Defense Analyses,

which draws on a stable of superb economists, arrived at essentially the same conclusion, in a special study for the FAA. IDA agreed there would be an effect on the balance of payments but said it could just as easily be either very minor on the positive side or even slightly negative if export sales of American SST's reduced exports of American subsonic planes or if U.S. airlines lost passengers to foreign airlines operating American SST's.

In view of the wide disagreements among economists on this question, the FAA's independent claim that the SST will make a huge cumulative contribution to our balance-of-payments position is preposterous and impossible to substantiate.

The uncertainties of any forecast concerning the balance of payments are large enough to make a firm narrow-range estimate impossible. What happens is that the assumptions you use are enough to create the result. That is precisely what the FAA has done. Because it wants the program, it has used sufficiently optimistic assumptions to create a result that justifies its want. This is no way to make either a governmental or a business decision.

The FAA analysis ignores the fact that the likely high fares on the SST will limit it, to some extent, to high-income passengers. This means that regardless of who owns the SST's, Americans—because of their affluence—would make up the largest proportion of SST passengers. As a result, our travel balance might well be much less favorable.

What I am saying is that if we, with our terrific manufacturing capacity, build many SST's, it will mean that there will be more flights overseas. It will mean that Americans will fly overseas and spend their money overseas. Will this have a favorable effect on our balance of payments? Of course not. The big effect of this development will be unfavorable to our balance of payments, because one of the most adverse elements in our balance of payments is American tourist dollars spent overseas.

The FAA analysis is defective because it pays attention exclusively to the revenue from sales of the SST abroad and totally ignores the income that would be generated abroad by the use of the planes sold—which also would have an effect on our balance of payments.

The FAA, in effect, has done a sum in which you count all the plus items—the receipts—and leave out a good many of the minus items—the loss of other receipts.

There is another factor—the most important factor of all—that must be considered in analyzing the balance of payments and the SST's effect on it. That is the time factor. The balance of payments is a time factor. It is not a problem in 1975 or 1980. It is a problem today, and now.

The SST will not go on the market until 1974—at the very earliest. By then, we may have extricated ourselves from Vietnam, and thus drastically reduced our military commitments abroad; and our foreign aid by then may be reduced relative to our gross national product. As a result, we might be running an embarrassingly large surplus in our balance of payments.

Of course, one of the big elements in our adverse balance of payments, is the fact that we have troops overseas, particularly our Vietnam experience, which is probably contributing, on the basis of the best estimates I have seen, up to $1 billion to our adverse balance of payments. Are we going to have 500,000 troops in Vietnam in 1974, which will be the first time that the SST can be sold by American manufacturers? Foreign aid, too, contributes somewhat to our adverse balance of payments. That is likely to diminish in relation to our gross national product. Of course, the biggest element in our adverse balance of payments today is American investment abroad.

There is every prospect that within 8 or 10 years we will be in a position where American investment abroad is bringing in far more than we are expending in investment abroad, because, by and large, the return from investment abroad is very substantial.

Under those circumstances, there is a real prospect that we could have a very favorable—almost an embarrassingly favorable—balance of payments by 1974 or 1975. That is why the President has reiterated, and so has the Secretary of the Treasury, that the balance-of-payments problem is a problem for now. That is why they have put into effect strictly temporary measures for curbing our adverse balance of payments.

Many economists question whether the balance-of-payments issue is even a valid one in connection with a decision on the SST. It seems to me quite possible that it is a fake issue or one that simply cannot be adequately assessed. Prof. Charles Kindleberger of MIT, one of this country's leading international economists, said in a letter to me several months ago:

> The United States ought to decide whether to invest in the SST on the basis of the cost-benefit criteria related to tastes and productive resources, not the balance of payments. The latter concept relates to liquidity, or the cash position, and should not have a major impact on expenditure decisions.

So the balance-of-payments issue is really an irrelevant one in deciding on the SST. If it is unwise, the balance of payments does not change that.

But I cannot regard it as irrelevant that the Treasury Department in particular has made no assessment that would assist our decisionmaking. If the FAA claim is true—and I believe it is not—the Treasury should be interested enough to say so in favor of such a substantial difference to our balance of payments. If the FAA claim is false, I would like to have the Treasury's estimate as a more valid basis for making a decision.

Mr. President, at this point I should like to review briefly the kind of money we have tied up in this project.

Congress has appropriated since fiscal 1962 a total of $511 million for a supersonic transport development. The total would go to $653 million if the amount recommended by the Appropriations Committee is approved.

Booz, Allen & Hamilton predict that the Government will have to fund the major part of the cost of the certification stage and some of the costs of the production stage.

Mr. President, Booz, Allen & Hamilton are financial consultants, and I think they are in a far better position to make an assessment in this matter. They have studied it, and they are an efficient financial firm.

They say that the Government will have to pump in another $1.3 billion which will jump the sum to $2.6 billion.

If their figures are correct, as they always are on these matters, the Government investment would go far higher at that time.

In my judgment, it will be at least $4 billion.

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator has stated that the Federal Government, after developing these two prototypes, will have to "pump in" $1.3 billion. I think the Senator owes an explanation to the Senate as to what he means by "pump."

Is it to provide for the revolving credit financing of the plane sold to airlines, which will be repaid when the plane is resold, or is it money never to be recovered? The word "pump" is very ambiguous and it is misleading. I am sure that the distinguished Senator does not wish to be indefinite in this matter.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I shall elaborate in considerable detail in a moment as to why I think this is likely not to be recoverable, and why the contract is so badly drafted that the taxpayers will not get any of this money back.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Does the Senator honestly believe that?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I certainly do and I think I can demonstrate that to the satisfaction of observers.

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I was interested in the terminology that the Senator used when he referred to "pump." I wonder if the Senator was talking about an approved and certificated supersonic transport which is sold and put under a temporary mortgage and is subject to long-term financing, perhaps by an insurance company, or what does "pump" mean?

Mr. PROXMIRE. This is not the view of the Senator from Wisconsin. This is the view of Booz, Allen & Hamilton.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am sure they did not use the word "pump" without clarifying or defining it.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Whether it will be pumped in, vested in, or expended on behalf of research with sincere conviction that it will be paid back—although I am convinced it will not be paid back—it is the view of these experts that if we are going to get a supersonic transport beyond the prototype stage and in a position to be sold commercially when finished, the Government liability will be $2.6 billion.

Mr. MONRONEY. Industry contributed to that, but if the Senator is talking about another $1.3 billion I think he

owes the Senate a detailed explanation as to where this money is coming from and what is meant by the word "pump."

Mr. PROXMIRE. The source of the money is the American taxpayer. The source of it is the same as the source of the other money. The American taxpayer. The argument for it will be the same argument as now. The argument will be that we have gone so far with this matter that we should not give up; that we have so much in the pot in this poker game that we cannot withdraw. It will be said that we have put in $1.3 billion and we cannot afford not to press on and up the ante. This is the kind of argument which will be used to persuade us to go forward.

I realize that the FAA has assured us that our commitment is limited, but on the basis of the best advice of financial experts who have studied the matter and who favor the project, and incidentally, who were employed by the FAA, we are going to have to expend—if the Senator prefers this phrase—an additional amount.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator adds $1.3 billion to this amount. He seems not to be able to identify what it is, as to whether it is a loan to be paid back on a short-time basis by the airlines, who are capable of meeting financing. They have financing by giant insurance companies who look on aircraft financing as one of their best sources for extending credit. This is the only way I can possibly see how the Senator contributes an additional $1.3 billion to the cost.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Booz, Allen & Hamilton say the Government will have to fund a major share of the cost of the certification stage and some of the cost of the prototype stage, in their judgment, if this is going to be commercially successful. These are people with great reputations as financial experts and they are one of the 2 or 3 top financial firms in the country.

Mr. MONRONEY. They are a good firm. The Senator realizes this is a charge against Boeing Aircraft and the profits made by this airline, and the production credit as this plane goes down the line. If one is sold to American Airlines, United Air Lines, I have no objection and I am sure the Government is taking no risk in connection with production credit for delivery of these planes during the course of manufacture.

It is as good as a loan and as good as any financing you could get. This is no giveaway or a risk of capital. This is as normal as bread and butter, and yet the Senator would make this look like it is high risk, speculative, and uncertain when he talks about the money that is going to be cranked into this in trying to conjure up something in connection with the development of the plane.

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Perhaps it would be helpful to have the actual figures involved in the additional investment. I have an article before me which appeared in the American Economic Review, by Stephen Enke. I understand he was involved as a Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense in this matter as it developed.

He states:

> If the U.S. Government is initially to finance 80-90 percent of the U.S. SST's development costs, and if up to $4 or $5 billions of American resources must somehow be invested in development and manufacture before the program generates a net cash inflow from sales to airlines, on obvious economic test of the U.S. SST's justification is its ability to earn the 10-15 percent rate of return earned on an average by domestic resources employed in U.S. industry.

Is it correct that before this program is completed the taxpayer is going to have to put up $4 to $5 billion?

Mr. PROXMIRE. There is a very great difference of opinion in the Senate on this matter. The contention of those who support the program say the liability is limited to $1.2 billion. They contend this amount will be repaid.

I disagree strongly with that contention and say that on the basis of the judgment of the financial consultants, and I accept their view, it is going to cost $2.6 billion on the basis of our experience with research programs in the military and so forth. I think that is optimistic. It is much more likely to cost $4 billion or more.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. When the Senator mentions $1.3 billion, is that only through the prototype stage?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct. That would be through two prototypes.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Are taxpayers' funds necessary after the prototype is developed?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The view of Booz, Allen, and Hamilton is that the additional cost to achieve certification and a plane capable of certification and additional construction costs will entail, in their view, a further Federal Government investment, a further taxpayer investment, which will amount to $2.6 billion or $1.3 billion more involved in the later stage.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Could we ascertain from the Senator from Washington or one of those Senators who support this matter whether they can give assurance to the Senate that no more than $1.3 billion will be spent?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I must turn to the testimony of all witnesses who assure us that there is no Government commitment whatsoever beyond $1.2 billion.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I understand that there is no commitment, but the point the Senator from Wisconsin is raising, and what is said also in the recent objective reports, and the Booz, Allen & Hamilton study, is that it will cost $3 billion, $4 billion, or $5 billion.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The entire cost of the project might, but I do not think Federal Government funds will be involved when we reach this point. The financial investment by the Federal Government in this airplane, that is the amount of money it will have put in, I do not think need trouble anyone at all because, as the Senator from Oklahoma has pointed out the Government commitment, as it now stands, ends when two prototypes are built and each flies 100 test hours. I do not know how Booz, Allen & Hamilton arrived at its estimate and come to a different conclusion but hundreds of experts have looked into this program. Reams of testimony have been printed. The committee examined this project with a fine tooth comb, as did the House and its committees.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Could I ask the Senator——

Mr. MAGNUSON. Let me finish please.

The Senate committee did not decide upon the amount of the appropriation. The House did. The House had a rollcall vote on it and decided it.

The House, as we all know well, is aware of the fiscal condition of the budget. This SST project was part of the administration budget. The House has already reduced the budget request by $50 million. The Senate committee went along with that action. These contracts and commitments were screened for 18 long months by a special committee appointed by the President. It included Mr. Eugene Black and Mr. John McCone—and Mr. Stanley Osborne. After 18 months it was decided that the financing embodied in the present contract was the best course and no further commitment was made.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. What concerns me is that it appears, from some of the objective studies which have been made as to what it will cost—the airplane itself, to develop from the prototype of the plane, and then the plane which will actually fly and be utilized—all this will cost the Federal Government a great deal more money.

Second, I do not believe we have the airports now which can accommodate this kind of airplane. As I understand it, the Los Angeles authorities will have to construct a special airport further away, which will mean an extra long period of time to go to and from such an airport.

Further, this plane will not be able to fly over land, or take a trip from Oklahoma to California, or Oklahoma to New York, or from Chicago to New York, or from the Midwest to the Far West, or to the East. It is not going to be able to fly over Europe, either.

I think it is a splendid thing for the airlines to do. I think it is a splendid thing for the airplane manufacturers. But I do not understand what the taxpayers of America will be getting out of it, particularly during this critical and crucial period of time in our history.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I should like to answer that——

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. That is why I raise the question.

Mr. MAGNUSON. When this airplane was first proposed, and it has been in the proposal stage for almost 12 years, many airplane companies worked on it. No design was ever suggested at any time, even during the industry competition, that would have precluded the airplane using any of our major airports today.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. If I may interject there, we cannot get an airplane into any regular airport today, let alone this kind of plane.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The SST will not make any difference. The Senator is correct, as everyone knows, the planes of today are stacked up over every one of

our major airports. The SST and the Jumbo 747 jets might even help because they will carry more passengers, thus perhaps lessening the number of airplanes flying and trying to take off and land at our airports.

Mr. PROXMIRE. There is a technical point here. RAND technicians have informed us recently that this plane is likely to weigh 900,000 pounds—that is, if it is to become a real possibility—so, a plane weighing that much would certainly constitute a real problem for our present runways and we would have to do something about new runways.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Well, the RAM technicians are in conflict with 213 aviation engineers and technicians who worked on the SST specifications for two and a half years.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. If this plane is as good as the Senator from Washington says it is, why do not the aviation manufacturers make this plane and keep the Government out of it? If it is such a great plane, why not let private industry do it and keep Government out of it?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Because no one aircraft company has the tremendous financial resources needed to do it by itself.

The late President, in Colorado, made clear the necessity for moving ahead to maintain American air superiority at that time. In a speech there in 1961 he suggested that this SST was a matter on which the Government must proceed, and he was hopeful that there would be Government participation. President Kennedy suggested formula of 75 percent Government participation-25 percent industry. Long hearings were held in the Commerce Committee—about a year and a half ago—chaired by the Senator from Oklahoma, and we determined that that figure was not quite equitable. Thus, the commitment the Presidential Advisory Committee worked out, after 18 months of study, provides the present formula.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That was the position which the Assistant Secretary of Defense, after careful study, took, to wit, that it should be built and it would be much better for private industry to build it. The answer to the Senator's question is that there is no very good reason for the Federal Government to come in on this, under any circumstances.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Well, that argument was settled long ago. At this point, I just want to answer and hope to clear up to the best of my ability some of the technical questions raised here.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I appreciate that.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am not an aeronautical engineer. I did not propose nor start the SST project myself. The design competition was keen. The Boeing Co. happened to win the airframe part of the competition. Its headquarters, of course, is in my State. That is all well and good. I am not embarrassed to talk about it. I would be just as concerned and just as enthusiastic, after all these years, of going through this SST project, both in the Appropriations and Commerce Committees if "company B" were doing it, or Lockheed, or North American, or Douglas, because I think it is good for America.

I am talking about superiority in the air. Now we can talk about all the social programs we want—and I have always enthusiastically supported these programs, and I know something about the pressing and urgent needs of our country—I have been voting for the social needs of this country in Congress for 31 years. I think I know a little bit about them. I think I am keenly aware of them. But I also know that we have to have some economic programs going to keep business alive and prospering, to provide new job opportunities and to preserve the health of one of America's great industries. We must be concerned with our unfavorable balance of payments, and many other things—in order to draw tax revenue into the Treasury to pay for our important social programs. I think the SST project happens to be one of great economic and technological importance for the future. I think it will eventually return to the Treasury much more than we ever will invest in it. This has been the history of Government investments in science and technology, and other areas of investment, including many public works projects.

The Senator from Colorado and I have sat in committee, hour after hour, for 6 years, listening to testimony on this subject. At first, we were skeptical, too. We were not sure it would fly. But I bow to the aeronautical engineers who have brought this concept to life. The financing part of the project, I think, has been gone over as thoroughly and with as fine a toothcomb by these same committees and the financial aspects of the program have been called fair and equitable by some of the most expert and knowledgeable men in this field.

I do not think that the motives of the junior Senator from Washington or myself should be impugned because we happen to have in our State a company which makes the most successful commercial airplanes in use today. About 80 percent of the people in the world are flying in Boeing airplanes today. I am sure there is no contribution which the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] and I make to the fine airplanes which Boeing produces. They just happen to be doing that. And I am confident they will do likewise with the SST. When Boeing makes a bad airplane, it will be a long, blue Monday for the world. Furthermore, I think the SST will be a good financial investment for the airlines.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin has the floor.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I go back to the point I made earlier, that perhaps this would make a good deal of sense if the world in which we live were different and the problems that face the country were different, but we are not talking here in a vacuum. We are talking about a war that is going on, and we are talking about the problem of our country facing a deficit of $29 billion, according to President Johnson. Perhaps I would look at it in an entirely different way if it were not for our internal problems. I know the Senators from Washington are much more aware of some of those problems than I am.

Mr. MAGNUSON. As the Senator knows, I was fighting on the floor 2 weeks ago for 5 long days trying to establish the proper priorities for some of these important housing and urban needs.

The House approved the $142 million SST appropriation by a 3-to-1 vote. That is the way the House voted, with all the priorities they are so keenly aware of over there. We, in the committee, merely accepted the House figure.

I think we must look ahead to keep our superior position in every way, including working for the vital domestic programs for which the Senator from New York so diligently labors, we must consider our balance-of-payments problem, and try to assure increasing tax revenues to pay for some of the social and urban programs we have been fighting so hard for.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Three hours ago the administration was in favor of cutting $198 million from the poverty program which would have provided jobs. Now it is supporting this kind of legislation and thinks it is important to have this kind of program. I think it is also important to have the other.

Mr. MAGNUSON. As you know, I voted against that administration cut, but that additional money was not budgeted. This SST appropriation is a budgeted item.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. If it was not budgeted, that means the administration was against it. Now the administration is suggesting this. It is the fact that it is a budgeted item that concerns me.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I do not want to prolong this debate. I simply wish to emphasize that this country has to remain great and strong in all fields. We cannot quit seeking to strengthen our economy and our industrial development, because then Mother Hubbard's cupboard—or the Treasury if you wish—would be bare, and we could not fund some of the programs that the Senator from New York and I so strongly favor. Commercial transport development is one of the fields in which we should move ahead. I think the amount of money we are asking you to provide today will keep us abreast of this field and is well worth while as we look toward the future and try to guarantee that more tax dollars will flow into the Treasury in the future.

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. To clear up the matter of the $1.3 billion, this is not Federal money. It is a fact that if this plane is unsuccessful this money will not be used, because there would be no mass production of supersonic aircraft. They have to be manufactured and completed before long-term financing can be had on them from the insurance companies or banking institutions. The $1.3 billion figure is working capital. What the Senator is talking about, with respect to the $1.3 billion that would be underwritten,

is what would happen if there was a great credit demand and success and demand for the plane.

Mr. PROXMIRE. This $1.3 billion would be after the prototype but before certification.

Mr. MONRONEY. There will be no drag on production credit until after certification. These prototypes are going to have to go through certification. One hundred and thirty of them have already been sold, with big deposits, to almost every American airline, running into $52 million. So we are talking about production credit. The Senator is worrying about total production credit, but I am saying that until the plane is a huge success they will not need that credit. If it is a success, Boeing will put under construction at least 300 supersonic aircraft, the price tag of which is $40 million per copy.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I think I can explain my position better if I can proceed with my statement. The likelihood of getting back the huge initial Federal investment is very small in view of the weaknesses in the contract.

Mr. MONRONEY. There are no weaknesses in the contract. The plane is the important thing. The insurance companies will not insure an unfinished plane, but when it is finished, they will insure the plane. It is that span that we are talking about, in view of the high number to be served. This amount of money will be required only if the plane is very successful and if the sales appear to be mounting.

Mr. PROXMIRE. There is an overlap of $1.3 billion between prototype and certification, tooling up, and so forth, before the plane will be sold in sufficient amounts, according to the Booz-Allen estimates.

To continue with my statement, we are spending all of this money on a project that has never been specifically authorized by Congress. The statutory authority upon which all appropriations for the SST have been based thus far is the implied authority of section 312 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, which allows the FAA to procure "experimental aircraft." Is the Congress going to allow billions of dollars of public funds to be committed to development and construction of a contraption that may well be irrelevant to the country's real needs without even taking a hard look at both sides of the issue.

I want to come now to the point so properly raised by the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY]. The possibility of totally or predominantly private financing of the SST has never been adequately explored. I think the magnitude of Federal spending on the SST has reached a point where a thorough reconsideration of this alternative would be appropriate. Such studies as there have been on this question have been suppressed. One I am referring to in particular was completed 2 years ago. It was done by now Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, Robert H. Charles. It was made public only a month ago after columnists Rowland Evans and Robert Novak got wind of it. One of the major conclusions of the Charles report was that extensive direct Government assistance to SST development would mean Government control which would result in a less satisfactory and more costly SST. The Government currently is financing directly 80 to 90 percent of the project's costs. Mr. Charles concluded, on the basis of a very detailed study, that the entire cost of development and production of the SST could be financed privately if the Government insured part, but at no time more than half, of the risk.

One compelling reason for exploring more intensively the possibility of total private financing is this: It has not been proven that the SST would directly benefit anyone beyond the 1 or 2 percent of the population who ride in these planes. It is unfair for a democratic government to use public funds to finance a project that will directly benefit only 1 or 2 percent of the population while imposing both a tax levy on all Americans as well as the additional cost of sonic boom damage to property, the deterioration of health due to an increase in noise pollution and the potential damage to the free enterprise system that would flow from the predicted bankruptcy of some airlines and the monopolization of aircraft manufacturing.

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Would the Senator clarify how many people it is estimated, or what percentage of the population it is estimated, will use the plane?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The estimate I made was based on the percentage of the people who now fly, the estimate of the percentage of people who fly overseas; and, to be fair to the proponents, it was assumed that the number might double or triple.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. What percentage of Americans does the Senator think are apt to use the plane?

Mr. PROXMIRE. One or two percent.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. One or two percent of the population of the whole country are likely to use the SST?

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is my view, but if the figure were 5 percent, the argument is almost just as good.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Is it also correct that traveling on the SST will be more expensive than on the subsonic plane?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Well, travel on the SST may be at a fare comparable with present costs. It might be a little lower. On the best estimates I have seen, it is likely to be substantially higher than on the jumbo jets which will be coming into production in 1970 or so, which are so much bigger than the present planes and which will fly at 600 miles an hour, and are likely to provide great competition.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Has the Senator worked out at all what the additional cost will be in more electronic equipment and more safety equipment and new airports if we go ahead with the SST?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I have no estimates at all on the cost of the new airports. We understand the weight of the SST may make the cost higher. We do not know. We have not worked it out. On the other hand, we have made the assumption that the estimates by the FAA may be reasonably accurate. We have had to increase the projected cost of the Concorde. It was estimated originally at $10 million a plane. Now it has already increased to $20 million. It is likely to be much higher.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Again going back to this article by Stephen Enke, he anticipates and predicts that the cost of additional airports, and additional equipment for the airports, because of the SST, will be at least several billions of dollars, which will have to be added to the cost if we go ahead with this airplane.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the entire article to which I have referred.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It would be very helpful.

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

[From the American Economic Review, Vol. LXII, No. 2, May 1967]

COST-BENEFIT ANALYSIS FOR GOVERNMENT DECISIONS—GOVERNMENT-INDUSTRY DEVELOPMENT OF A COMMERCIAL SUPERSONIC TRANSPORT*

(By Stephen Enke)

The U.S. Government is expected to spend $2 billion or more to develop a commercial supersonic transport (SST) that will be safe, profitable, and available for airline use around 1974.

Among the major policy questions now being raised by the U.S. SST program are: (1) Is a U.S. SST economically justifiable? (2) Why is federal assistance necessary? (3) How much of its expenditures on the SST should the federal government recover, and through what means? (4) How can government finance an SST monopoly, and yet protect the public interest without concerning itself with aircraft prices, flight frequencies, and passenger fares? (5) Are the benefits of the SST sufficiently general to justify a federal subsidy of its development and possible manufacture?

The answers to these questions are of very broad interest because the U.S. SST may be the first of several federal government programs to develop products of advanced technology for commercial use.

SST'S ECONOMIC JUSTIFICATION

The President has declared that the U.S. SST must be safe and "profitable," but what is the interpretation of profitable and how can it be estimated far in advance?

Airline managements presumably will not buy an SST unless it can earn as much on its investment cost as can be earned on the advanced subsonics of the 1970's (e.g., the Boeing 747). Practically, this means that SST prices, flight costs, and receipts must permit a return of about 20 percent before taxes and interest. (Publicized "orders" for SST's are revocable until performance and prices are known.)

What airframe and engine manufacturers must ordinarily expect to earn from a new aircraft is more uncertain. Realizations have often been far worse than expectations, and several new commercial aircraft of the past ten years have lost money for their manufacturers (e.g., Convair 880). Expectations of

*The author wishes to acknowledge contributions from Drs. Arnold B. Moore, Edward H. Rastatter, and John A. Walgreen.

profit must presumably be higher the greater are the sums to be risked and the greater the dispersion of possible financial outcomes.

If the U.S. government is initially to finance 80–90 percent of the U.S. SST's development costs, and if up to $4 or $5 billions of American resources must somehow be invested in development and manufacture before the program generates a net cash inflow from sales to airlines, an obvious economic test of the U.S. SST's justification is ability to earn the 10–15 percent rate of return earned on an average by domestic resources employed in U.S. industry.

Whether the resource and money costs sunk in the U.S. SST's development and manufacture can earn a 10–15 percent rate of return depends upon: (1) costs of development, for airframe and engine; (2) costs of manufacture, for airframe and engine, as a function of production rate, cumulative output, and calendar date; (3) operating costs per plane mile, as a function of various performance parameters (e.g., specific fuel consumption) and permissible altitude of transonic acceleration; (4) operating receipts per plane mile, as a function of seating capacity, load factor (percentage capacity sold), and fare levels; (5) availability of supersonic passengers, as a function of number of long-haul passengers, subsonic passenger fares, willingness to pay more for less time in the air, and extent to which sonic boom nuisance restricts available routes and schedules. All of these factors remain shrouded in uncertainty.

Development costs of aircraft have often been underestimated by a factor of two—especially where the necessary state of art has yet to be attained.

SST operating profits are extremely sensitive to specific fuel consumption, lift-drag ratio (a measure of aerodynamic efficiency), and aircraft weight empty. Of its maximum gross take-off weight of maybe 650,000 pounds 10 percent or less will be payload and about 45 percent will be fuel. An X percent improvement in fuel economy, if translatable into greater seating capacity, could increase net flight receipts by perhaps 3X percent, proportionately increasing the selling price the aircraft can command.

Supersonics will have to compete with subsonics. Advanced subsonics may have costs per seat mile 20–30 percent below those of the U.S. SST. Airlines, unless they acquire SST's at subsidized prices, will hence buy relatively few SST's so that load factors are exceptionally high (e.g., 70 percent of seats are filled instead of the 55 percent typical of today's jets) and have to levy a surcharge (e.g., 10–20 percent) on SST tickets. No one knows how many long-haul passengers would be diverted to subsonics by such fare differentials. Estimates are that one-half may be lost.

The growth rate of passenger demand is also uncertain. Long-haul revenue passenger miles have increased at an average of 14 percent during the past ten years, but this rate is expected by most to decline. Continued growth will presumably vary with quality of service, per capita incomes, and population growth. The lowest estimate of passenger volume growth between 1966 and 1990 is five times.

Public acceptance or nonacceptance of frequent sonic booms by commercial aircraft remains doubtful. If commercial overland supersonic flight is not permitted by the U.S. and most foreign governments, no more than 40 percent of long-haul passengers remains to be shared with subsonics on the available routes over water. Conversely, as the SST's engines are "sized" for high altitude transonic acceleration (above 35,000 feet) and fuel consumption per mile at subsonic speeds is much higher, the economics of the SST are improved if it is permitted to cross the sound barrier at lower altitudes nearer to airport terminals. Unfortunately, as SST designs increase in gross take-off weight to permit more seats and hence lower seat mile costs, the severity of expected sonic boom increases and the possibility of operating restrictions (e.g., curfews on transcontinental flights) is increased. The prudent assumption, until more conclusive predictions can be made of public reaction to boom, is that commercial supersonic flights over populated land areas will be prohibited.

Anyone who has been intimately involved in econometric assessments of SST "profitability" realizes full well that its prospects will remain most uncertain at least until prototype flight tests and possibly until regular commercial operations begin. The total market for SST's to 1990 is probably somewhere between 150 to 600 aircraft. The profitability of the program is sensitive to numbers of SST's sold. Under certain sets of favorable assumptions the overall rate of return could be 10-15 percent. But under other sets of equally plausible assumptions the return is negative. Perhaps a best guess is an overall program rate of return of 0 to 5 percent.

The simple truth, however, is that such a complex and technically advanced aircraft must be an investment gamble in its first generation.

NECESSARY FEDERAL ASSISTANCE

There is general agreement that, if there is to be a U.S. SST program, the federal government must finance it, past flight test and possibly certification, by means of outright grants, advances to be recouped later, and/or guarantees of borrowing by the airframe and engine contractors from the financial community.

Three of the principal manufacturers and their suppliers lack both the ability and willingness to provide $4 billion or so for the development and production funds required before the date around 1975 at which time net cash inflows commence. Their collective net worths, including that of some of their probable subcontractors, do not approach such a figure. Besides, even if able, why should airframe and engine manufacturers risk such sums on an SST? They have alternative investment opportunities involving fewer technical uncertainties, smaller investments, and shorter "dry" periods before recovery of principal. That one airframe and one engine manufacturer are expected to be selected around January 1, 1967, for continued development with government assistance, almost guaranteeing a limited monopoly of a usable design eventually, is not enough apparently to evoke more than 10–20 percent participation in development costs by the manufacturers.

Potential airline customers are not expected to be a significant source of funds. No way remains of compelling the airlines to depart from their usual policy of "wait and see" before purchasing. Firm orders cannot be expected until after successful prototype flight tests in 1970 perhaps. And even then it seems unlikely that more than half the aircraft's flyaway price can be extracted through progress payments six to twelve months before delivery. (Although the first fifty or so SST's delivered probably have a special premium value of several million dollars each, because of high load factors during their initial two to three years of service, the first hundred-odd U.S. SST's have already been allocated for refundable deposits of $100,000 each.)

The combination of high technical risks and large dollar magnitudes makes it most improbable that the manufacturer, or indirectly the financial community, will provide the needed funds. Thus the federal government must either provide assurance against certain risks (e.g., accidental loss of a prototype) and/or become a sort of silent partner (providing say 80 percent of the net cash outflows and sharing say 80 per cent of the net cash inflows). Such a scaling down of the private sums at risk to one-fifth of the total funds involved, with a commensurate scaling down of cash surpluses later, might be sufficient to evoke limited private financing despite the program's many uncertainties.

In addition to the funds required for development and production of an SST, safe and economical operation of SST's will be possible only if government expenditures are made for improved air traffic control, solar and cosmic radiation monitoring systems, and an improved meteorological forecasting capability.

The SST will cruise at 65,000 as compared to 35,000 feet for subsonics. The effects of wind and temperature on SST fuel consumption and the consequent impact on SST operating costs and payload make better data on the parameters vital. At supersonic speeds more advance warning is required to maneuver around unfavorable weather. In the period from 1970 through 1990 meteorological improvements alone could cost governments over a billion dollars.

These negative "externalities" should be considered part of the price of having an SST.

HOW SHOULD THE GOVERNMENT RECOVER?

The manufacturers will not risk even limited sums unless they and the government can agree on a financial plan that specifies at least the formula by which government will recoup its share of development and other "sunk" costs.

Unless there are significant and "external" national interests served by the program, a controversial issue discussed below, the federal government must be placed in a position to obtain the same rate of return on its investment as do the manufacturers if an impolitic and unwarranted subsidy is to be avoided. Thus if the program is continued because the $4 billions-odd worth of resources invested in it are expected to earn 10 to 15 percent before taxes or interest, and if the government were to accept say 5 percent on an 80 percent share of costs, the manufacturers would be expected to earn 30 percent to 55 percent on their investments. The only way government can avoid paying such a subsidy and still accept say 5 percent for itself, is to continue a program that prospectively wastes some of the nation's resources by promising a return less than that ordinarily obtained from domestic labor and capital used by industry in the U.S.

Thus government must be expected to share in profits if (1) the program appears economically justifiable and (2) unjustified subsidies to manufacturers are to be avoided. There is no logical escape. This requirement for government profit sharing has nothing to do with "socialism."

A major issue is whether government recovery should be either through some sort of tax or through sharing in net cash inflows as a silent partner.

Levies most often mentioned are:

1. A "royalty" or tax "off the top," added to the manufacturer's price of the aircraft: this would probably mean a $10 million tax added to say a $35 million manufacturer's price, and such a tax would lose sales to competing subsonics and possible supersonics.

2. An annual tax on SST aircraft operated by U.S. airlines: this would advantage foreign airlines, and a tax adequate for full government recovery plus an equity risk return would have the same present discounted value and incidence on price and sales as would an adequate royalty on delivery.

3. A tax of 10–20 percent on fares charged all SST passengers originating or terminating in U.S. territory: such a tax would further divert passengers to subsonic aircraft.

A tax on jet fuel purchased in the U.S. by all commercial supersonics may have to be reserved to pay for the special SST flight support services discussed above.

The alternative to a tax is sharing through a financial partnership or "pooling" arrangement. There could be one pool on the airframe and another on the engine. In each case the selected manufacturer and the federal government would be the initial members—able to sell their shares later to financial intermediaries. They would contribute, quarter by quarter, development and production costs in some agreed upon ratio. And, when net cash inflows start around 1975, these would be shared by the contractor and the government in proportion to their credits in the pool. Such credits should include both advances and an equity rate of return, preferably the same for each partner, of from 10 to 15 percent compounded.

One advantage of pooling as against taxing is that there is less likelihood of handicapping U.S. SST manufacturers or U.S. airlines operating SST's.

Another potentially important advantage of pooling is that the self-interests of the airframe and engine manufacturers are made coincident with the interests of the federal government. If the contractor believes some design change will more than pay for itself, i.e., that it will earn a good rate of return on the extra cost of making a change, government will similarly be advantaged if the contractor knows his business. And ordinarily, because airframe and engine manufacturers are experienced in commercial air transport and presumably know the airlines' needs better than FAA officials, pooling could permit the federal government to give the manufacturers the maximum degree of private initiative possible. Such freedom may be needed to make the program an economic success. Certainly, the SST program should not be administered as though the U.S. were developing and procuring a bomber say, for hopefully it is airlines and not the federal government that will buy and use this aircraft.

Another recoupment issue is whether the government should share in manufacturers' receipts or net cash inflows forever or only until such time as the government has realized some previously stipulated rate of return on its outlays.

Making either the royalty or pooling claims to SST sales revenue transferable would enable the government to sell its rights to future revenues to the private sector if and when success of the program seems assured.

Why should government seek to recover all its advances from those who buy or use the SST, for are there not other broad national interests being served?

The most intangible and commonly suggested "external" benefits are (1) technological "fall-out," (2) contingent military use, and (3) national prestige, but each of these proclaimed grounds has been vigorously denied by others.

A more explicit argument is that the sale of U.S. SST's at $35 million or so each will benefit the U.S. balance of payments in the 1970's. Such claims ignore many substitution effects. Traditionally, half U.S. aircraft exports have been financed in the U.S. Each U.S. SST exported may mean at least one less U.S. subsonic exported. If the U.S. sells competitive aircraft to foreign airlines, U.S. airlines may lose passengers to them. Estimates suggest that, over five years from date of sale, the net balance-of-payments credit for the U.S. from the sale of an SST is no more than 5–10 percent of its U.S. export price (and may even be negative if increased U.S. tourist spending abroad is considered).

Nevertheless, some gross external benefits must exist, although not necessarily net of special high altitude meteorology costs, etc. In the end the program's Phase I and II (design competition) costs to the federal treasury might be "forgotten" as an alleged contribution of $300 million-odd to some vague "national interests." But beyond that, and starting with Phase III (prototype development) in 1967, the program should be treated as a commercial risk enterprise of manufacturers and government in partnership.

MITIGATING THE MONOPOLY

The federal government in early 1967 may select a single SST airframe and engine contractor to continue prototype development. The selected manufacturers will emerge with considerable monopoly power that could be of considerable value. How can the government use public funds to create a monopoly and yet protect the public interest without destroying the managerial prerogatives and efficiency of private manufacturers and airlines?

First, the monopoly will be limited, for there may be some competition from the supersonic Anglo-French Concorde; but more important should be the rivalry of growth subsonics, competition that compels the selected U.S. SST manufacturers to provide the best possible performance at a price.

Second, the selected prime development contractors will have many subcontractors, especially on the airframe. These subcontractors will acquire a competence that later could be used by a rival prime contractor. Also key employees have been known to transfer at higher salary to a rival manufacturer.

Third, the federal government is expected to have the right to license patents at zero cost, together with shop drawings, to any other airframe and/or engine manufacturers who might later seek to compete.

Hence, if a really large and profitable SST market were to prove itself, it is not evident that rival manufacturers could not materialize. The DC-8 did follow the Boeing 707. A first generation manufacturer is not always sure of developing a profitable aircraft that excludes competition.

A single airframe and single engine manufacturer for the U.S. SST should create other novel problems more easily overlooked.

One is division of the flyaway aircraft's price between airframe and engine. There is a very large range of indeterminacy. The engine for example might be priced almost down to its marginal production cost. But its price could be as high as the aircraft price minus marginal airframe cost. The maximum conceivable engine price could be three times the minimum. Previously an airframe company had some choice among engine firms to narrow the range of possible engine prices.

The airlines will be face to face with a limited monopolist able to charge variable (i.e., discriminatory) prices unless prevented by government. Some of the earlier deliveries, assuming they can maintain schedules, have potentially higher load factors and hence should command premium prices. Should the competition of Concorde and the subsonics prove minor, some airlines may ask for federal ceilings on U.S. SST prices.

This could be a dangerous step. If government regulates SST prices, should it not more energetically regulate SST fares so that airlines do not receive unjustified profits, and perhaps depress load factors through excessive competition in flight frequencies on approved SST routes? The situation of the U.S. merchant marine should be enough to deter any airline management from inviting government intervention.

The remaining alternative would be to develop two airframe-engine combinations—which practically would mean also producing two rival aircraft. This would double development costs. It would also lose some "learning curve" efficiencies in manufacturing. These extra costs would be justified only if, attributable solely to prolonged competition, operating costs were reduced by about a quarter.

ARE THE BENEFITS GENERAL ENOUGH

Costly public enterprises of great inherent risk are more easily justified if the spending of taxpayers' funds occasions widespread benefits. It is not enough that they provide employment and profits for a few localities and firms. How diffused are the benefits of the SST program likely to be?

About 85 percent of U.S. residents have never flown, those who do fly do not always take long-haul flights, and perhaps less than 5 percent of all Americans will ever fly SST's at their higher fares. Private, nonexpense account, long-haul passengers will mostly continue to fly subsonically. (It is not even certain that the federal government will reimburse its employees and those of its contractors for a supersonic surcharge.)

Further, American SST passengers will tend to travel to and from a few areas, such as New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Seattle, Washington, D.C., and Miami. Americans living elsewhere may never use an SST except on international flights. But 100 million Americans may find themselves subjected daily to sonic booms if overland SST flights are permitted.

For all these reasons, and as the U.S. SST program is seen increasingly as a rival to expansion of Great Society programs, it is certain to become more controversial.

CONCLUSIONS

There are few modern instances of development with public funds of a technologically advanced product that is to be produced—very likely by a monopoly—and used commercially by private firms. Desirable guidelines in such cases are: (1) continuation only so long as the program is expected to earn a rate of return comparable to that expected by U.S. industry in making investments; (2) equal government sharing in such a rate of return, partly to avoid subsidization, but also to provide incentives for only economical design changes, etc.; (3) full recoupment by government, plus an equity or risk-taker's return, except insofar as there clearly are not "external" or national interests; (4) recoupment by government of its advances, not by taxes that reduce sales and use, but through some partnership (pooling) arrangement; (5) avoidance of special controls that will prevent the usual exercise of experienced management by the airframe and engine manufacturers; (6) use of public funds only to the extent that a private and excessively profitable monopoly will not be created; (7) no unrecovered government subsidies except where adequate benefits are likely to be diffused among a large fraction of citizens.

Finally, it is to be hoped and expected that a U.S. prototype of an SST will be flying well before the end of the 1970's, one that promises to be safe and profitable without being a public nuisance because of sonic boom. This means a state of art that will permit a rate of return of at least 10 percent on all resources invested in development after 1966 without supersonic flight over populated land areas. Until proposed designs can give this promise with more confidence it seems premature to begin construction of a prototype aircraft.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the counterargument is that the numerous subcontracts for SST parts will spread the benefits among a large number of people by creating or maintaining many jobs over large geographic areas. This is the same tired old argument used to defend the space program. The fact is that the jobs provided would be primarily for the highly skilled, as I pointed out earlier. The supply of skilled workmen is already too small to meet the demand. Creating more demand pressure does nothing but boost wages artificially. It can also have the effect of drawing skilled workmen away from vital defense projects into nonessential projects such

as the SST. The SST would do very little to satisfy the real need—providing jobs to the unskilled or partially skilled.

Furthermore, are we to produce an unnecessary, unwanted, and uneconomic "gadget" at great cost to the majority of the population in order to achieve some desirable, but minor, side effects?

The alternative of total private financing must be thoroughly studied. Those who say the amount of money required is much more than the aviation industry could ever pull together are underestimating the industry's resources. If the market mechanism reflected a genuine demand for supersonic flight and a genuine need for it, if our aviation industry were, in fact, threatened by the Concorde or the TU–144, then I think the market mechanism would also draw forth sufficient private capital to finance development of SST's just as it did for the jumbo jets and the earlier subsonics, without substantial Government intervention.

Mr. President, regardless of our political philosophy, whether we are liberal or conservative, I think hard, practical experience shows that when the Government gets into these big subsidy operations, and subsidizes something of this kind to the extent of hundreds of millions of dollars, we are very likely to create an uneconomic product, a product that cannot stand on its own feet, that involves very great waste.

All of us are familiar with how this has necessarily occurred in our defense program. There we have to go ahead with planes. We know what a fiasco the B–70 was, what enormous waste was involved in that plane. That, too, was a supersonic plane. By the same token, if we rely on the test of the market and rely upon private financing, which top governmental people like Secretary Charles insist can work, then we are much more likely to get a practical product, and the timing is more likely to be economically sound and sensible.

We abandoned the guidance of the market, in this case, far too hastily and with too little cause.

If the Government participates at all in a project like this which provides minor benefits for a very narrow segment of the population, it should participate on the same terms as any private entrepreneur would, for in such a case there is no justification for passing the costs on to the taxpayer. The Government should have an airtight agreement for getting its money back. It should be paid a fair market price for its risk taking.

Here, Mr. President, is the real weakness of this proposition. We do not have any airtight contract. And, parenthetically, the Government should not get involved at all if it is spending very heavily on other more significant projects and running a big deficit.

The Government, in this case, does not have an airtight agreement for recovering its investment. The repayment agreement signed early this year has too many loopholes.

The phase III contracts—the contracts for the construction of the two prototypes—contain a section outlining the formula by which the Government will recoup its investment—which, as I said, could run to $2.6 billion, by conservative estimates, and probably much more. This section of the contract specifies that the Government will be repaid through royalties from the manufacturers when and if the plane goes into full production. The airframe royalties would start with the 100th model off the assembly line.

In other words, there would be no royalties until the 100th model has been produced. By that time, all the tooling has been accomplished, and not only have the prototypes been developed, but you have a substantial amount, by far the most expensive element, in production. And this, remember, would be 9 or 10 years from now, if the present schedule is followed.

Contrary to the advice of an advisory group consisting of Government lawyers and economists from the Bureau of the Budget and the Justice and Treasury Departments, the FAA wrote an extremely narrow definition of what will constitute a "royalty-bearing airframe."

Mr. President, as I say, this was contrary to the advice of the Bureau of the Budget, the advice of the Department of Justice, and the advice of the Treasury Department—that is, a production model airframe upon which the airframe manufacturer would be obligated to pay the Government a royalty. The definition of a royalty-bearing airframe written into the phase III contract is that it would be "principally of titanium structure" and that it would "achieve a maximum speed of not less than mach 2.2 nor more than mach 3.1." This is so narrow, as the advisory group pointed out, that the Government could be completely denied its share of returns on the SST if changes are made in the production model, over which the Government presently has no contractual authority whatever. The Government's control over model changes extends only through the prototype stage. If a couple of years after the SST goes into production, Boeing switches from titanium to another more superior metal alloy, or if the top speed is pushed a hair above mach 3.1, then the Government could be out all of what we have invested in it. We could lose it all.

I say either of those events is a real possibility, over the next 10 years. Anyone who does not think so has only to recognize what has happened during the past 15 or 20 years. With the advances in chemistry, especially the chemistry of metals, the advances in aircraft, with all the experimentation that has been going on in the military and overseas and elsewhere, there is a significant prospect that in the next 10 years we could have the kind of technological changes that could make the evasion of this contract easy, and of course inviting.

Boron filament and boron-reinforced plastics are only a couple of examples of materials that may have a big future in high-speed planes because of their extremely high strength-to-weight ratios. I am not saying, and never have said, that we have reached a point with any of these materials that would permit us to use them on the initial SST's. For one thing, at $300 a pound, boron costs too much. But 2 years ago, its cost was close to $2,000 a pound. Yet, even now, the Defense Department is considering the possibility of using boron filament in the horizontal tail surface, the landing gear door, and other sections of a selected number of F–111 production models. If the price of boron continues to drop, it could well become a strong competitor to titanium. A lot can happen in metals technology in the next decade. And because the 4,000-mile range of the SST may be a significant limitation on its ability to compete in the market, switching to a lighter and stronger alloy could become important.

Going to another metal like boron filament, or pushing the speed up a little would be minor steps compared to the giant first step of developing an SST in the first place and the Government should not be cheated out of its investment in that first step. The SST will represent a 200-percent increase in speed and a 200-percent increase in weight over present jet transports. These are enormous and unprecedented gains. The taxpayer is footing between 80 and 90 percent of the cost of making them. A contract should have been drawn that would protect his interest.

If a private entrepreneur assumed 90 percent of the risk, as the Government is doing, in developing an SST, he would be paid handsomely. I am not suggesting that the Government should earn a windfall on this investment. But, by the same token, I seriously question whether Boeing and General Electric should be allowed to earn the windfall profits forecast for them by the firm to which the Senator from Washintgon has referred—Booz, Allen & Hamilton in their financial study on the basis of only a 10-percent investment in the development. The Booz, Allen & Hamilton study shows that if SST were highly successful and 1,200 of them were sold by 1990, Boeing would earn a 38-percent return on its investment while the Government would only earn 10 percent.

If 500 planes were sold, as the FAA now predicts, Boeing would earn 12 percent, General Electric 11 percent, and the Government 4 percent. Even if the SST were a dismal failure and only 200 of them were sold, Boeing would still earn an 18-percent return on its investment, GE 5 percent, and the Government nothing.

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, when the Senator refers to the 12 percent earned by Boeing and the 11 percent earned by General Electric as compared to the 4 percent earned by the Government, does that take into consideration the taxes that will have been paid by Boeing and GE on this transaction? I think that is important.

Mr. PROXMIRE. This is such a complicated element.

Mr. MURPHY. It is not really complicated.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It is complicated in this case.

Mr. MURPHY. I cannot see that it is complicated.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Let me say why I think it is complicated. I think it is complicated because, in my view, if the SST's are sold in anything like this amount, it will mean that we will not sell as many jumbo jets. Therefore, the people making the jumbo jets will not be paying taxes.

My answer would be that we are unlikely to get any significant net increase in tax revenue as a result of this kind of investment.

Mr. MURPHY. The Senator was quoting an actual case with regard to this particular project. And I would like to point out that there is roughly a 52-percent corporate tax that returns to the Government immediately. So, that might change the reflection cast by these figures a little bit.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I understand, and the Senator makes an excellent point. We should take those things into consideration. However, this will simply replace the market for the jumbo jets, subsonic jets, and other jets which would be sold.

There would be a reduced profit on those planes because the market would diminish as the market for the other planes increased. I agree with the Senator that there may be some gain. It would be modest.

Mr. MURPHY. Is it not true that, historically, since the first day we felt we could make a supersonic plane—which is not so long ago, and incidentally one of my old schoolmates was the metallurgist who made it possible—there have been prognostications of many kinds with regard to the cost, the amount of planes to be sold, and the number of people to be handled which far outnumbered the guesses we have been able to make?

Is it not also true that with regard to the actual use, international and otherwise, and the benefits that may be obtained by further shrinking the globe and bringing people closer together, these are considerations that make it very dangerous to try and prophesize exactly what is going to happen.

Over 2 years ago I thought that our airport in Los Angeles was very good. I must say now that it is very bad.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Projections have been good, bad, and indifferent. The Lockheed projections on the Electra were overly optimistic.

We are going to see a great change in technology that will move things ahead. We will get improved metal and planes that will move faster.

The supersonic transport will probably have a short life. It will have competition which will sharply reduce its competitive advantage in a relatively few years.

The manufacturers may sell quite a few. However, there is the counteracting argument, that they will get competition and that there will be new technology in this field that will erode most of this kind of gain.

The main point is that the contract we have here is a contract that just overlooks changes in technology. It provides that the subsidized industry will not pay a nickel back if they can fly faster than mach 3.1 or use anything besides titanium.

This is a very unsound contract.

My amendment would slow this down. It would provide something like $188 million that would be available for the SST this year, $124 million from the Federal Government and the remainder from the private agencies and industry.

In a year of tremendous stress on our finances, and at a time when we have this enormous deficit, this is a wise and sensible stretchout. It would not kill the program. However, more important than anything else, it would give us a chance to take a longer and more careful look at the program to decide whether we should revise or change the contract, and whether we should reconsider how we want to proceed with this.

Mr. MURPHY. The Senator made a remark about the B–70 program which was held up a tremendously long time by the Secretary of Defense. Three planes were ordered to be built. However, only one was built in spite of the legislation. One was manufactured, and then a second one was built because of the destruction of the first one.

I assure the Senator, from firsthand knowledge, that there has been a great deal of advancement in aviation and the ability to carry the passengers further and faster, and that much of the military knowledge gained from the B–70's, I am satisfied, was well worth the investment.

As the Senator knows, I am one who is most concerned with what happens to the taxpayers' dollars. I am known as Old Tight-Purse Murphy around here.

In this case, I want to make certain that we consider every aspect of this matter, which I consider to be very important, not only economically and commercially, but also militarily.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from California.

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. I only have about 5 minutes remaining. I prefer to continue with my statement.

I will mention one other weakness in the present program before concluding, and that has to do with the overlapping of the certification stage, phase IV, and the production stage, phase V, in the program's present master schedule. The schedule calls for the manufacturers to begin ordering long-lead items for full-scale production as early as the second half of 1970. The certification stage will have just gotten underway at that point. Flight testing, which is actually a part of the development stage, will still be going on also. The purpose of this overlapping is to make it possible to get the first production SST into the air very shortly after FAA certification has been obtained.

Certainly, there is enough conflict involved here when the same agency is both masterminding the development of a plane and is also responsible for certifying its safety, without adding this additional pressure to "look the other way" during certification tests in order to prevent delay. But, in the event certification testing did reveal substantial deficiencies in the SST airframe or the engine that would have to be corrected, the overlapping in the schedule could result in enormous unnecessary costs. If, for example, the deficiencies discovered during certification necessitated major changes in airframe and engine design, substantial investments in work in progress might have to be written off because it would have been initiated before the defects were discovered. In other words, the manufacturers would have invested large amounts of money in new facilities, tooling, and inventories for full-scale production under the assumption that the original design would be approved. A design change might require scrapping much of this. I think this is a poor way to run a development program—especially when we do not need to rush.

Striking all but a million dollars of the SST funds from this bill will by no means kill the SST program. There is a $99 million carryover from the money appropriated for fiscal 1967. There is also $25.5 million that was set aside from previous appropriations for a payback reserve fund established by the FAA to repay the contractors in the event the Government unilaterally withdrew from the contract. Both the Senate and House Appropriations Committees have recommended that this fund be abolished and the money applied to program costs.

The carryover from fiscal year 1967 and the money in the payback reserve fund total $124.5 million. This amount would constitute about a third of what the FAA has said would be needed from all sources in fiscal 1968.

In addition, a total of $64 million in airline contributions could become available in fiscal 1968. The 10 U.S. air carriers who were in the initial group of airlines to order SST's promised on June 5, 1967, in an agreement with the Boeing Co., to contribute during 1968 a total of $52 million in risk capital toward development of the SST.

Later in the summer, six airlines promised under a similar agreement to contribute another $12 million in 1968. These contributions are contingent, however, on congressional appropriation of funds for fiscal year 1968 for financing "all or any portion of the costs of phase III contract work." I suggest that Congress approve an appropriation of $1 million, as provided in my amendment, to insure that this contract continues to be legally binding.

Mr. President, I shall summarize briefly later. Before I yield the floor, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I think we have had a good debate on this subject. It certainly is highly important that Senators be well versed in it.

I am glad that the Senator from Wisconsin has obtained an order for the yeas and nays on his amendment, because Senators have asked me about that.

I want to sum up, somewhat, and point out the need for the supersonic transport; but I ask unanimous consent that I may first yield to the Senator from Missouri as much time as he may need to speak on this subject, without losing my right to the floor.

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

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I thank the able Senator from Mississippi.

It has been many months since the Senate last debated the many difficult problems raised by the proposal that the U.S. Government should contribute to the cost of designing and producing a commercial aircraft capable of flight beyond the speed of sound—the so-called SST.

The problems, however, are still before us and still before the country. If anything they are more urgent now than they were last year; in fact, even more urgent than they were in 1961, when we first considered them.

Time in the world of technology does not stand still. The Anglo-French supersonic prototype, the Concorde, is nearing completition. It will be tested within the year and may well be in operation by 1970.

The Soviet TU–144 may be even further advanced.

The American program, toward which we voted $280,000,000 in August of 1966, calls for a flight-testing of a prototype in 1970 and commencement of passenger flight by 1974.

In other words, it is a program now approaching the point at which it must either move ahead, or be written off.

My own attitude toward this project is familiar to the Senate. From time to time I have questioned it in the past, not because I was opposed to technological progress in the air—no resident of the State which launched Colonel Lindbergh's famous *Spirit of St. Louis* 40 years ago this spring could fairly be charged with that—but precisely because I believe in technological progress. Both as a Member of this body and as a former member of the Air Force I have long been interested in the development of new planes and engines, the air power of the United States that has been established and is superior to all others.

But a belief in the ever-opening frontiers which the advancing technology of aviation has conquered is a belief also in the methods of technology. Sound technological advance demands inquiry, scientific detachment, and a long, hard look.

It was this long, hard look for which we argued last year, and also in 1964, and as far back as 1961.

When last August I voted for the Proxmire amendment, an amendment which would have reduced by $200 million the contribution of the Federal Government to supersonic experiment and design, I did so, as presented the Senate, because it was felt that haste should be made more slowly; questions should be answered first, not after. I believed the objections raised and difficulties foreseen, should be examined not after the country was irretrievably committed to the supersonic program, but before it was thus committed.

There were, as Senators will recall, many such objections, many and earnest doubts—doubts which were held not only here and in the press, but also within the industry itself.

I presented some of them in a list of questions put to the Senate a year ago last August. Let me recall a few now.

There was first the question of priorities as between military and commercial development in the supersonic field. As early as July of 1961 I had taken the position that the Senate should not vote funds for commercial supersonic transportation until military supersonic aircraft had been fully developed.

There was also the related question of the level of supersonic speed appropriate to commercial transportation.

Down to last year, we were told that the new plane was to fly at mach 3. This proposal, as I presented the Senate in October of 1965, was disturbing not only to me, but also to many people whose opinion I respect who were apprehensive because of the tremendous expense and delay. The British and French and apparently the Russians were working on a mach 2 airplane and I felt, as I said at the time that "if we stick to the mach 3 airplane we will have a great number of theoretical engineering problems as well as applied engineering problems to solve. We would have to put up additional billions of dollars into research and development."

These engineering problems included the extreme heat of the skin of the plane at high supersonic speeds, possible dangers from radiation at the altitudes envisioned, the maintenance of cabin pressure in the event of accident, and all the unknowns for scheduled transport at these combat velocities.

In addition, beyond these engineering problems were economic questions touching the feasibility of supersonic commercial transportation. We were told that one airline had conducted a survey which proved the operating cost of a plane flying at mach 3 would be 4¾ percent higher than the operating cost of a subsonic jet over short hauls and 26 percent higher over long hauls; and plans, at that time, it will be remembered, called for the use of the new supersonic jet for short as well as long hauls.

Another, and equally disturbing, economic consideration had to do with the cost to the Federal Government—which meant the cost to the taxpayer—of the whole program.

In 1961 it had been estimated that the Federal Government's contribution for a smaller plane would be $750 million but by last year the estimated cost of development and test had risen to $1.5 billion, with the taxpayers providing 90 percent; and although there was talk at that time of repayment of the Government's contribution, there was no firm commitment. History, as I said in presenting questions to the Senate, offered little basis for optimism that repayment under such circumstances would ever be made.

Again, there was the question as to the agency of the Government which would administer the undertaking. The intention when last this matter was before the Senate, had been to confine administration to the Federal Aviation Administration. But the difficulty, as I presented, was that the FAA was also the agency which, under the law, would certify the new plane as operational once it was constructed. This seemed to some of us to create a situation in which a conflict of interest between the promoter and the regulator could hardly be avoided.

It was these objections, these doubts, that I felt we must discuss frankly before approving the proposal made to us.

In the debates of August 1966, however, we did confront them; and possibly partly as a result of these discussions, there has been a reconsideration of the whole project in the industry as well as among aviation engineers and the management of the country's airlines.

This reconsideration has brought changes. Let me note some of them.

First, the design of the new SST has been altered considerably, with its proposed speed reduced. To me, that is very important. We are no longer asked to provide a compromise supersonic airplane capable of both intercontinental and transcontinental ranges; we are asked to think only of a long-range, overwater, intercontinental version—the Boeing–100—which will carry 280 passengers up to 4,000 miles at speeds not of mach 3, but around mach 2.7. This reduction of speed, I am assured by engineers for whom I have great respect, will reduce the engineering problems which multiply at rising velocities; and the clarification of the design will reduce the anticipated operating cost by omitting the costly short-haul features.

Second, and in this same connection, the entire program has been tied in to the military development of supersonic aircraft in such a way as to put the experience of the armed services at the service of the designers of the supersonic transport plane in such a way as to relate the two undertakings to each other with the result that the question of priorities previously much on my mind, is no longer a prime consideration.

As example, the entire B–70 program has now been redirected so as to support and assist the SST program; and the experience gained in supersonic flight with the SR–71/F–12 family of reconnaissance aircraft, now amounting to several thousand supersonic hours, has been placed at the disposal of the designers and engineers of the supersonic transport plane.

At the same time, technological advances in metallurgy, combined with the reduction in planned speed, have apparently solved one of the most critical engineering problems, that of excessive heat. We are told that titanium alloys used on reconnaissance planes of the SR–71/F–12 family have successfully met the demands of flight at mach 3. U.S. production of titanium alloys has more that doubled over the last 5 years—27,500,000 pounds in 1966 as against 11,200,000 in 1961. In addition, the price has dropped some 20 percent.

In this connection, by all odds, the finest fighter in North Vietnam or South Vietnam is the F–4. There is a great deal of titanium on it. I checked with the president of the company and I looked at the plane, and I was assured by him they have no more problems with titanium as with the average metal of that type and character. That was one of the most important developments because 15 years ago, after extensive study in the Committee on Armed Services we were quite cool on titanium. That problem has been licked.

A similar change for improvement has been agreed to in the development of plans for financing the program.

As the project was presented to us last August, the economic burden fell too heavily on the Federal Government—which is to say the taxpayers—with the manufacturers carrying little of the risk; and the prospect of repayment of the Government's investment seemed dubious.

I am now informed, however, by Gen. William F. McKee, able and experienced Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, that a new contract has been negotiated between the Government and the airplane and airframe manufacturers under which the manufacturers will not only share in the development costs at full risk, but will share substantially in any cost overruns should manufacturing costs prove to have been underestimated. General McKee computes the investment at risk by the manufacturers by the end of the prototype program as $288 million.

The negotiation of this contract changes radically the financing of the project, and goes a long way toward meeting the objection I presented during last year's discussion.

And there are other similar developments. It was believed last year, as I presented the Senate, that the airlines, the potential purchasers of the SST, were not convinced that such a plan would be economically feasible because the cost of operation would be too high. Indeed, one of them, as previously mentioned, had conducted a survey which reached the conclusion that the design as then proposed fell short of economic feasibility.

Now, however, the airlines would appear to have changed their views as a result of the changes in the program. Eleven carriers, including the airline which made the survey just referred to, have already committed a total of $52,000,000 toward the expenses of development; and General McKee advises that this commitment has been reduced to contract form.

At the same time, I am told Government economists and engineers have reached an optimistic conclusion as to the marketability of the plane as now programed. They have reported that there is a market for 500 SST's at $40,000,000 a unit even if operations over noise-sensitive areas are prohibited because of sonic boom. If, however, the SST proves to be usable over such areas, they conclude that the sales potential figure would rise from 500 to 1,200.

Furthermore, the Government's future position in the program has been contractually assured. The FAA has obtained from both the manufacturers and the airlines firm commitments by which the investment of the Government will have been returned out of royalties by the time 300 SST's have been sold. If and when 500 are sold, the interest at 6 percent will also have been repaid.

Finally, as the Senate well knows, for many years I have been viewing with growing apprehension the continuing 18-year unfavorable international balance of payments that has been running against the United States. Today, with less than 10 percent of the free "nonmonetized gold" required to honor our current liabilities abroad redeemable in gold, anything and everything that might be done to correct this growing danger to the value of the dollar should be given serious attention.

It is significant, therefore, that the effect of the SST program on U.S. balance of payments can now be estimated with some assurance.

With the sale of the minimum estimated figure—500—involved, sales would amount to some $20 billion; and if 50 percent of these sales were made abroad, as is possible, the "swing" ranges of potential favorable balance of payments would, according to President Tillinghast of TWA—one of the finest of all operators of airlines we have had in the experience of this country—run from 20 billion of dollars up for a 15-year period from 1975 to 1990.

Finally, the question of potential conflict of interest within the FAA would appear to be resolved. The Secretary of the new Department of Transportation, Mr. Alan Boyd, states that the FAA will not be permitted to act as judge of its own safety performance.

All this leads me to conclude that the Senate should now agree to proceed with this program.

I think it is fair to say, based on the record I have presented, that I have studied this matter thoroughly and I am convinced that it is in the best interests of the country. I cannot say to the Senate that all my doubts have been resolved, or all my questions disposed of: There are still doubts, and there are still questions. But the decision which must be made, as is true of so many decisions in this modern, complicated technological world, is one in which the pros and cons must be balanced against each other.

As I said at the beginning of these remarks, time in technology does not stand still. The Anglo-French Concorde is now close to production to the point where a hundred purchasers have already made down payments; and American airlines, if they are to maintain their leadership in the industry, will shortly be compelled to decide whether self-interest, to some extent survival, do not require them to place or increase their orders for the Concorde.

Given a choice between the Concorde and the SST, they tell me they would choose the SST, because it is larger, and because its cost of operation will be lower. Unless it becomes certain in the relatively near future that the American SST is to be built, however, U.S. airlines will have no choice but to place their orders abroad, and that is what they have told me.

If they do, the effect on the U.S. balance of payments in the late seventies and eighties would be precisely the opposite of the effect foreseen by Mr. Tillinghast.

I asked last year, and in 1964 and 1961, that we take a long, hard look at the SST project before approving Government participation. That long, hard look has now been taken, and I now believe that, on balance, the program should be approved.

(At this point, Mr. MUSKIE assumed the chair.)

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

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to my friend from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I shall not trespass on this subject because there are others in the Chamber who will summarize it ably.

I wanted to express my gratification and satisfaction in the able presentation made by the Senator from Missouri. If I remember correctly, I think it was the year before last that the Senator, in a speech in this Chamber, to which I listened attentively, raised some very pertinent questions about the practicability of our proceeding with the SST. Those questions were so pertinent and so impressive to me that even though I was, at that time, serving as the senior minority member of the Subcommittee on Air Transportation, under the able chairmanship and leadership of the Senator from Oklahoma, and I had been constantly impressed with the need for the SST, his speech disturbed me so much and I found myself in such grave doubt that I, too, went to General McKee. I, too, discussed this with Secretary Ford who was then, I believe, on the CAB, and went downtown and looked over the plans. Then I felt reassured.

As time went on, my duties led me to the subcommittee, and I felt much more reassured. But what troubled me were the able and pertinent questions raised by the Senator from Missouri, for whom I have great respect and whose experience in this field as Secretary of the Air Force and his long years of experience caused me a great deal of mental—I shall not say anguish—but grave doubts.

I resolved those doubts. It is particularly reassuring to have the able Senator from Missouri find that he has resolved most of his doubts and feels that this is the thing to do at this time.

I want to thank him for the aid and comfort he has given me in reassuring me on my decision.

I want to say this, and I want to say it to my chairman because I do not want to trespass more than half a minute more on the time which other Senators might take, that I think it has been most unfortunate and somewhat thoughtless that Members of the Senate this afternoon, have been constantly comparing this proposal with the moon shot, or placing a man on the moon. I can see not the slightest analogy there. The moon shot is a prestige matter, largely, unless we find some unexpected riches on the moon that could contribute to the stability of our economy, which is extremely unlikely. This project is just as in the old days, before the self-starter for the automobile was invented, when we had to reach our hand down and lift the crank in order to start the motor pulsating.

In the same way, the Government has, in my opinion, reached down and turned that crank to start private enterprise pulsating, in order to see to it that the United States continues in the forefront on one of the great frontiers of development, that we are at the head of the procession and not behind it.

Again, I want to thank the distinguished Senator from Missouri for what he said.

Mr. SYMINGTON. If the Senator from Mississippi will yield, let me express, first, my deep gratitude for the kind remarks that the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire has made. We do not happen to sit on the same side of the aisle, but every Member over here as well as every Member over there knows that the Senator from New Hampshire is a true patriot and would never take a position on a matter of this kind unless he thought it was the best thing for the country.

With respect to many of the programs which have been brought up, we do have great poverty in our cities, as well as in the rural areas.

Still this country has been able to achieve the finest standard of living of any in the world. Why?

One of the reasons for that is that instead of making handouts the standard practice, we have adopted policies which have created jobs by keeping us ahead in industry and therefore in banking and business in general, not only in this country but also all over the world.

I am convinced in my mind, after careful study of this project, that we would be losing dollars to save pennies if we did not proceed.

In addition to that—and we might as well be frank about it—there is a certain basic requirement incident to the program that relates to our national security.

Last July, at the first air show in 6 years since 1961, the Soviets flew six brand new fighters, including two with variable wings and, of course, all in the supersonic field, as well as three fighters with major improvements which they have made.

We in this country have not got a strictly new fighter even out of the blueprint or drawing board stage.

I think the experience of the SST will help preserve our commercial position around the world. It will also improve our balance-of-payments situation. It will create jobs for more people. In the long run, its importance to the national security of the United States will be evident.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. I want to commend the able senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] for a brilliant statement on this subject.

I know of no one in this body who has spent more time, for example, on the problem of our balance of payments, than the able Senator from Missouri.

I think his analysis of the problem here this afternoon is extremely helpful to all Members of the Senate.

He has raised the questions which are most pertinent and appropriate to this problem, and he has answered them most effectively.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator is very kind. Naturally, I appreciate his gracious remarks.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, let me commend the Senator from Missouri, as well as the Senator from Wisconsin, for fine presentations. The Senator from Missouri, in particular, has made a fine presentation and a summing up which will be a historical statement with reference to the SST. It is a statement made by someone who really knows the subject, who has prepared himself and presented the major points, principles, and problems involved, and has given thorough, honest, and valuable answers. I think he has made a very fine contribution.

I am also impressed with the remarks made by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], who has also wrestled with this problem.

I thank the Senator from Missouri for his very fine analysis. He has really answered all the questions. He is well versed in those subjects.

Mr. President, we are in this thing now. A year ago was the time of decision, and we have passed that and appropriated $280 million. I think that has now been spent or committed.

Someone mentioned the B-70, the large bomber which was never perfected. It was not so much the victim of mistakes, or anything like that, as it was the victim of the improved offensive missile. That is what really took it out, plus those weapons we have right today which are ready to move. There are other contributing factors, such as more effective ground defenses. That is the basic reason why we have to go into this move now and go over into private plane manufacturing, we might say, because we did not perfect the super, super bomber but went back to the smaller bomber which is just not large enough.

Now, Mr. President, during the hearings I became aware of the very fine knowledge on this subject which the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] possesses, and I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to him, a member of the subcommittee, for his remarks, without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Colorado is recognized.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, first, let me say to the distinguished chairman that I did not want to interrupt the earlier flow of debate when he first presented the bill to the Senate.

Like the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], I want to pay my tribute to the Senator from Mississippi for the way in which he has handled the bill. He has a very unusual facility and ability to bring to the committee room, and the Senate in particular, which enables the committee to act at its best, at its most efficient, and with the greatest speed, without curtailing the rights of anyone to express their thoughts.

I would therefore be remiss if I did not express these sentiments to him, and to the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] who is the ranking minority member of the subcommittee who has also done so much.

Second, let me say to my good friend from Missouri, I appreciated hearing the thoroughly detailed and analytical remarks he made about this matter. He did have some serious questions, and no one could be honest with himself and be involved in this matter, as the Senator from Washington and I have been since 1961, and not have some serious questions in his mind. It is well to have those questions laid out on the floor of the Senate and analyzed.

My remarks will be brief, but I do want to straighten out a little history in this matter, and I want to read all the words of our late President on this subject, which I think will provide the direction that we only partially obtained from the quotation that the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma had with him. I understood he did not have the full quotation with him.

In the first place, the initial appropriation on this program was made in the summer of 1961 by the Independent Offices Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, of which the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] was chairman, and I was the ranking minority member. We appropriated $11 million, most of which went into engine research. That was for the fiscal year 1962.

In the following year we appropriated $20 million more.

This amount has been added to year by year.

Earlier in the discussion some question was raised as to what part the Government would play in this program. It will be recalled also that the present President of the United States had headed a committee to study this matter and had recommended this program favorably to President Kennedy. So in a speech at graduation at the Air Force Academy on June 5, 1963—and I am reading from the public papers of President John F. Kennedy, at page 221—President Kennedy said as follows:

> I am announcing today that the United States will commit itself to an important new program in civilian aviation. Civilian aviation, long both the beneficiary and the benefactor of military aviation, is of necessity equally dynamic. Neither the economics nor the politics of international air competition permits us to stand still in this area. Today the challenging new frontier in commercial aviation and in military aviation is a frontier already crossed by the military—supersonic flight. Leading members of the administration under the chairmanship of the Vice President have been considering carefully the role to be played by the National Government in determining the economic and technical feasibility of an American commercial supersonic aircraft, and in the development of such an aircraft if it be feasible.
>
> Having reviewed their recommendations, it is my judgment that this Government should immediately commence a new program in partnership with private industry to develop at the earliest practical date the prototype of a commercially successful supersonic transport superior to that being built in any other country of the world. An open, preliminary design competition will be initiated immediately among American airframe and powerplant manufacturers with a more detailed design phase to follow. If these initial phases do not produce an aircraft capable of transporting people and goods safely, swiftly, and at prices the traveler can afford and the airlines find profitable, we shall not go further.
>
> But if we can build the best operational plane of this type—and I believe we can—then the Congress and the country should

be prepared to invest the funds and effort necessary to maintain this Nation's lead in long-range aircraft, a lead we have held since the end of the Second World War, a lead we should make every responsible effort to maintain. Spurred by competition from across the Atlantic and by the productivity of our own companies, the Federal Government must pledge funds to supplement the risk capital to be contributed by private companies. It must then rely heavily on the flexibility and ingenuity of private enterprise to make the detailed decisions and to introduce successfully this new jet-age transport into worldwide service, and we are talking about a plane in the end of the 60's that will move ahead at a speed faster than Mach 2 to all corners of the globe. This commitment, I believe, is essential to a strong and forward-looking Nation, and indicates the future of the manned aircraft as we move into a missile age as well.

He goes on to discuss other matters, but I think I have covered all the text of his address at that time which relates to the supersonic transport. In it he lays out the direct participation of the Government—the heavy participation of the Government.

I am particularly appreciative of the distinguished Senator from Missouri's remarks about the balance of payments. Awhile ago a good friend of mine—and I do read many of the things he says and writes—said something to the effect that we might even have a large balance of payments by 1974. I hope I will live to see the day. But there can be no question in my mind—and the argument he used is not to be compared with the argument the Senator from Missouri used—that what is going to happen is simply this. The figures I have, which are probably not as recent as those of the Senator from Missouri, shows that 74 delivery positions have been reserved for the Concorde, 40 of these by seven major U.S. lines, 36 by nine foreign carriers.

Why does this mean? I think the figure the Senator from Missouri used was 100, or something like that. Does it mean airlines are going to buy jumbo jets in this country and use them when the rest of the companies in this country and the rest of the world are buying supersonics? I do not think so.

Let us go back to the days when we had the "Connie Super G" and the DC-7, probably the best workhorses of our airlines. All of a sudden we had produced subsonic jets which were selling at about $5 million a copy, and perhaps more by the time they were equipped. Many of us must have wondered, if we were honest, how in the world such an expensive plane could be made to pay. How could an airline pay that much for an airplane and find that it could be made to pay its way?

We have found out several things from that experience. We have found that man will demand, and he will get, the fastest speed, the most comfortable speed, he can get. He will demand it, and he will get it. That is the first thing we found out.

Second, we found out that the cost per mile of running one of our old planes—and I am not downgrading the fine old prop planes we had; they were great planes for their day—simply would not compare with the cost of the jets.

So we have seen the pressure for speed and the pressure for comfort take hold until we have almost divested ourselves, in the commercial field, of prop planes in this country.

I predict the same thing will happen with the supersonic jet. We have the technology. We have the know-how. When we perfect ours, what will happen will be that the orders will flow from the Concorde to the SST, which I believe is designated the 100 by the Boeing Co.

In lieu of this, if we do not develop it, or if we put it off for a period of a year, as the Senator suggests, it seems to me only logical that what we will be doing is foregoing the opportunity for a favorable balance of trade. Great organizations, engineering and economic and fiscal structures, will have to be put in mothballs for a year. Then we will have to get those technical people back together. While there is some evidence, I grant, that it would only mean a delay of a year, in my opinion it would mean a much greater delay than that.

The Senator from Wisconsin counts very much upon the $52 million as a part of the money that could be used during this year.

When the U.S. Government asked the U.S. airlines to contribute $1 million per aircraft position held, the intent was clear that this $50 million would help reduce the Government's share for the fiscal year 1968 requirements to keep the program on schedule so that the airplane would be ready for timely use by the airlines. A $1 million Government appropriation for a fiscal year is clearly not the understanding—and I think we ought to spell this out—under which the airlines agreed to participate. While the clause taken literally as written states the Government can appropriate any portion of funds to support fiscal year 1968 efforts, the airlines would be in a strong position to balk and break their contracts with Boeing for the $1 million payment.

If the airlines were able to relieve their obligation to contribute the $1 million each, the SST program would only have approximately $125 million available to apply to the program. It is estimated using funds at this reduced level would result in approximately a year slip in the first flight of the prototype. Even if the airlines were forced to contribute their $1 million, the added $52 million would only gain back a portion of this time—probably at the most about 3 months of that year.

The most serious impact of such a funding restriction cannot be stated in dollars and cents, but will be felt in loss of momentum in the program and will open the door to contract changes that are disadvantageous to the Government. The SST program is a cost-sharing contract—in effect, a partnership. If the senior partner elects to alter the terms of the agreement the others will have cause to seek redress. Renegotiation of contract terms under sole source conditions can only weaken the favorable terms which have been secured through long negotiations in the competitive phase.

Mr. President, I think no one in the Senate has devoted himself more assiduously than have I to the effort to effect savings in the cost of Government, especially through my activities on the Appropriations Committee. And I feel that way about this particular bill. But even with this amount in, the bill as reported to the Senate is $67 million under the estimates for 1968, and it is under the appropriations for last year by $69 million.

I think it is a remarkable achievement that this committee, headed by its distinguished chairman, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], has been able to accomplish such a thing and still preserve the momentum of this project, which can mean so much—not to 5 percent of the people of this country, but these jobs will spill over into other jobs, and their effect will be felt clear across the country—have no doubt about it; people in Nebraska, Missouri, Colorado, Illinois, Massachusetts, New York, and even Wisconsin will feel part of the spillover from the successful attainment of this SST. We already have a great investment in it, Mr. President, it is not an investment that we can afford to let go down the drain today.

I thank the Senator very much for yielding.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the contribution the Senator from Colorado has made to the debate, and the contribution he made to the hearings. He is one of the best versed Members of the Committee on Appropriations on many subjects. I thank him very much.

Mr. President, I am not trying to hold the floor. I do not want to keep the floor. I do wish to address the Senate a few minutes longer before we conclude, but I certainly hope we can reach a vote this afternoon, Mr. President, not only on this amendment, but on the bill. I think that the pending amendment is the only thing—I know it is the only thing the chairman knows about—that is really in contest on this entire measure; and I hope, after every Senator has had all the time he wants to debate it, we can proceed to a vote on the amendment, and then to a final vote, even if we have to have a night session; and I, for one, am prepared for a night session if necessary.

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

Mr. STENNIS. Yes, I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The purpose of my questioning is to learn to what extent the U.S. Government will become involved, in total, in the development of this supersonic plane.

I refer to a table at page 423 of the record of the hearings, which purports to show the costs of the prototype program, phase III.

Under the heading "Who Pays?" it shows the Government, $953 million.

I now direct the Senator's attention to page 396 of the hearings record, on which are set forth the appropriations for this project beginning with 1962, and showing that up through fiscal 1967, $511 million was appropriated.

Is that correct?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The bill before us would provide an additional $142 million?

Mr. STENNIS. That is the correct figure.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That would make a total of $653 million down to the end of fiscal 1968, is that correct?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Now, my question is, Is the $653 million appropriated for this project since 1962, down to the end of fiscal 1968, included in the figure of $953 million which is supposed to be the Government's cost of the project, down to the completion of phase II?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct. The $653 million is included in the $953 million; but I really think the projected total cost to the Government will run somewhat above the $953 million.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I believe there is a statement here that it would be somewhere about $1.1 billion.

Mr. STENNIS. As near as it can be determined now, it is $1.2 billion. I said in the opening argument here that we had just passed the midway mark.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I now direct the attention of the Senate to page 398 of the testimony in which there is a paragraph discussing the Government's commitment, which paragraph reads as follows:

> I would like to emphasize that our commitment to this program is to Phase III only. There is no commitment on the part of the Government to support in any way, shape, form, or fashion, these following phases for certification or production.

This language does not mean that we are out of this project at the end of phase II. At the end of phase II, we must determine whether we are going into phase III.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct. We would not necessarily be out of it. However, contractually we would be out of it. There is no promise or no definite binding obligation involved.

On the remaining questions, it would be an open question. However, hope was expressed that the cost would fall within the private sector.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is it the argument that since we already have $511 million in it, without the $142 million contemplated for 1968 within the overall cost of $1.100 million, that we should go forward now with the completion of phase II?

Mr. STENNIS. That point is certainly a substantial factor in the picture. It adds momentum and reason and logic to the other points that are involved.

There have been no setbacks in this program. There has been no delay. There has been perhaps some little slippage. However, there has been no marked disappointment in the way things are turning out.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, for my information, will the Senator describe to me what commitments are made in the contracts concerning the reimbursement of the Government if and when the supersonic planes are sold in the market at an anticipated frequency that will enable the manufacturers to sell them and make a profit so that the Government can be paid back?

Mr. STENNIS. That is certainly a part of the picture. That is somewhat speculative. However, the best calculations that can be made are reflected in the RECORD here.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is the Government to be reimbursed in full?

Mr. STENNIS. The sales could go on to that point. As I understand the contract, if there are enough sales, the Government will be reimbursed in full, according to the calculations.

The calculations reveal that the Government will be reimbursed when the point of 300 sales has been reached. Referring to page 424, there is then a provision for a return of Government money from additional sales, but that is highly speculative. That is a chance that no one can calculate.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If 300 planes are sold, what part of the $1.1 billion that the Government will invest will be reimbursed, approximately?

Mr. STENNIS. There is a general calculation of a break-even point at 300 sales. That is a general calculation. However, I do not consider that those are hard figures. I want to be perfectly clear on this. They calculate that there will be a break-even point on the sale of 300 aircraft.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator means that the Government will be reimbursed in full?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. However, if fewer planes are sold, the reimbursement will not be as great.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What if more than 300 planes are sold?

Mr. STENNIS. It is possible that they will get into the black and that there will be a profit return. Certain calculations have been made on sales up to 500, I believe it is. However, I want to make it clear—and I think these are good questions and should be considered—that there is no guarantee on this. However, this information is believed to be approximately correct.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, regarding the engine royalties, which amounts to half of the contract, the engine royalty payments begin with the first engine sold and it applies to a percentage of the sales price on all engines and spare parts for 18 years beyond the engine certification date.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Then it is just a inference to draw the judgment that on the basis of the advice of experts and those who have studied this matter, it is anticipated that the development will be a success, production will be achieved, and sales will be made in substantial numbers, and the Government substantially, at least, reimbursed for its investment.

Mr. STENNIS. There is no doubt about that. If there are 300 sales, the Government will probably be fully reimbursed. This is a calculation by FFA, and they are the Government authority on the subject. They told us that financial studies indicate that the 500 aircraft market estimate would not only repay the basic investment, but would also return sufficient additional money to be at least equivalent to the amount of interest that the Government would pay for the use of the money during the same period.

It is estimated that we will recover the additional amount by virtue of the sale of 500 aircraft. The basic investment itself must be returned at the 300 aircraft sales level. So, they have calculated these things the best they can, we believe.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I point out to the distinguished Senator from Ohio that this is all contingent on the plane flying less than 3.1 mach speed. If it flies over that, none of it has to be paid. This is also contingent on them using titanium. If they use some other metal, none of it has to be paid.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the administration's recently released objections to Senate action placing restrictions on the military assistance and arms sales programs in the foreign aid bill demonstrate the potentially dangerous influence of the Pentagon and the arms industry over foreign policy and underscores the wisdom of the Senate on setting limitations on arms distribution.

When the bill was under consideration in the Senate, administration spokesmen expressed more concern over the military program than over the economic provisions of the bill. They continue to do so. The administration now argues that a limitation on arms distribution will have "a major adverse effect on our global defense posture and on the effectiveness of U.S. foreign policy," and describes the Senate action as unilateral disarmament by the United States.

We passed a $2 billion defense appropriation last week and anticipate additional requests.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the Senate have rejected the contention that reduction of the military assistance program and establishment of greater congressional surveillance over that program puts the Nation's security in jeopardy. Administration and the Pentagon does not seem to understand.

The administration has said, "Our ability to influence the course of events or to assist in the solution of problems in the Middle East and Africa will appreciably diminish" if the Senate action is sustained.

The intention of the Foreign Relations Committee is that the use of arms as an instrument of U.S. foreign policy be changed and that the use of weapons to influence the course of events in other nations—particularly the less-developed nations—and the futile attempt to win friends through arms supply be modified.

Five countries on the perimeter of the Soviet Union and China are singled out for special attention by the administration. The administration claims that, if the proposed reductions are sustained, "it will be necessary to make crippling cuts, perhaps as much as 40 percent" in the programs in Korea, Taiwan, Greece, Turkey, and Iran, since programs in "all of Latin America and Africa, and Indo-

nesia and the Philippines . . . cannot be wiped out entirely." A 40-percent cutback might be a good thing. The program is not likely to be cut back so severely. In any case let us consider the case of Africa and Latin America. It is not clear that the marginal benefits of the military assistance program to improve internal security and civic action efforts outweigh the harmful effects.

In Latin America, the military aid program has led to continued identification of the United States with military elements which too frequently overthrow constitutional government on grounds of which they alone are the judges or which demand the preservation of special privileges or policies as the price for permitting the survival of constitutional government.

In Africa, where national development is proceeding precariously and where instability is widespread, even small supplies of arms can have a highly disruptive effect, as recent events in the Congo have demonstrated. A little over 10 years ago, only one country in Africa—Ethiopia—was receiving grant military aid, in the amount of $4 million. By 1962, 15 countries were receiving this type of assistance, and today we are attempting, with difficulty, to keep the lid on military assistance and sales to Africa at $25 million.

As for Indonesia, its most pressing needs are in nonmilitary areas. Secretary McNamara advised the Foreign Relations Committee in July, 1967, that "no weapons are involved" in the proposed program for Indonesia. Why cannot assistance, therefore, emphasize the economic needs. Flexibility, sufficient for any real need, remains in effect. The administration still has authority to sell, lease, or grant up to $300,000,000 worth of equipment out of inventory—to transfer from economic aid to military aid—approximately $250,000,000 worth of equipment.

Although the United States has a historical interest in the Philippines, the real problems are economic and not military. It is difficult to see how additional U.S. weapons could contribute to the solution of these problems.

The military requirements in these areas—Africa, Latin America, the Philippines—are not pressing. The security of the United States is not at stake, and in some cases military assistance and arms sales programs appear to be doing more harm than good.

What is the case as to the countries on the periphery of the Soviet Union and China? We are told programs of aid will have to be severely cut if the military assistance program in Korea is to remain intact while Korean troops are fighting in Vietnam. This clearly implies a payment for mercenaries. Not only is the United States paying the costs for the Korean troops in Vietnam, but we have more American troops in Korea today—50,000–55,000—than there are Korean troops in Vietnam—approximately 45,000.

The administration states:

> The Iran program is part of a prior commitment which would be politically difficult to reschedule.

One of the major justifications for the decision to sell our most sophisticated operational jet fighter, the F–4, to Iran was that if we did not, the Iranians might accept Soviet aid. A Defense Department witness advised Senator GORE's Subcommittee on Disarmament February 7, 1967:

> The U.S. sale was made fundamentally to avoid the serious danger of a radical shift in the orientation of the recipient country through the introduction of Soviet arms, training missions and other instruments of influence.

But the Iranians accepted Soviet assistance anyway. As the Defense Department later advised Senator SYMINGTON's Subcommittee on Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs:

> The decision to sell F–4 aircraft to Iran was conveyed to the Government of Iran on July 20, 1966, and the letter of offer was signed on September 30, 1966. The Iranian arms barter transaction with the Soviet Union was announced by the Prime Minister of Iran on February 19, 1967.

There are all kinds of political difficulties, including those we make for ourselves.

If these restrictions will keep us out of the arms supply business with the Arab States, perhaps we can avoid the mistakes of our past policies. The previous policy of attempting to balance the Arab States against each other has been a failure, as the events of last spring demonstrated. It should again be noted that Israel would not be affected by these limitations, as financing for the arms she requires for her defense is available without use of a Defense Department guarantee.

As far as Greece and Turkey are concerned, the administration claims that NATO readiness would be reduced if programs in these countries have to be cut. Our generals are still, it seems, preparing for the unlikely event of Soviet land power rolling across Europe. The Greek generals, however, seem more interested in taking over the country than in making their contribution to NATO.

The administration states that negotiations over "U.S. forces in Turkey would be made more difficult" and "U.S. willingness to support NATO could be questioned" if we do not give the Turks more arms. But, apart from the continued existence of tensions between Greece and Turkey, it should not be forgotten that, over the past 17 years, we have given the Turks some $2.5 billion in military assistance. At what point can it be said that the position of our troops and the good faith of the United States are assured?

The administration further claims Taiwan's defensive capabilities will deteriorate if we have to cut the program there, yet Chiang Kai-shek's army, no matter how well equipped, would be of little effect against the Chinese were it not for the presence of the U.S. 7th Fleet.

The administration claims that our bases in Ethiopia, Libya, Spain, Portugal, and the Philippines would be imperiled if the Senate action is sustained. In Libya and the Philippines, the status of American bases has already become a point of discussion, if not friction. If the availability of American arms is the only reason these countries have permitted us to have bases on their soil, we ought to question how important they consider our bases to their own security. We might also question the wisdom of a U.S. defense posture based on such tenuous grounds. In any case, the amounts involved here are very small.

In attempting to place restrictions on the military assistance and arms sales programs, a main concern of the Senate has been a reevaluation of the concepts of "forward strategy" and the "instant interventionism" which have assumed such a dominant place in our relations with the rest of the world. An indifferent Pentagon did not get the message, it said.

In the administration's appeal for the retention of the authority to guarantee credit for arms sales, we have a further warning against development of what President Eisenhower called the "military-industrial complex": a listing of some of the manufacturers and the banks who have been engaged in the arms supply business under the aegis of the Pentagon's international logistics negotiations office:

> (*a*) A $36 million loan to the Government of Iran by the First National City Bank of New York, Morgan Guaranty Trust Bank, and the Chase National Bank. This was part of an overall $200 million agreement between the United States and the Government of Iran which involved prior foreign economic and military policy agreement before going ahead with the loan.
>
> (*b*) The Raytheon Corp. sale of HAWK air defense missile systems to the Government of Saudi Arabia in the amount of $126 million as part of a major British-United States-Saudi Arabia agreement. Saudi Arabia desired to implement the agreement directly with the Raytheon Corp. Raytheon would not have been able to obtain credit for this transaction without a Department of Defense guarantee covering $73 million of the sale.
>
> (*c*) The Hiller sale of $800,000 in SL–4 helicopters to Chile. The Bank of New York financed this transaction with a U.S. guarantee.
>
> (*d*) The pending $10.5 million sale of C–130 transport aircraft by Lockheed Corp. to the Government of Saudi Arabia. The sale has been approved as being in our foreign policy interest and will be carried out directly between Lockheed and the Government of Saudi Arabia. Lockheed has obtained agreement of a private bank to finance the sale on the assumption that the U.S. guarantee is available.

All we in the Senate are trying to do is put some kind of a limit on the power of the military-industrial-financial complex to control or unduly influence the foreign policy of this Nation.

Because the Nation is engaged in the third largest war in its history, because a new and infinitely more dangerous round in the nuclear arms race threatens, and because of an increasing tendency to see America's role in the world in terms of our capacity to respond to every challenge in military terms, I urge that the foreign aid conference sustain the Senate action in reducing the military assistance program and in repealing credit authority for arms sales.

I ask unanimous consent that the comments of the administration on these provisions in the foreign aid bill, on

which I have just commented, may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

EXECUTIVE BRANCH COMMENTS

GENERAL AUTHORITY

(House—Section 201(b)1)

(Senate—Section 201(b)1)

The Difference

The House version, in accordance with an Executive Branch request, strikes out the words "lease, sale, exchange" in Section 503(a).

The Senate version, in addition to striking out "lease, sale, exchange", also strikes out the words "or any other means" in Section 503(a).

Executive Branch Position

The Executive Branch prefers the House version but has no objection to the Senate version. The word "grant" should be understood to include those transactions carried on MAP records and reported to the Congress as grant aid which take the ostensible form publicly of a sales transaction calling for nominal payment in local currency.

GUARANTEES

(House—Sections 201(b)(3)(A) and 201(i)(5))

(Senate—Sections 201(b)(4) and 201(i))

The Difference

The Senate version repeals the guaranty authority.

The House version retains the guaranty authority.

Executive Branch Position

The Executive Branch prefers the House version.

1. The purpose of the guaranty authority is to make effective use of private rather than federal budget financing for sales, which are approved by the Departments of State and Defense as being in our national interest, in accordance with the general philosophy expounded in the Foreign Assistance Act of making maximum use of private channels. Examples of some of the credit sales which have been undertaken in the past and which would not be possible in the future without such guaranty authority or the appropriation of substantial amounts of increased NOA are as follows:

a. A $36 million loan to the Government of Iran by the First National City Bank of New York, Morgan Guaranty Trust Bank, and the Chase National Bank. This was part of an overall $200 million agreement between the United States and the Government of Iran which involved prior foreign economic and military policy agreement before going ahead with the loan.

b. The Raytheon Corporation sale of Hawk air defense missile systems to the Government of Saudi Arabia in the amount of $126 million as part of a major British/U.S./Saudi Arabia agreement. Saudi Arabia desired to implement the agreement directly with the Raytheon Corporation. Raytheon would not have been able to obtain credit for this transaction without a DOD guaranty covering $73 million of the sale.

c. The Hiller sale of $800,000 in SL-4 helicopters to Chile. The Bank of New York financed this transaction with a U.S. guarantee.

d. The pending $10.5 million sale of C-130 transport aircraft by Lockheed Corporation to the Government of Saudi Arabia. The sale has been approved as being in our foreign policy interest and will be carried out directly between Lockheed and the Government of Saudi Arabia. Lockheed has obtained agreement of a private bank to finance the sale on the assumption that the U.S. guarantee is available.

2. The alternative to continuation of the guaranty authority, if such sales which further the national interest are to continue, is to authorize and appropriate approximately $300 million annually for directly financing such sales.

FUNDING LEVELS

(House—Section 201(c))

(Senate—Section 201(c))

The Difference

The Senate version authorizes $475.1 million for fiscal year 1968 and, within that amount, earmarks $84.1 million for Infrastructure and International Military Headquarters.

The House version authorizes $590 million for fiscal year 1968, of which amount $24.1 million is available only for International Military Headquarters.

Executive Branch Position

The Executive Branch strongly supports the House version.

The Senate version leaves us $205 million short for grant aid and credit sales of meeting minimum United States security objectives. This reduction will have a major adverse effect on our global defense posture and on the effectiveness of United States foreign policy. It will most certainly cause consternation among our friends and allies who rely on our adherence to the principle and practice of free world collective security.

This $205 million shortage in the fiscal year 1968 program is about equal to all military assistance and sales requirements for fiscal year 1968 other than grant aid planned for the five countries on the perimeter of the USSR and Communist China—Korea, Republic of China, Greece, Turkey and Iran.

Since all these other programs (including all of Latin America and Africa, and Indonesia and the Philippines in East Asia) cannot be wiped out entirely without serious security and foreign policy implications, it will be necessary to make crippling cuts, perhaps up to 40 percent, in programs of the key forward defense countries contiguous to Communist China and the Soviet Union, since the planned programs for these five countries make up the bulk—about three-quarters—of the total program.

If the Korean program is to remain intact, or nearly so, while its troops are fighting in Vietnam, then the programs for Greece, Turkey, Iran and China must absorb the majority of the cut. Replacement of obsolescent and worn-out equipment planned for these countries will be virtually precluded. Operating support will be reduced. The countries may have to increase their defense budgets, thus cutting into economic sector programs. The readiness of these countries to meet Communist aggression would be adversely affected.

The Iran program is part of a prior commitment which would be politically difficult to reschedule.

In Greece and Turkey there would be a reduction of NATO readiness, with consequent increased reliance on reinforcements from other NATO nations, including the United States. Our negotiations concerning United States forces in Turkey would be made more difficult. United States willingness to support NATO could be questioned.

The defensive capabilities of the Republic of China will deteriorate unless the GRC is willing and financially able to make up the cuts by purchasing the necessary arms. However, another Senate amendment deleted the authority for credit sales. Taiwan's first line of defense—her air force and navy—will suffer the most, since they were due to receive the bulk of modernization equipment.

Military assistance extended to countries where we maintain important bases in our own security interests must be drastically reduced. While our need for bases in Ethiopia, Lybia, Spain, Portugal and the Philippines remains, our tenure could be jeopardized by our inability to provide anticipated military assistance.

Latin American programs, already cut to a bare minimum, would be further reduced at the same time that Castro is reaffirming his subversive intentions in the area. Latin American internal security programs would be summarily disrupted by abrupt cuts in military assistance.

Our ability to influence the course of events or to assist in the solution of problems in the Middle East and Africa will appreciably diminish. At a time when the Soviet presence is increasing in the Middle East area we would have no flexibility to take countering action. United States military assistance support for moderate Arab states would be reduced severely.

Military assistance supports major forces on the periphery of the USSR and Communist China which form a shield deterring Communist aggression and thus maintaining the peace. In other nations of the world to which military assistance is extended, it promotes internal security so that the nations can develop in the more stable atmosphere existing as long as Communist aggression is deterred. These other countries need assistance to solve their internal security problems. The reduction will severely limit our capability to provide any such assistance. By forcing reductions in assistance to countries essential to our forward defense, as well as in assistance to the other countries included in the program, the free world security posture is weakened.

REVOLVING FUND

(Senate—Section 201(h))

(House—Section 201(h))

The Difference

The Senate version terminates the Credit Sales Account as of 31 December 1967.

The House version retains the Credit Sales Account and makes minor technical language changes in proposed Section 526 of the Act.

Executive Branch Position

The Executive Branch strongly supports the House version.

Both the Senate and the House versions eliminate the proposed section 524 which set forth the general authority for credit sales. Hence, the only extant authority for credit sales is the language of the revolving fund, which states that funds placed in the Credit Sales Account either directly or as a result of repayments on prior loans shall be available until expended solely for the purpose of financing sales and guarantees including the overhead costs thereof.

In the absence of the revolving fund and its implicit authority to make credit sales, no authority would exist to finance credit sales from new procurement. The only means available to provide material from new procurement would be either on a grant basis or on cash payments basis. Since the principal purpose of the general credit sales authority was to provide credit to those countries capable of paying but not able to obtain Export-Import Bank or private bank credits, the deletion of such credit sales authority would eliminate, not limit, all DOD financed credit sales to any Middle Eastern country, any Latin American country and numerous other countries around the periphery of the Communist world.

Without the revolving fund credit authority, repayments from countries cannot be channeled to the ExImBank, private banks or the U.S. Services as appropriate since all repayments under the Senate version go to the general fund of the Treasury. Further, it would not be possible to pay outstanding obligations of the Account of approximately $700 million as of December 31, 1967, the date on which the Senate version terminates the Account. To prevent default on such out-

standing obligations, the Administration would have no recourse other than to request that the Congress vote approximately $230 million of appropriations to pay outstanding obligations which will come due in the last half of fiscal year 1968 and an estimated additional $500 million in subsequent fiscal years to meet payments due after fiscal 1968.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I think that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] said most of the things I might have said. There are several other corrections in the RECORD that I want to make as to figures in answer to some of the questions.

Mr. President, this country must maintain its superiority in the field of air transportation. This is the reason why this country must proceed with the supersonic transport program. The reasons for maintaining air superiority are obvious.

When President Kennedy first called me to the White House in 1961, he said that we should start on the SST because the British and the French were beginning and he also had word that the Russians were proceeding on a program. These predictions have proven to be true. The British-French Concorde is scheduled to fly early next year and is 3½ years ahead of the United States. The Russians are also well on their way. When I was in Russia last fall, they would not let me see their TU–144. However, it may well be that the Russians will be first to fly an SST into Kennedy Airport.

Commercial SST travel will soon be a reality. The question is: Will the U.S. SST, the Concorde, or the TU–144 dominate the air?

The U.S. supersonic transport will be a larger, faster, and a more profitable plane. Airlines would rather fly the U.S. SST since it will be a greater moneymaker than the Concorde. Already, orders have been placed for 129 U.S. SST's. Of that number, 65 have been from foreign-flag carriers and 64 from U.S. carriers.

On April 29, 1967, President Johnson authorized the FAA to sign contracts with Boeing and General Electric to begin prototype construction of two supersonic transports. These contracts were signed on May 1 and a budget amendment was forwarded to the Congress to finance construction for fiscal year 1968.

Congress has already appropriated $511 million for the SST. Of that amount $200 million was appropriated last year to begin prototype construction. The $142,375,000 which the House has appropriated for fiscal year 1968 will allow work to proceed so the United States will have an SST flying late in 1970.

To deny this current request would have a serious effect on the SST program. The program slippage would be 12 to 15 months and would add additional millions of dollars in expenses due to the escalation of prices and materials. The market for the U.S. SST would also be reduced since the airlines would be forced to buy more Concordes and, consequently, adversely affect our balance-of-payments position.

A more serious impact would be a loss of confidence and momentum in the program. The door would be open to contract changes that would be disadvantageous to the Government. The contracts with the manufacturers were negotiated under competitive conditions. Renegotiations of contracts under sole-source conditions can only weaken the favorable terms secured through long negotiations in the competitive phase.

As of this date, Boeing has signed agreements with the airlines to contribute $52 million in risk money this fiscal year. In addition, they have tentative offers for $12 million additional in risk contributions but these latter agreements have not yet been signed. If this appropriation should not go forward, it would be a breach of faith with the airlines and any future financial support would be hard to come by.

The SST is a partnership program between the government, the airlines and the manufacturers. The manufacturers, Boeing on the airframe and General Electric on the engine, will have nearly $300 million invested in the program during the prototype phase. The basic reason the Government is involved in this program is that it is a high-risk program beyond the financial potential of the manufacturers. This is the first commercial SST to be built in this country and presents certain risks. The effort is large, involving approximately $1,450 million for the construction and testing of two prototypes. There will be a long dry period before profit is possible.

The SST contracts call for the Government to recoup its investment. The Government will receive a royalty payment on each plane sold and on the sale of 300 planes the Government will receive its investment back; on the sale of 500 planes the Government will receive its investment plus 6 percent interest. Contrary to statements of some of the critics, there are no loopholes whereby the Government would never get a cent back.

The sonic boom does present probably the biggest problem in the development of a supersonic aircraft. At this time it is not known whether this plane will be able to fly over land and this may not be known until the plane is actually flown. In any event, current market projections show a minimum of 500 planes overwater market alone. This first model is being designed as a primarily intercontinental plane. If it cannot fly over land, derivative versions of it may have much better sonic boom characteristics which will be tolerable over land. The contract with the manufacturers states that the Government will also receive a royalty on derivative products.

The Boeing design of the SST also has one other factor in its favor, the variable sweep wing allows this plane to cruise efficiently at subsonic speeds, consequently, giving it excellent characteristics around airports.

The SST program has many positive factors. The balance-of-payments positions of this country will be enhanced since half our sales are projected to be to foreign buyers. With a market of 500 aircraft this could result in a favorable balance of payments of $17 billion, and the 1,200 market could amount to as much as $32 billion.

The SST will create jobs. There are approximately 50,000 jobs associated with the manufacturers of this plane, and, using the ordinary rule of thumb and multiplier effect, 200,000 to 250,000 jobs would be created by this program.

Mr. President, the SST will be in commercial service in the 1970's. People will ride on the SST in the same way they flocked to jets when they first entered into commercial service. The question is whether they will ride on a U.S. SST, the Concorde, or the TU–144. We are already behind on this program. To deny this appropriation would put us further behind and cost us a great deal more in the long run.

Mr. President, one of the Nation's most important developmental programs, the civil supersonic transport project has been the object of much criticism in recent weeks in the press and here in the Senate.

Much of the criticism has been based on misinformation, unsubstantiated charges, and a general misunderstanding of the nature of the program.

Many of the critics urge the project be delayed or even permanently shelved. Perhaps unwittingly, these people are actually advocating that the United States relinquish its world superiority in commercial aviation.

A delay in the U.S. supersonic transport project at this point would be a great boost to the British-French combine which now plans to put a supersonic airliner aloft several years before the American transport will make her maiden flight. This British-French airliner is now for sale and threatens to capture the commercial market for the SST transport should our own program be delayed.

The Russians, too, are pushing their own SST project forward at full speed and are making every effort to move into the forefront of commercial aviation.

The U.S. longtime domination in this vitally important area of commerce and technology must not be sacrificed simply because some prefer to see the United States stand still and fail to meet the opportunities and challenges of civil aviation in the next decade. Their cries for economy are, in reality, hollow.

They fail to realize the undeniable adverse impact on the U.S. economy should the U.S. airlines turn to foreign manufacturers for the transports they will need in the 1970's. They fail to see the consequences of an ailing American air transport industry on employment, tax revenues, and balance of payments. They fail to admit that carriers and air travelers of the future will demand supersonic transportation regardless of whether the airliners are manufactured abroad. But perhaps most importantly they fail to realize the impact of an entirely new technology—developed by American scientists, engineers, and technicians—on the lives of every American in the decades to come.

No, we must not sit back complacently while progress in commercial aviation continues its inexorable advance. Rather, the United States must continually move

ahead to maintain its commanding lead in this exciting and challenging project of the future.

The September–October issue of Aerospace International contains a simple, succinct, and factual explanation of the American supersonic airliner now being developed by Boeing and General Electric. The article is written by the man who probably knows more about the project than any other American and the man best qualified to put to rest some of the ill-advised attacks on the supersonic transport project, the brilliantly able Maj. Gen. J. C. Maxwell, Director of the U.S. supersonic transport development program.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE U.S. SST: SAFE, FAST, AND PRODUCTIVE

(By Maj. Gen. J. C. Maxwell, USAF)

(NOTE.—The U.S. SST's reason for being is one of economics: The aircraft must be comfortable enough, safe enough, and fast enough to attract the passenger. It must be productive and profitable enough to attract the airline operators, and lastly, it must show a profit for the manufacturers and the taxpayers who are underwriting the entire project during the prototype phase. The Air Force General charged with the awesome responsibility of running the SST development program answers these and other questions about supersonic travel in this exclusive article for Aerospace International.)

Most transportation economists would agree that air traffic is going to grow at a rapid rate for the foreseeable future. Assuming an annual growth rate of ten percent—a rate lower than our current experience and one that most experts agree is reasonable—the number of revenue passenger-miles flown in the Free World is expected to increase tenfold—from about 140,000,000,000 in 1966 to approximately 1,400,000,000,000 in 1990. More than two-thirds of the total forecast for 1990, or 1,000,000,000,000 revenue seat-miles, will be for route segments that are more than 700 miles (1,130 km) long. This is the market in which the SSTs can win up to 1,000,000,000,000 revenue passenger-miles. How much of this vast market can be captured by an SST depends upon how efficient, reliable, and economical it will be. One trillion revenue passenger-miles works out to a market potential of some $90,000,000,000 to $100,000,000,000 worth of airplanes, subsonic and supersonic. This market is for passenger aircraft alone. It does not even include the air-cargo market, which is growing by leaps and bounds.

The United States Government, in partnership with private industry, has for the past five years undertaken extensive research, technical development, and detailed design investigations to come up with the kind of supersonic transport that the airlines need and that passengers will want to fly on. The objective is to develop a safe, reliable, and profitable SST for the world's air carriers, one that is capable of servicing the market.

SAFETY

To be successful, the SST must meet safety demands that are almost absolute. And it must be versatile—able to operate under a wide variety of conditions. These factors underlie the U.S. decision to incorporate variable-wing geometry, which was tested on experimental research aircraft as early as 1951. More recently, variable geometry was employed on the supersonic F–111 fighter, now in large-scale production for the U.S. Air Force and Navy.

For subsonic flight, the variable-sweep wing design offers many advantages. In this configuration, the U.S. SST incorporates a high-lift system that provides slow approach speeds, conventional handling qualities, and good approach attitude and visibility similar to that of a Boeing 707 or McDonnell Douglas DC–8. Its takeoff and landing speeds, ground-roll distances, and general-handling qualities in ascent and descent are comparable to today's jets. The SST's lowered nose will give better visibility than today's jets. The takeoff and handling attitudes, similar to present airplanes, will be simple for today's jet transport pilot. Four powerful General Electric engines contribute to safety in the air and give an extra margin of safety in takeoff and landing. Shorter takeoff rolls combined with high rates of climb mean that the SST can be at a significantly high altitude as it passes over areas surrounding airports. Since takeoff and landing requirements and speeds are comparable to today's jet aircraft, the U.S. SST can use existing air terminal and airways systems with very little difficulty.

The supersonic cruise configuration, with the wings fully swept back, provides high-speed stability and control, maximum lift/drag ratio, and simple operating procedures. In supersonic configuration the wing is integrated with the horizontal stabilizer into a single aerodynamic unit, which makes it look much like a deltawing. Obviously, the swept-wing mechanism adds some weight and complexity, but these are more than offset by more efficient subsonic, transonic, and supersonic performance.

To ensure maximum reliability and easy maintenance, proven structural concepts have been used throughout the airframe. Titanium, which is one-half the weight of steel but far more heat resistant than aluminum, is used in the airplane structure, which is designed for a service life of more than 50,000 hours. All important systems are backed up by alternate systems so that the SST can proceed safely and reliably to its scheduled destination even if trouble should develop en route. High daily airplane utilization will be possible by reducing ground times for through, stop, and turnaround maintenance, fueling, cleaning, and cargo loading and unloading. These normal activities should take no longer than at present.

Four main landing gears permit high gross weight takeoffs and inherently soft landings. More importantly, a safe emergency landing can be made using only one main gear on one side of the airplane. This added safety feature is not available on today's aircraft. The four General Electric engines utilize technology and experience gained from the XB–70 program.

ECONOMICS

An SST design must give the airlines a chance to make money with it. Initially, the SST will operate on longhaul, overwater intercontinental routes. The design is aimed at highest efficiency and economy on supersonic nonstop flights of about 4,000 miles (6,440) km), but it can be operated subsonically on short overland segments and still remain economically profitable.

Airlines need an airliner that is not only efficient but also highly productive. The Boeing SST offers three times the speed and two-thirds the number of seats for about twice the price of the largest subsonic airplane currently in planning. Economic efficiency—attaining the highest speed for the least fuel with the most passengers—when expressed as direct operating costs per seat-mile, is well below those of current subsonic jets in international operation. In fact, direct operating costs are only slightly higher than those of proposed subsonic transports which can carry more passengers than the SST.

The U.S. SST's productivity (work capacity in available seat-miles per year for the international market) is almost equal to that of four 707s and 30 percent better than that of the large capacity subsonic jets. Since airplane productivity is a function of speed and capacity, a productive airliner must provide high flexibility in seating combinations and trip times, so as to be useful for a variety of individual markets. The large passenger cabin and the high-lift variable-sweep wing of the U.S. SST increase its adaptability and productivity in matching specific airline markets.

Productivity, however, is only theoretical unless the passenger likes the airplane. The SST's speed alone will provide high passenger appeal. And it will not only be fast, but comfortable as well. Cabin interiors will be more spacious than those of today's jetliners. The wide fuselage permits double aisles and wider seats. Passengers will not realize how fast they are flying. They will notice no change, for example, when they pass through the speed of sound. Supersonic flight will be smooth and quiet, since the engines are mounted aft and beneath the tail plane. This fact, plus thermal insulation, will hold cabin noise below the level of current jet transports. In short, the SST is designed as a passengers' airplane.

The high productive capacity of the U.S. SST, coupled with its ability to grow in size and range, will permit it to meet increasing traffic demands, including peak load requirements at popular departure hours. Structural and aerodynamic efficiency will improve. So will engine thrust and fuel economy. International operators will take advantage of these growth factors to increase range and payload on such routes as Rome-New York and Tokyo-Seattle. The built-in growth potential assures future lower unit operating costs. And the SST's greater seat-mile capacity may well help reduce both airport congestion and the need for new facilities.

THE VALUE OF TIME

Before we decided to build an airplane that can fly 1,800 miles (2,900 km) per hour (Mach 2.7) we tried to find out if this kind of speed was important to the passenger. While the U.S. SST design promises to provide an attractive airliner from the airline point of view, the passenger himself is the real judge. What is the value of his time? Are several days or hours intrinsically valuable, or important, or necessary? How much is an hour, or a day, really worth?

Let us compare the cost/value considerations for a round trip between Washington, D.C., and Los Angeles. By today's jet the trip takes about ten hours' flight time and costs $210, with meals included. The train takes six days and costs about the same when meals and tips are added on. The bus also takes six days for the transcontinental trip, with the total cost about $50 less. The six days' travel time lost in either case has some valve. A vacationer could increase his income by working when he otherwise would be en route, or he can use the time saved to lengthen his real vacation. A business or professional man's time has implicit value, which can be equated against his income. Thus, it is always cheaper, in fact, to travel by air when the monetary value of the time saved is recognized. The growth of the international transportation market attests to this hard monetary fact.

With the U.S. SST any two points on the globe will be within 12 hours of each other. History has shown that whenever travel time is substantially reduced there is a dramatic expansion in trade and population mobility. These factors, in turn, feed the growth of international air transportation, in a political sense, air travel time can be equally significant. For instance, President Johnson could have saved nine hours if he could have used the SST on his recent trip to Vietnam, a 50 percent saving in time. And everyone would agree that his time is pretty valuable.

Nothing but good can come from exploiting the technological explosion to secure faster, more efficient means of transportation. Time and distance barriers to communications among nations must be reduced. As the world grows smaller, men must come closer together. The SST will help, immeasurably.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, commercial aviation has become the fastest growing segment of the American economy. Air travel is growing at the rate of 17 percent a year. American built jet aircraft far outnumber their foreign counterparts in the skies throughout the globe.

The United States is the world leader in this vital, sophisticated field of endeavor—air transportation. It leads in both the manufacture of planes, in quantity and quality, and as a carrier of passengers.

The supersonic transport, Mr. President, makes sense as the next step in the growth of aviation that started on the shores of this country—at Kitty Hawk. The seeds of aviation were planted here, and through our enterprise we have nurtured it to its present state. Much of this Nation's prosperity is attributal to this industry—just as steel and automobiles have been so important. In the cities of this Nation, where the finding of jobs is so necessary to solve the social problems, the aircraft industry is a leading employer. A great number of SST dollars will go into urban centers throughout the country.

Mr. President, the United States has moved from the origins of flight to the threshold of the availability of supersonic transportation for its citizens. We have moved a step at a time, from biplanes to monoplanes, from one engine, propeller driven aircraft to four and six-engine transports. We have moved from propeller planes to subsonic jets. Now we move to the next step—the supersonic jet transport. It is part and parcel of the scientific and technical evolution that has enriched this country.

But our efforts are not unilateral. The pressure of competition exists. Great Britain and France are actually ahead of us with their SST, the Concorde, which was the greatest attraction at the big Paris Air Show last spring. While the Soviet Union's efforts in this area are cloaked in secrecy, there are strong indications that Russia is moving steadily ahead. The Russians claim the world's largest air network in their widespread Aeroflot operations, covering 325,000 miles. The Anglo-French company is taking orders—from both U.S. and foreign carriers. We know in the United States than we can build a superior aircraft in both efficiency and economy. Commercial carriers are prepared to purchase the American supersonic transport if it can meet their timetables. A delay of the U.S. version will enhance the salability of the Concorde.

The Federal Aviation Agency economic feasibility report concluded that SST aircraft sales for a 15-year period starting in 1975 can result in a favorable balance-of-payments impact of $17 billion on minimum estimates and $32 billion with maximum estimates.

It has been estimated that a 2-year delay in the program could reduce sales from 1,100 by 1990 to about 660. At best we can hope for initial deliveries to take place from three to four years after the Concorde begins carrying passengers.

It makes no more sense, Mr. President, for this country to rule itself out of production of sophisticated aircraft than it has been for the United States to deteriorate to its present position as a second-ranking merchant marine power—in both vessels on the seas and our shipbuilding capacity.

America's broad continent and its wide oceans on either side insist that we be a leader in transportation. We cannot wipe out the immense gains we have made in the most dramatic transportation area of all—the skies of the world.

I am aware of expressions made by high officials of the Department of Defense that the SST has no military application. Lacking a crystal ball, I will trust history on this question.

Every major aeronautical development over many years has seen beneficial fallout to the second party, be it military or commercial. An excellent example is the old workhorse DC-3 which came on the scene as the major airliner of the 1930's and also served the military so gallantly for many years.

The Air Force is building the huge C-5A, capable of carrying outsize cargoes to all points on the globe at less than sonic speeds. The C-5A's civilian counterpart is the jumbo jet, 747. Commercial lines are ordering both the subsonic 747 and the SST, planning to use both aircraft on their routes to meet specific needs. It will follow that the military, too, will need a transport of supersonic speed where time is a more critical factor in movement of personnel or high priority cargo. The SST engine development will have very considerable military significance, with a possible almost immediate application on fighter aircraft.

Congress first saw the military need for nuclear power on its warships, and the Polaris submarine has proved the wisdom of the Congress. I know that Congress is keenly interested in what contributions the SST can make to our defense posture and what the presence of such an airplane can do to help maintain the peace.

It has been predicted that before the SST flies in a commercial operation, military requirements will have been developed and military orders will have been placed for this aircraft. But, while the military possibilities must be considered, they are in no way involved in the ultimate success of the program. The SST will be a financial success purely in the commercial realm.

The breakeven point—when the Government will fully recoup its investment—is at the construction of the 300th plane. Yet, informed estimates are that some 1,200 will be sold if the program proceeds on schedule.

Mr. President, a Cabinet member in the late 19th century, on contemplating the great technical advances that had been made to that time, guessed that "there's nothing new to invent."

It would rival this 19th century assumption if we were today to conclude that we have nothing more to develop in the way of bigger, faster, more efficient air transports. I support the appropriation for this program and urge my colleagues to do so.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, for the benefit of the Senators who came in late, I do not know of any other amendment. It is my impression that there will be one vote on the amendment and then a vote on passage of the bill.

I certainly hope we can dispose of the bill this afternoon. I am willing to stay here as long as necessary.

I yield the floor.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, what concerns me are the questions of priority in this matter.

As I have said, yesterday, with the administration's support, we cut the budget by about $900 million in the field of poverty, cutting from the recommendation of the committee. This morning we almost cut another $198 million; we avoided this cut despite the administration. I do not believe any investment is more worthwhile in our country at the moment than to find jobs, so that people can become productive members of society and can get off relief. It seems to me that that problem should receive the highest priority, a higher priority than any plane we can make, or any engine we can build, a higher priority than enabling people, 15 years from now, to travel across the Atlantic or the Pacific at 800 miles an hour rather than 600 miles an hour. That would be very comfortable. It would be fine for those of our population who fly to be able to get to Europe in 3½ or 4 hours, instead of 6 or 7 hours. But I do not believe that the longer trip will kill anybody. If they are going to Paris or London or Rome, it will not hurt them to stay on the plane 2 or 3 hours longer than they do at present. I do not believe that having to spend 6 hours on a plane rather than 4 hours will destroy their vacation or their trip.

With all the problems we have in the United States at the moment, we are now debating something which—if it is completely successful—will give us some gain seven years from now. We are not talking about something in 1969, or 1971, or even 1973. We are talking about 1974. We are going to take some steps. We are going to spend $142 million this year. We have already spent $511 million. We are going to spend another $142 million this year, and continue to spend more each year, so that we will have some possible gain—if the program is completely effective—7 years from now.

Looking at this matter from the position of the administration, first, they say, as Members of the Senate have said, that it is possible we will have a deficit of $29 billion this year. How, then, can we afford to spend $142 million this year for this plane, when it will not give us any gain for at least 7 years? How can we say, as many Senators have said when they argued against the poverty programs, that we must save money and cannot afford the poverty programs? If we cannot afford any program, we cannot afford the supersonic jet program, which will not give us any benefit until 1974.

It is not a question of cutting out the

program completely. Nobody has suggested that. It might be a worthwhile program. But at least let us defer it, in view of the problems that this country is experiencing internally and externally. We are faced with a $29 billion deficit. We are spending approximately $30 billion a year in Vietnam. We have internal problems in our own country, and the problems are not improving.

The unemployment rate of those who live in the ghettos and in the high rate of unemployment centers across the country is becoming worse, not better, according to the Department of Labor.

A number of those who advocate the SST program say that it will make jobs, and this is one of the reasons we should approve the program. If we are going to get jobs for people, why do we not build housing in the ghettos or where there is unemployment in the rural areas of the United States? Why do we not build factories or hospitals in those areas and give the people jobs on those projects and in those facilities when they are finished?

We should not build a supersonic plane so that 1 percent of our population can get to Paris in 4 hours—that is the basic question—while so many of our people are in such desperate need, not only the Negroes, but the whites of Appalachia, the Puerto Ricans, and the Mexican-Americans as well. What will they say when they read of this debate—on the same day it has been advocated to cut $198 million from our poverty program, and but one day after we cut $900 million from our poverty program which was designed specifically to find jobs.

We would be committing ourselves to a program that possibly would bring benefit in 1974—a plane that could not fly over the United States and would only be able to fly over the oceans. It could not fly from the east coast to the west coast. It would be for the benefit of the people in the United States who could afford to go to Europe or to Asia, either on an expense account or on vacation. I believe they constitute a small minority.

I support the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin, an amendment which would not destroy the program but would just postpone it.

Let us take another look at the matter. There is enough controversy about this program, and it deserves another look. There are enough problems at the present time in our own country, as well as our problems in the Far East, in Vietnam, and all over the globe. I believe this matter deserves another look, and I support the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I should like to make a few remarks to see whether we can clear up some of the misunderstanding that has been generated in the discussion of this matter.

I do not look at the SST—nor do I believe any member of the committee does—as a special conveyance to transport a few members of our jet set to Europe, Singapore, or the Middle East. I look at it as a vital factor in a very important industry which must be kept modern. It must be given the excellence of the American standards. Certainly, this jet plane, with the sonic boom, will probably not be very useful for transcontinental flight. Neither were the clipper ships useful for transcontinental traffic, but they brought the world's commerce to America.

You do not have to look at any statistics other than the retirement of the *Queen Mary*, the *Queen Elizabeth*, and other ocean liners, to realize that the passenger traffic of the world is moving by air; and when it moves by air on the long-haul routes, it will move by the fastest aircraft available.

On February 29 of next year, the British will fly the Concorde. Make no mistake about it. I have heard this announced by the chairman of the board of the consortium that Britain joined with France in its production. On this day, the age of supersonic flight will be here. Of course, it will take 3 or 4 years for the delivery of the Concorde. That is why most of our own transoceanic airlines have covered themselves for this period by buying the Concorde, because they know they dare not be second best. They want to buy American aircraft, because they know it will be the best.

If we fail to take this opportunity to move forward, if we curtail, by the amendment of the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin, and chop from the funds all but $1 million, we will be doing, I believe, a tremendous disservice to this country.

In the first place, as the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado mentioned, I believe we certainly will be forgoing the $52 million that was asked for by the opponents of this program to be put up by the airlines; because I cannot conceive this Government—I cannot conceive the ethical standards with which we try to deal with people dealing with the Government—that would consider that money put up in good faith for a continuation of this program, could be held in force perhaps by a legal suit, certainly not by ethical standards, to keep the $52 million that has been put in as their contribution of good faith for the continuation of this program, with the normal speed of the development and the continuation of the funding of this program.

Certainly, I do not wish to see us slide back to 2 or 3 years' delay, because each year will mean a further penetration of this supersonic market by the Concorde. They will be forced to buy the Concorde, or perhaps the Soviet plane, both of which will be flying, because of our insistence on building the finest plane, which will be delayed several years after the Concorde is on the air routes of the world.

We will have the best plane, because titanium is the new metal. It is the only metal that can withstand the heat generated at supersonic speeds beyond mach 2.1. I disagree strongly with the contention that there is any trick or any joker—it has been outlined repeatedly in the contracts—that because the contract requires a titanium structure that will fly beween ranges of mach 2.2 and mach 3.1, there is a joker in it.

Mr. President, I say to my distinguished colleague, whom I love dearly and whose association I enjoy so much in the Senate, if by any chance we should find another metal that would be more superior than titanium it would be worth every dollar to have this developed and placed on the market instead of titanium. If we can bring about the development of another metal in the range of time of 10 years that we have been talking about, I think our moving ahead at this time would be justified.

The first metal planes that came into existence, which were made of aluminum, somewhere back in the late 1920's have been extremely useful as the principal airplanes in aviation. Now we are moving to a new metal after all these many years. I doubt seriously if we have true mach 3.1. If the plane should exceed this speed it would be unfit to fly because none of the systems, and there are multimillion-dollar systems that have to go into this complex aircraft, would operate or be safe or workable at above mach 3.1 because at that point the temperature on the airframe would exceed 650 degrees Fahrenheit, a heat beyond which the systems being designed in this plane will not be able to take.

Mr. President, with respect to the fear of being booby-trapped into a contract that is inescapable, I find it difficult to understand that argument. We will get our money back when we begin the 300 number in delivery. We will have justified the recovery of our investment. If we go forward to 500 we reach beyond, according to Secretary Boyd of the Department of Transportation, and we should receive and realize $1.1 billion in profits and interest. If 500 planes are sold or if 1,200 planes should be sold, through a breakthrough in the sound barrier handicap, we should receive $3.8 billion. This is not a subsidy. It is not a gamble. American technology is capable of doing it. Nearly every plane that has written great records for America in aviation has been the result of Government investment.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand a photostatic copy of a memorandum from the War Department dated February 10, 1908. The contract is signed by the Wright Brothers at Dayton, Ohio, and it provides for the order of one heavier-than-air flying machine, in accordance with Signal Corps specification No. 486, dated December 23, 1907, at a price of $25,000.

This is where it all began and the fertilization of aviation has been possible by that $25,000 for the first Wright brothers plane. It is difficult to find any aircraft we produce that does not go back to the genesis that governmental research has been the most important factor in its success. We are not subsidizing; we are advancing the funds.

I believe this will be the finest and best supersonic transport in the skies when it is completed and that it will return not only the original investment but a profit on that investment.

Mr. President, I urge the Senate not to accept the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] and I believe that the committee recommendation would permit us to move forward at the best and most appropriate speed.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, it is time to recognize and act on the indisputable fact that our Nation, rich and

powerful though it is, does not have inexhaustible resources.

The recent event in our cities have clearly demonstrated that we have a crisis right on the main streets of our Nation. This crisis poses a challenge to the ingenuity, the skills, and the resources of our society.

The Senate must recognize the legitimate needs of our citizens. We must establish some priorities, and I support the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE].

The plan to cut funds earmarked for development of the SST does not kill the idea. Adequate funds remain for a more deliberate program which can proceed at a slower pace and study the effects of the sonic boom—a major stumbling block for the future of the SST.

It is not responsible to say we as a Nation can have everything at once. I do not believe a few hours faster trip to Europe takes precedence over our own massive domestic requirements.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the committee feels that the facts have been developed at the hearings and the record has been fully presented to the Senate. We rest on the matter. Other than that, the debate will close with a statement by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] on his amendment.

Mr. President, will the Chair actively see that we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, for the last hour or so I have listened to arguments against the amendment and in favor of going ahead full blast with $142 million for the SST.

One of the arguments is that this would help the balance of payments. This argument completely overlooks the fact that there will be no benefit to our balance of payments for 10 years. The balance-of-payments problem that we have is not 10 years from now, but this problem is with us now.

The argument overlooks the fact that none of the competent agencies of the Government which deal with balance of payments, and I refer to the Treasury, Commerce, the Federal Reserve and the Council of Economic Advisers, have made any statement on this matter at all. The best estimate I can get from the economists is that the matter is a tossup as to whether it would favorably or adversely affect the balance of payments.

Mr. President, in the second place, there has been no answer to the contention we made that this is a rush job to attempt to combat competition from the Concorde. The Concorde is a plane that has already jumped in cost from $10 to $20 million, and it is going to cost more.

There is no answer to the argument that the Concorde will not be able to compete because it cannot fly over land at high speeds and will not be in the same ball park with our supersonic transport even if we take 2 or 3 years more. There is no answer to the argument that the Concorde is made of aluminum and cannot fly more than mach 2 and for that reason will not be able to compete, even if we take 3 or 4 more years.

There is no answer to the alternative offered by the Assistant Secretary of State who said we could finance this plane as effectively by private funds as well as by public funds, and that indeed it would be much better. This SST constitutes a new departure that we should finance a commercial and profit venture at the expense of the taxpayer, which is not for military purposes, but for the benefit of those who take advantage of flying by air.

There has been no answer on the contracts. The Senator from Oklahoma is very expert in this area, but he conceded that if the SST flies at more than mach 3.1, the taxpayer loses everything under this contract. The SR-71 now flies at mach 3, and with tolerances there, does go over mach 3.1, with none of the breakdown of equipment the Senator referred to. There is a real possibility with the advancement of air technology this plane could fly at more than mach 3.1. If it does, the Federal Government has lost all of our investment.

Mr. President, there is a possibility we can develop another metal other than titanium; if so the Federal Government loses all of its investment. To this there has been no answer.

There has been no answer to the argument made by the Senator from New York that there is no urgency on this SST. What is the hurry? What difference does it make if we postpone this for a few months?

There has been no answer to the argument of the Senator from New York and the Senator from Arkansas that this SST cannot be placed in any priority of national needs. There are many priorities above this.

There has been no answer to the argument that very few persons will benefit from this. No one has contended that more than 3 percent or 5 percent of the population could benefit from this kind of flight. They are the only persons who could afford it.

Finally this year, this month of October 1967, the House Ways and Means Committee has said that unless the President can reduce spending by $7 to $10 billion, they will not proceed on the tax bill. This is a time when we all should be conscious of our fiscal responsibility. There has been no answer and there has been no attempt to answer the argument that we face a $30 billion deficit, and yet we would go ahead with a frill that could be postponed without any significant loss and we would be going ahead with it on the basis of grossly inadequate justification.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MUSKIE in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] is paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS]. If present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina would vote "yea," and the Senator from Florida would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]. If present and voting, the Senator from Arkansas would vote "yea," and the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] is paired with the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Ohio would vote "yea," and the Senator from Alaska would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is absent for religious observance.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] are absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] would each vote "nay."

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

The result was announced—yeas 19, nays 54, as follows:

[No. 283 Leg.]

YEAS—19

Burdick	Hatfield	Proxmire
Byrd, Va.	Holland	Ribicoff
Case	Kennedy, N.Y.	Spong
Clark	Lausche	Williams, Del.
Griffin	Mondale	Yarborough
Gruening	Morse	
Hansen	Nelson	

NAYS—54

Aiken	Harris	Metcalf
Allott	Hart	Miller
Anderson	Hartke	Monroney
Bayh	Hickenlooper	Montoya
Bennett	Hollings	Mundt
Bible	Inouye	Murphy
Boggs	Jackson	Muskie
Brewster	Jordan, N.C.	Pearson
Byrd, W. Va.	Jordan, Idaho	Pell
Cannon	Kuchel	Percy
Church	Long, Mo.	Scott
Cooper	Long, La.	Smith
Cotton	Magnuson	Sparkman
Curtis	Mansfield	Stennis
Dirksen	McCarthy	Symington
Dominick	McClellan	Tower
Ellender	McGee	Williams, N.J.
Fong	McIntyre	Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—27

Baker	Gore	Pastore
Bartlett	Hayden	Prouty
Brooke	Hill	Randolph
Carlson	Hruska	Russell
Dodd	Javits	Smathers
Eastland	Kennedy, Mass.	Talmadge
Ervin	McGovern	Thurmond
Fannin	Morton	Tydings
Fulbright	Moss	Young, Ohio

So Mr. PROXMIRE's amendment was rejected.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask to have it read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 6, lines 11 and 12, to strike out "$65,400,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$28,400,000."

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the Senate, I would like to make a unanimous-consent request, which has been discussed with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], manager of the bill, and the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

I ask unanimous consent that on all amendments there be a time limitation of not to exceed 30 minutes, the time to be equally divided between the proposer of the amendment and the chairman of the subcommittee, the manager of the bill.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. And, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that 1 hour of debate be allowed on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, if the Chair could get order and keep it, I believe we could dispose of the amendment rather rapidly. I believe the Senator from Delaware said he had only a few remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized. For how much time?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield myself 5 minutes, Mr. President. I concur in what the Senator from Mississippi has said. I think we can dispose of this amendment very quickly.

I am not debating the merits or demerits of this particular appropriation. It is just a question of how much we can afford.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, we are not in order and we cannot hear.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The Senate is not in order.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to suspend the business of the Senate until we can hear. There is so much talk going on back here that those of us who must handle the business of the Senate cannot hear what is being said.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi is more successful than the Chair. The Chair thanks the Senators from Mississippi.

The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, this is a section of the bill which deals with facilities and equipment at the airports.

Under the budget as submitted to the House the administration asked for $35.4 million. This compares with $28 million appropriated for the same purpose in 1967. The House allowed $30 million.

After the bill came over to the Senate a revised budget request was submitted in which this estimate was revised downward to $28.4 million. Their request was revised downward on the ground that the extra money was not needed.

The administration asked for only $28.4 million.

The bill as reported by the committee, instead of complying with the budget request, provided $65.4 million or an increase of $37 million.

My amendment would reduce the amount to exactly that which the Budget told the committee it would need. Reading from the House committee report, it was stated that it is estimated that even with the lower amount, at the end of the fiscal year they will have an unobligated balance of $33.138 million. At the beginning of this fiscal year this agency had an unobligated balance remaining of $84,038,000.

I quote these figures from the House report.

I see no need to appropriate more than double the amount which the Budget thinks this agency needs. That is why I offer this amendment.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes or such part of it as I may use.

Let me direct the attention of the Senate to what we think is a highly important matter. This concerns itself solely with the question of safety. These funds are to be used exclusively for procurement of equipment. These items are listed at the top of page 7 of the report. The increases contemplated by the committee would include airport surveillance radar. The lack of such equipment is what may have cost the lives of the 84 people at Asheville, N.C., just about 2 months ago.

This item also includs terminal automation to receive and process altitude information on radar scopes, instrument landing systems, and approach lights.

Members of the Senate, this figure was arrived at after the closest study and seeking of information, not from the Budget Bureau, but from the FAA. They did not volunteer anything. We had to use a corkscrew to get it out of them. I finally got General McKee and put the question in such a way that it was not suggesting anything.

This is a purely Federal undertaking. It involves terminals and centers. It is interstate commerce, to begin with, but the Federal Government is the only one in the business, the only one who can do the job, the only one who has control over it.

I am not talking out of school, but one of the most recent air disasters involved a small plane coming into an airport. He was told to turn to the right and follow a certain line. Instead, it turned to the left, but the man in the tower had no way of knowing that, although it was only a few miles away. If the man had had the ground radar, he would have seen the error of the little plane, and through communications, could have told the pilot he was on the wrong route and to change his course. No one knew that, and the small plane hit into the underside of the jet airplane, and 82 people were killed in one disaster.

Those are things that happen.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Does not the Senator think we need ground radar here at National Airport?

Mr. STENNIS. We have it here. It is needed in many other places. I am not willing to wait any longer. The Senate can do what it wants to. We can forget about the $7 million request that came in late. The men who work in the towers have to be employed and trained for 2 years before they are ready to go to work.

So the Budget Bureau took $7 million off of facilities, and added $7 million to operations. But, frankly, the committee ignored both of those items, and put in 30 million new dollars into facilities and equipment and 20 million new dollars into operations, to provide more manpower and more money to pay for some extra hours.

I ask Senators to be careful before they vote to take this money out, or somebody, I am afraid, will get stung.

I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I point out to the Senator from Delaware that there is really no economy in cutting this payment, because what we are doing here is fulfilling a commitment which the Federal Government has made, under the law, to these airports, to provide these safety devices. This is the place to pro-

vide for them. All we could do by cutting it back would be to defer it for a year or more and running the additional risk, but ultimately the Federal Government has to meet its commitment to provide the safety devices.

So, if Senators agree with the Senator from South Dakota and the Senator from Mississippi—and other Senators, I am sure—that aviation is here to stay, I say there is no economy in just postponing a commitment we have to meet. I think we ought to do it now, and provide these airports with the kind of safety devices that can protect human life, as we proceed with the aviation program. I do not think this is a place where we can afford to cut back.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from South Dakota for his kind remarks.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes. I believe just as strongly in safety as does the Senator from Mississippi. I do not disagree with the chairman on that point at all; but appropriating more money would not have changed the facts, as far as the 1966 accident to which he has referred or any other accident is concerned this year, because at the end of fiscal 1966 there remained $123,324,000 of unobligated balances in this Agency's account, and at the end of fiscal 1967 the unobligated balance was $186,456,000. Had they wished they could have spent more to buy the equipment of which the Senator was speaking.

These accidents resulted not from a shortage of funds for the Agency.

At the end of fiscal 1966 there was $186,456,000 remaining as unobligated and, according to the House committee report, it is estimated that at the end of fiscal 1968 there will be $86,300,000 in unobligated balances, even with the amount being reduced as proposed in the pending amendment.

I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt from this House committee report, beginning on page 13 and continuing on page 14, confirming the statistics I have quoted, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

Following this House report I insert an excerpt of the Senate report, which confirms that the Budget had reduced its original request by $7 million, or to the amount of $28,400,000.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the House and Senate reports were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPT FROM HOUSE REPORT

Facilities and equipment

Appropriation, 1967	$28,000,000
Estimate, 1968	35,400,000
Recommended in the bill	30,000,000
Reduction below estimate	−5,400,000

The $30,000,000 recommended is $2,000,000 more than the $28,000,000 appropriated last year for this activity. The total obligations in this activity anticipated in fiscal year 1968 total $86,300,000. At the beginning of the fiscal year an unobligated balance of $84,038,000 was estimated to be available. The Committee opposes the buildup of unduly large unobligated balances and feels that the funds available, along with the additional $30,000,000 provided, will enable the FAA to fund those activities for which obligations are required during the fiscal year.

It is estimated that at the end of fiscal year 1968 $33,138,000 will remain unobligated. Usually, estimates of unobligated balances are optimistic. Last year, it was estimated that $123,324,000 would be unobligated at the end of fiscal year 1966. In the fiscal year 1968 budget, it is shown that the actual amount unobligated at the end of fiscal year 1966 was $186,456,000.

EXCERPT FROM SENATE REPORT

Facilities and equipment

1967 appropriations to date	$28,000,000
1968 budget estimate	[1] 28,400,000
House allowance	30,000,000
Committee recommendation	65,400,000

[1] As amended by S. Doc. 50. (Original estimate decreased by $7,000,000.)

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. This report shows that there are and will be available funds in this program without the $37 million added by the Senate committee. This is an area where we can cut back on the recommended appropriation.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute. With the greatest of deference to the Senator from Delaware, there is an explanation about there being this much available money. There is a time-lag question involved here, of long leadtime, to obtain this equipment. But I have no doubt that we know what we are talking about, about this need, and that the appropriation of these funds will make this equipment start to move. The orders have to be made, and the long wait cannot be avoided. We are overdue now.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I quoted the statistics from the House committee report. I read just one sentence from that report:

It is estimated that at the end of fiscal year 1968, $86,300,000 will remain unobligated.

It goes on to point out the other figures which I have stated; and I feel we have a right to rely upon the committee reports.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, on July 19, I received a note from a gentleman in the Government, transmitting to me an interoffice memorandum from a Federal aviation agent in my own State.

This is what the memorandum says:

Beginning on or about July 24, the radar communication crew will become involved with installation of the ASR-5—

This is the new radar—

We will transfer——to the installation crew for the duration of the project. This transfer, during the annual leave season, leaves the crew 2 men short. Operating this short, we may not always have a man available to take care of your problems, so be patient, and we will take care of the equipment failures as soon as we can.

I sent the memorandum to the FAA, to find out whether in fact we had a situation which was of critical importance should a breakdown in the radar system occur.

They replied that although they were short of people and did need more funding for them, nevertheless, these people could be available, because their installation work was being done at the same field, and they could be shifted over to take care of the other unit.

It does seem to me that this, interoffice memorandum, clearly reveals the need for additional money, as advocated by the committee. This memorandum is particularly significant in view of the fact it was not prepared for a Senator or committee but was for intraoffice use. I think this issue is extremely important. Ordinarily, as Senators know, I try to support cuts in what I think are unnecessary expenditures; but with the enormous increase in air traffic that we are experiencing, I sincerely hope that we can retain the committee recommendations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is time yielded back?

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. STENNIS. Under the parliamentary situation, this is really a committee amendment we are about to vote on, is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is an amendment to a committee amendment which was left open for further amendment.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Presiding Officer. Those in favor of the Senator's amendment, of course, would vote yea, and those not in favor would vote nay; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. Does the Senator yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield back the remainder of my time.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. For what purpose does the Senator from Oklahoma address the Chair?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am not clear as to the holding of the Chair with reference to the vote on the amendment of the Senator from Delaware. If one is in favor of the amendment, would his vote be "nay"?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware. A yea vote would support his amendment, and a nay vote would be in favor of retaining the committee amendment unchanged.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the Presiding Officer.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and the Senator from

Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is absent for religious observance.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] are absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 2, nays 68, as follows:

[No. 284 Leg.]

YEAS—2

Proxmire	Williams, Del.

NAYS—68

Aiken	Gruening	Miller
Allott	Hansen	Mondale
Anderson	Harris	Monroney
Bayh	Hart	Morse
Bennett	Hartke	Mundt
Bible	Hickenlooper	Murphy
Boggs	Holland	Muskie
Brewster	Hollings	Nelson
Burdick	Inouye	Pearson
Byrd, Va.	Jackson	Pell
Byrd, W. Va.	Jordan, N.C.	Percy
Cannon	Jordan, Idaho	Ribicoff
Case	Kennedy, N.Y.	Scott
Church	Kuchel	Smith
Clark	Lausche	Sparkman
Cooper	Long, Mo.	Spong
Cotton	Long, La.	Stennis
Curtis	Magnuson	Symington
Dirksen	Mansfield	Tower
Dominick	McClellan	Williams, N.J.
Ellender	McGee	Yarborough
Fong	McIntyre	Young, N. Dak.
Griffin	Metcalf	

NOT VOTING—30

Baker	Hatfield	Moss
Bartlett	Hayden	Pastore
Brooke	Hill	Prouty
Carlson	Hruska	Randolph
Dodd	Javits	Russell
Eastland	Kennedy, Mass.	Smathers
Ervin	McCarthy	Talmadge
Fannin	McGovern	Thurmond
Fulbright	Montoya	Tydings
Gore	Morton	Young, Ohio

So the amendment of Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware was rejected.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 5, line 22, strike out "$618,400,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$605,400,000."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, if I understand the tabulation correctly, I believe that I lost the other amendment.

Seriously though, I recognize the futility of pressing this matter further. I offered this amendment merely to get an opportunity to point out the increases over the budget on certain items in this bill. On page 4 of the bill, under title acquisition and construction and improvements, the committee added $14½ million over the budget.

On page 5, under Federal Aviation Administration allowances for operations, the committee amount is $13 million over the budget. The budget request for that items was originally $598 million.

A revised budget request added $7 million. The Senate committee, however, added $20 million instead of $7 million. That amount is $13 million over the budget. In other words, the Budget Bureau asked for $7 million extra, and the committee in its generosity added $20 million. I had planned to offer an amendment to reduce that to the Budget request.

On page 14 we find that the Senate committee added $8 million for Alaskan assistance under the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1966. This was not a budget request. The entire item of $8 million was added by the Senate over the administration's recommendations.

Added altogether we have $72 million over and beyond what was requested by the budget.

I recognize that to try to cut the appropriations for this agency is like killing the sacred cow. In light of the recent vote I realize the futility of any further effort, and in view of the lateness of the hour I withdraw the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in withdrawing this amendment I reiterate that we in the Senate had better pause and ask ourselves how long we can continue to increase these various appropriations over the budget requests.

At the same time, I pay my respects to the Senator from Mississippi because I fully recognize that the overall total of this particular bill is slightly below the budget request.

But that does not justify the increases of $72 million to which I have referred.

I shall not press the point further at this time. I merely wish to emphasize that whether it be in my pet project or in the other fellow's pet project, at some point this Congress must decide whether or not we will roll back these expenditures; otherwise we shall be confronted with a sizable increase in taxes, and that rollcall vote will be interesting.

I am withdrawing these amendments because I see no evidence that a Senate vote on the other amendments to which I have just referred would be any different from the preceding vote; therefore I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is withdrawn.

The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read the third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, today, as we consider the Department of Transportation appropriations bill for fiscal 1968, we are debating the merits of the future of the supersonic transport in the United States. This bill includes an appropriation of $142,375,000 for the SST. Throughout recent months, there has been a great deal of criticism directed at the Government for its proposed large participation in the SST program and at the huge sums of money which the Federal Government is now planning to make available for the development of the SST.

There is no question that there are current strains on our economy which must be evaluated. The Federal Government is participating more heavily than ever in projects to improve our schools, our lakes and rivers, our ghetto areas, and many other things. Of course, we face the huge defense outlay which is greatly increased by our involvement in Southeast Asia. Many, including myself, are calling for reductions in nonessential Federal spending in order that a serious inflation does not beset the economy, and there are those on this floor today who argue that these funds for the SST program should be reduced for this very reason.

Mr. President, with this argument I cannot agree. I support the SST program for what I believe to be very valid reasons.

Air transportation today is a major economic asset to this country both in manufacturing commercial transports and in operating them on the airlines. Air transportation is the fastest growing segment of our economy today and promises to multiply tenfold in the next 25 years. Supersonic air transportation for passenger carrying is clearly going to be a part of that future whether or not the United States builds an SST. The SST is going to capture between 25 and 50 percent of a $1 billion market for air-

craft sales. What this would mean to American industry and labor is obvious.

Mr. President, the question today is whether the U.S. Government should proceed with its support of the SST development as planned, or whether it should defer its responsibility in this area until such time as these funds would be more readily available. To delay our proposed spending on the SST would be, in my opinion, a mistake. I believe it is imperative that we proceed as planned so that the SST can be in full operation at least by 1975. While there are certain technical problems, including the most serious sonic boom, which must be solved, I strongly feel that the technical capability of our engineers will prove to be equal to the task by the time this plane is flying.

I have already briefly touched on the impact which the SST program will have on our economy. A successful SST program will pump from $20 to $48 billion into our economy over a 15-year period. Virtually every State in the Union would share in the benefits since approximately 65 percent of the SST productive program would be subcontracted out. Some 60,000 jobs would be created in the aerospace industry and at least that many in the airline and associated industries. In addition, there are other selling points. The balance of payments considered is a major one. The projected market for the SST is 500 to 1,200 aircraft by 1990. Half of these sales will be to foreign-flag airlines, resulting in a gold inflow of $10 to $24 billion over a 15-year period. Availability of a U.S. manufactured SST will also limit sales of the British-French Concorde to the U.S. airlines and prevent billions of dollars in gold from leaving this country.

It should also be emphasized that the Government will receive a royalty on the sale of each SST and thus recover its investment. To date, 113 delivery positions have been reserved through the Government and 16 through Boeing. Airlines have contributed $11.3 million for 113 positions in the SST allocations. An additional $11.3 million will be contributed by October 31, 1967. In addition, the U.S. airlines have agreed to contribute as risk money $1 million per position or a total of $52 million.

Mr. President, these arguments are put forth very briefly in the hope that my colleagues will share my concern over the success of the SST program and will choose to retain the $142,375,000 appropriation in this bill. The development of a successful SST program by the United States will undoubtedly be of tremendous significance in the world of transportation in future years. It is imperative that we face up to this task and choose to support this program now when it should be supported. To delay would be to flounder and would, I fear, be defeating.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I wish to comment on the remarks of my esteemed colleague from Wisconsin regarding the SST program.

Why are we building an SST? The answer is simple, we have found in the United States that building and operating commercial aircraft is a very lucrative and a most rewarding business. We are No. 1 in commercial aviation and we intend to try harder now and stay No. 1. But is it that important? Let us look at a few facts.

Air transportation is our seventh largest industry and growing faster than any other major segment of our economy. For the past 20 years air travel has been growing at the rate of about 17 percent annually, which is nearly double the rate of the second most vital sector of our economy—electric utilities. Last year, even with a 43-day airline strike, air travel was up 16 percent and the number of passengers carried topped 100 million for the first time in history. In fact, the airlines have become the primary means of commercial travel within the United States, carrying more passengers than trains and buses combined. Last year the airlines accounted for about 62 percent of common carrier passenger traffic between U.S. cities. This is almost double the share of the market the airlines had only 10 years ago.

Today, 86 percent of all people who travel overseas fly as compared with 68 percent a decade ago. The number of international passangers carried by U.S. airlines has grown from 1,700,000 in 1956 to 5 million in 1966. The competitive success of air travel is the reason the *Queen Mary* and other big cruise ships are retiring from the scene. The *Queen Mary* offers an interesting comparison between the productivity of large ocean liners and intercontinental aircraft. The SST will carry more passengers to and from Europe in 1 year than six *Queen Marys*, and while the SST is expensive, it certainly is not going to cost as much as six *Queen Marys*.

Air cargo is also beginning to stir and grow by leaps and bounds. Over the past 3 years the number of cargo ton miles flown by the airlines has doubled. Not that we envision the SST as a cargo plane—certainly it will not be in the first generation—but the SST will carry some cargo and in the future there is every reason to believe that urgently needed and high-value cargo may well move on SST's.

Twenty years ago, at the end of World War II, anyone who predicted that we would be flying freight by jet transports would have been called a starry-eyed dreamer.

The tremendous growth in air travel and air cargo is creating new jobs in the airline industry and all of the associated sectors of the economy. Last year, 33,000 new jobs were created in the airline industry alone. Over the past 10 years the number of airline jobs has jumped almost 80 percent—from 131,000 in 1956 to 244,000 in 1966. The airline payroll has increased from $706 million to $2.1 billion in this same time—an increase of 175 percent.

Most transportation economists agree that air travel is going to continue to grow at a rapid rate for the foreseeable future. Assuming an annual growth rate of 10 percent—which is less than our current experience, and a rate that most transportation economists will agree is reasonable and perhaps even conservative—we find that the number of revenue passenger-miles flown in the free world will multiply tenfold from about 140 billion in 1966 to approximately 1.4 trillion in 1990. About 1 trillion of the total revenue passenger-miles forecast for 1990 will be for route segments that are over 700 miles long, and this is the market in which the SST will compete. This is equivalent to the entire population of the United States—every man, woman, and child—making a round trip flight from New York to Los Angeles and back. Or another example, the entire population of England making three round trips from London to New York and back. Or finally, a third example, 1 trillion passenger-miles a year means the entire population of Japan making a round trip from Tokyo to San Francisco and back. I give you these simply as examples of what kind of air travel we are talking about.

It is going to take a lot of airplanes with great productivity to satisfy this need. As a matter of fact, somebody will have to build about $90 to $100 billion worth of airplanes to fill this need whether they be subsonic or supersonic—Concorde or SST—and this is just for the passengers. I have not attempted to project what the figure would be for air cargo, but it certainly will swell the total.

Now a $100 billion market is not just a frill or a luxury. Obviously a manufacturing task of this size will have a major impact on our economy.

This is a business proposition. We are in competition with the British and the French. The Anglo-French Concorde will be on the scene 3 years ahead of the American SST. We have already lost valuable ground. We must not allow this lead to grow. We must maintain our No. 1 position in the field of commercial aviation.

The gold flow situation demands it. This is not something like the poverty program that can be put off until next year. We must act now.

HIGHWAY SAFETY

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, in 1894, the first gasoline automobile in the world, the Panhard, was invented. In 1966 this Nation's annual highway death toll exceeded 50,000. Our automotive progress has been costly. So it was with a real sense of urgency that the Congress passed both the Vehicle Safety Act and the Highway Safety Act in 1966. These laws committed, for the first time, all levels of government—Federal, State, and local—to the task of reducing the senseless carnage on our Nation's highways. As a result, we now have national uniform standards designed to insure both the operational safety of the automobile and maximum safety precautions on the highway.

In 1968, new cars will include, as standard equipment, a variety of safety features including seat belts, better braking systems, outside mirrors, padded interiors, energy-absorbing steering columns, shoulder belts and other more complicated items.

The highway standards cover periodic vehicle inspections, driver licensing,

driver education programs, emergency medical care, compilation of driver and accident records, protective gear for motorcyclists, and driver examinations for alcohol content.

The first 13 highway safety standards issued marked an important beginning. They sounded the notice that the Nation, working with State and local communities, finally is going to do something about the mounting deaths and injuries on our highways.

This we have needed for many years. Many fine civic-minded and dedicated organizations have done yeoman work in this field, but never before in history has such a comprehensive and carefully planned attack been mounted in the realm of safety.

When the National Highway Safety Act—which gave birth to these standards—was passed in 1966, we in the Congress voted funds to get the work underway. Now we have reached a critical time in getting these programs started in the States. I, for one, am not ready to say that saving lives is too costly to attempt.

President Johnson has repeatedly asked for increased State-Federal cooperation in the highway safety effort. The recently issued standards provide the perfect opportunity for that cooperation to flourish.

I am particularly pleased that the Senate has restored $20 million of the funds for State and community programs cut by the House. The $40 million appropriated is still less than half the funds requested for these vital programs, but they will assist the States in beginning such important safety programs as driver education and vehicle inspection, two programs I have long fought for.

HIGH-SPEED GROUND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, part of the important work going on in the Department of Transportation's Office of High Speed Ground Transportation is based on the knowledge that rail passenger service may shortly become a thing of the past if efforts are not made to revive it.

We have all heard about the new types of passenger trains which will soon be put into service in the eastern United States as part of this program. Yet, I fear that we do not all appreciate the fact that these trains represent important experiments with new equipment and service.

The Office of High Speed Ground Transportation will demonstrate and test technological innovations in these trains. New services will also be tested on passengers—food service, baggage handling, and the public relations of railroad personnel will be improved, for example.

Through these demonstrations, therefore, the program will derive information of value in future railroad research and development work, and information on the comfort and service requirements which passengers will want if they are to return to the rails for intercity travel.

These demonstrations do not represent an attempt or any intention on the part of the Department of Transportation to go into the railroad business.

The projects will be operated for the high-speed ground transportation program by privately owned railroads in areas where testing of equipment and service promises to produce the most and the best data. These experiments will be conducted for specific periods of time, after which the railroads involved—and others not involved initially—may choose to continue the improved service on their own.

The results of this work will have implications of national import. The railroad industry and railroad equipment manufacturers are taking an interest in the potential renaissance of rail passenger travel which may be stimulated. They have not had funds to devote to the extensive research and development and demonstrations which will be required to initiate such a revival. Those of us in the Federal Government and others in government on all levels who must make decisions regarding the investment of public funds in transportation facilities will benefit from information on the potential role of railroads in meeting the Nation's future requirements for additional intercity passenger transportation, especially in densely populated regions.

I cannot imagine that these facts about the demonstrations aspect of the work of the Office of High Speed Ground Transportation had been adequately brought to the attention of Members of the House who voted to cut this program's fiscal 1968 budget request so drastically.

Only $5,650,000 of the $9,611,000 was allowed for demonstration projects. One of the three proposed projects—the Washington to Jacksonville auto-train—was completely eliminated. A second—the Boston to New York TurboTrain service—was cut. Funds for the third—Washington to New York service—were not involved in the current budget request.

I urge restoration of all of the funds which the House disallowed for these projects.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is all time yielded back?

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the committee is happy to submit the bill, and with the understanding that all time will be yielded back, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. KUCHEL. Any time we have remaining is yielded back, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alasaka [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is absent for religious observance.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] are absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 71, nays 1, as follows:

[No. 285 Leg.]

YEAS—71

Aiken	Gruening	Mondale
Allott	Hansen	Monroney
Anderson	Harris	Morse
Baker	Hart	Mundt
Bayh	Hartke	Murphy
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Muskie
Bible	Holland	Nelson
Boggs	Hollings	Pearson
Brewster	Inouye	Pell
Burdick	Jackson	Percy
Byrd, Va.	Jordan, N.C.	Ribicoff
Byrd, W. Va.	Jordan, Idaho	Scott
Cannon	Kennedy, N.Y.	Smathers
Case	Kuchel	Smith
Church	Lausche	Sparkman
Clark	Long, Mo.	Spong
Cooper	Long, La.	Stennis
Cotton	Magnuson	Symington
Curtis	Mansfield	Tower
Dirksen	McClellan	Williams, N.J.
Dominick	McGee	Williams, Del.
Ellender	McIntyre	Yarborough
Fong	Metcalf	Young, N. Dak.
Griffin	Miller	

NAYS—1

Proxmire

NOT VOTING—28

Bartlett	Hayden	Pastore
Brooke	Hill	Prouty
Carlson	Hruska	Randolph
Dodd	Javits	Russell
Eastland	Kennedy, Mass.	Talmadge
Ervin	McCarthy	Thurmond
Fannin	McGovern	Tydings
Fulbright	Montoya	Young, Ohio
Gore	Morton	
Hatfield	Moss	

So the bill (H.R. 11456) was passed.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill (H.R. 11456) was passed.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized in the engrossment of the Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 11456) to correct any technical or clerical errors.

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

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments and request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer (Mr. MUSKIE in the chair) appointed Mr. STENNIS, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. MUNDT conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation to the Senate as a whole for its cooperation in expediting the final passage of the Transportation appropriation bill; in particular recognition should be given to the excellent management of this measure by the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] and the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the ranking minority member of the subcommittee. When this combination is responsible, there are few wasted moments.

To the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], the Senators from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON and Mr. JACKSON], the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the leadership expresses its deep appreciation for the expeditious manner in which they each expressed their strongly held views without delaying the disposition of the matter.

With the passage today of the poverty bill and the appropriation bill on Transportation, the Senate has truly been productive. I hope that the momentum gained today can be continued tomorrow, throughout next week and for the remaining days of this session.

FREE WORLD ASSISTANCE TO VIETNAM

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I understand that there has been presented in the Senate today a proposed resolution stating that the free nations of Asia should be doing more to help the Republic of South Vietnam and the United States in the conflict in Southeast Asia.

While I am sure everybody would always like to have more help from somebody else no matter what they are trying to do, I would not like for the impression to be left here today that the United States and South Vietnam are virtually alone or unsupported in the current effort.

The facts of the matter are that a total of 39 free nations of the world—that is, 39—are providing assistance in the Vietnam effort; and the United Nations is adding additional help on its own part. Just so we can keep things in perspective here today and in discussions and news reports about the proposed resolution, here is a list of the nations providing military, technical, or financial support of some kind:

Australia, China, Japan, Korea, Laos, Malaysia, New Zealand, the Philippines, Thailand, Greece, Iran, Turkey, Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Germany, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Spain, United Kingdom, Argentina, Brazil, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Guatemala, Honduras, Uruguay, Venezuela, Liberia, Tunisia, Canada, France, Ireland, Israel, Norway, Pakistan Switzerland, and the United Nations.

As General Westmoreland said when he addressed Congress:

> We must remember that Korea, Australia, New Zealand, Thailand and the Philippines all have military forces working and fighting with the South Vietnamese and Americans—that more than 30 other nations are helping provide non-combat support—and that the whole of free Asia opposes Communist expansionism.

The facts of the matter are that nearly 60,000 combat troops from Asian nations are now in Vietnam fighting the Communists, and more troops are pledged for the future—pledged from nations far, far smaller and less prosperous than the United States; nations which normally count their armed forces in hundreds rather than the thousands we are used to talking about in our country.

Australia has sent almost 6,000 troops; Korea nearly 50,000; New Zealand 375; the Philippines 2,000; and Thailand nearly 2,500. It should be noted that these are the nations immediately threatened by Asian communism. They recognize the threat. They are helping, within the limits of their capabilities, to meet and defeat the threat.

In addition, other nations around the world are sending doctors, nurses, teachers, agricultural advisers, engineers, and other technical personnel. Some 25 medical and surgical teams from a dozen nations are providing care in provincial hospitals.

Other nations which have not been able to send personnel have helped in Vietnam by sending substantial material help, including medical supplies, textbooks, construction materials, construction equipment, refugee-relief supplies, and foodstuffs. They also have provided generous scholarship aid to Vietnamese students and training for Vietnamese civil policemen.

We are not alone in this world in our recognition of the need to control Communist expansion. We are not alone in our desire to preserve world order. We are not by ourselves in the belief that stopping the Reds today will save lives in the future.

Although I have been critical of the administration's policy of "gradualism" which I think prolongs the war unnecessarily, I would never seek to convince Americans that we are unaided in Vietnam. We are the free world's leader. As such, special demands are on our shoulders. But we have many friends in this world, and they are doing what they can in following our leadership toward a more stable, peaceful world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD a detailed listing of the free world assistance to Vietnam.

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

FREE WORLD ASSISTANCE TO VIETNAM AS OF OCTOBER 1, 1967

Thirty-one nations besides the United States are assisting Vietnam under the Free World Assistance Program. Six other countries not considered part of the FWA program and the United Nations also assist, and promises of help have come from three other nations. Five Asian countries now have almost 60,000 troops on the ground in Vietnam. A detailed listing by geographic area follows:

FAR EAST

Australia

Australia is providing a wide and substantial range of aid to Vietnam under the Colombo Plan and by direct bilateral assistance. Economic aid since 1964 is valued at more than $10 million.

Military aid consists of:

1. Approximately 5,750 combat troops including a brigade and support, and a squadron of 8 Canberra bombers. In addition, they provide naval assistance and a guided missile destroyer.

2. 100 combat advisors (primarily specialists in jungle warfare).

3. A 73-man air force unit at Vung Tau with six Australian caribou planes which fly daily logistical transport missions in support of Vietnamese military forces.

Economic and technical assistance includes:

1. Three surgical teams, totalling 37 personnel, in 3 provincial hospitals. These teams, in addition to performing major operations, have established a blood bank and are giving lessons in nursing.

2. A group of civil engineers working on water supply and road construction projects.

3. Three experts in dairy and crop practices and radio techniques.

4. Training of 130 Vietnamese in Australia.

5. In goods and materials: 1,250,000 textbooks in Vietnamese for rural schools; 3,300 tons of corrugated roofing for Vietnamese military dependents' housing; 6 large community windmills; 15,750 sets of hand tools; 400 radio sets and 2,400 loud-speakers; 16,000 blankets and 14,000 cases of condensed milk.

6. A 55 kilowatt broadcasting station at Ban Me Thuot.

The Australian Government decided on February 1 to increase its non-military aid to Viet-Nam during FY 1967 to $2 million. This will permit substantial enlargement of current medical and civic action programs and the undertaking of new projects such as providing equipment for refugee resettlement centers.

Republic of China

The Republic of China has provided:

1. An 80-man agricultural team.

2. An 18-man military psychological warfare team.

3. A 34-man electrical power mission under the leadership of Taipower.

4. A 16-man surgical team.

China has also provided training for more than 200 Vietnamese in Taiwan. In the way of goods and materials, they have provided 26 aluminum prefabricated warehouses, agricultural tools, seeds and fertilizers, 500,000 copies of mathematics textbooks and an electrical power substation.

Japan

Japan has provided over $55 million worth of economic assistance to Viet-Nam, chiefly through reparations. Japan has sent two medical teams, considerable amounts of medical goods (4,544 cases), 20,000 transistor radios and 25 ambulances. It has provided technical personnel and funds for the construction of a large power dam across the Da Nhim River and electrical transmission line. A new medical aid agreement ($1.1 million) was signed in une 1967.

Korea

Korea has sent approximately 48,800 troops including:

1. 2 combat divisions and 1 combat brigade.
2. A 130-man Mobile Army Surgical Hospital (MASH).
3. 10 military instructors in Korean karate for training Vietnamese military in hand-to-hand combat.
4. A 2,200-man Task Force Unit composed of the following elements: 1 Army engineer battalion, 1 Headquarters group, 1 Army Transportation company, 1 Marine Corps Engineer company, 1 Infantry battalion, 1 LST and 2 LSMs, 1 Composite Support unit (communications, medical supplies, etc.).

Korean military medical personnel are providing some medical care to the local population in areas where ROK troops are stationed. In addition, 7 civilian medical teams totaling 118 doctors, nurses and support personnel are working in provincial health programs.

LAOS

One million *kip* ($4,167) for flood relief in 1965 and a small cash donation for refugees in 1966.

Malaysia

Since 1963, Malaysia has trained over 2,000 Vietnamese military and police officers. Groups of 30–60 are regularly sent for about a month's training in counterinsurgency with Malaysian Police Special Constabulary. Malaysia has previously provided substantial amounts of counterinsurgency materials, primarily military and police transport such as armored vehicles. Medicines and relief supplies have also been donated.

New Zealand

New Zealand has sent an artillery battery and an infantry companay (approximately 350 men) and provided a 25-man army engineer detachment.

In *non-military aid*, New Zealand has sent a 15-man surgical team, and a professor in English language for the University of Saigon. A second 16-man medical team will be sent to Binh Dinh province. They are presently training 83 Vietnamese in New Zealand and have provided 7,500£ ($21,000) for equipment for a technical high school. They are also assisting by providing approximately $600,000 for a science building at the University of Saigon.

Philippines

The Philippine Government has sent a 2,000-man military engineering unit with security support personnel, a station hospital, and rural health and civic action teams.

In *non-military aid*, approximately 60 Philippine civic action personnel including military and civilian medical teams have been working in Viet-Nam for several years.

Thailand

Thailand has sent a total of approximately 2,200, men including a recently arrived combat brigade. A 150-man Thai naval group manning an LST and PGM patrol craft arrived in Viet-Nam in December 1966. A 35-man air force contingent has been flying operational transport missions for the Vietnamese forces. The Thais have also been providing jet training for Vietnamese pilots in Thailand.

In *non military aid*, the Thais have provided rice for refugees and cement and zinc roofing materials. At the Manila Conference, the Thais offered the Vietnamese a $20 million rice credit. The Thais have also announced they will send a medical unit to Viet-Nam.

MIDDLE EAST

Greece

Greece has contributed $15,000 worth of medical supplies.

Iran

Iran has contributed 1,000 tons of petroleum products to Viet-Nam and has dispatched a 20-man medical team to Viet-Nam.

Turkey

Turkey has provided medicines and also offered to provide a substantial amount of cement.

EUROPE

Austria

Austria has offered to supply medical supplies, blankets, tents through the Austrian Red Cross.

Belgium

Belgium has provided medicines and an ambulance and has given scholarships for 15 Vietnamese to study in Belgium.

Denmark

Denmark has provided medical supplies and has offered to train 12 Vietnamese nurses in Denmark.

Germany

Personnel in Viet-Nam: A 3,000-ton hospital ship, the "Helgoland," with 8 doctors, 30 other medical personnel and 145 beds, is on duty in Viet-Nam. Seven Germans, a director and six instructors, are teaching at the new Vietnamese-German Technical High School at Thu Duc near Saigon. At Hue University there are five Germans: three physicians in the Medical School, a professor of music, a professor of German language, and one expert in forestry is working at the Department of Rural Affairs, Saigon.

Vietnamese in Germany: Forty Vietnamese are studying in Germany and the Germans have agreed to accept 30 more primarily for training as future instructors in the technical high school. A considerable number have previously been trained.

Goods and Materials: The Germans have provided the following credits:

(1) DM 15 million ($3.75 million) for import of German products such as machine tools, fertilizer, etc. The piastre funds generated go to the National Office of Agricultural Credit to aid farmers, particularly with loans;

(2) A credit of DM 50 million ($12.5 million) for development of the major industrial complex at An Hoan-Nong Son;

(3) A credit for DM 20 million ($5 million) for construction of an abattoir at Saigon-Cholon, and three coastal vessels;

(4) A credit of DM 500,000 ($125,000) for equipment at the Vietnamese-German Technical High School at Thu Duc.

In April 1966, the Germans announced a gift of DM 17.5 million ($4.4 million) worth of pharmaceuticals, the first shipments of which have arrived. Also in the medical field, they have provided two mobile dental clinics and 30 ambulances for the Ministry of Health.

In June 1966, the Cabinet voted DM 25 million (U.S. $6.25 million) for new aid to Viet-Nam including:

(1) Sending 25 experts to establish a refugee center;

(2) Building a home for wayward youths;

(3) Expansion of eight social centers and construction of a ninth, and

(4) Establishment of a training center for social workers.

The Germans have also donated 260 tons of rice for refugee relief programs.

Italy

The Italians provided a 10-man surgical team and have offered science scholarships to 10 Vietnamese to study in Italy.

Luxembourg

Luxembourg has provided plasma and blood transfusion equipment.

The Netherlands

The Dutch have undertaken to build 5 tuberculosis centers in Saigon; sites for 3 have been selected. In August, the Netherlands announced a contribution of $355,000 for a 4-year UN project in social welfare, part of the $1 million they have earmarked for UN projects in Viet-Nam. In 1964, the Dutch gave antibiotics and 4 scholarships for Vietnamese. They previously provided a dredge.

Spain

Spain has sent a 12-man medical team to Viet-Nam and has provided 800 pounds of medicines, medical equipment and blankets.

United Kingdom

The United Kingdom has supplied economic aid valued at more than $2 million in the past three years. It has provided six civilians for the British Advisory Mission and a Professor of English at Hue University. Twenty-one Vietnamese are receiving training in the United Kingdom. A pediatric team of four British doctors and six nurses went to Viet-Nam in August, 1966.

In 1963–64, the United Kingdom provided the following goods and materials: Laboratory equipment for Saigon University; a typesetting machine for the Government Printing Office; a cobalt deep-ray therapy unit for the National Cancer Institute; various equipment for the faculties of Medicine, Science and Pharmacy at Saigon University, the Meteorologic Service and the Agricultural School at Saigon, and Atomic Research Establishment at Dalat and the Faculty of Education at Hue. In 1965-1966, British economic aid totalled $226,800 for roadbuilding equipment, diesel fishing boat engines, and portable anesthetic machines. Total aid in British FY 1967 was $515,200 and it is estimated $666,400 will be expended in FY 1968.

LATIN AMERICA

Argentina

Argentina is contributing 5,000 tons of wheat.

Brazil

Brazil has sent a substantial quantity of medical supplies which was carried to Viet-Nam by a Brazilian Air force plane and has also provided coffee.

Costa Rica

Costa Rica is contributing an ambulance for use in Viet-Nam.

Dominican Republic

Cement has been offered by the Dominican Republic for use in Viet-Nam.

Ecuador

Ecuador has sent medical supplies to Viet-Nam.

Guatemala

Guatemala has sent 15,000 doses of typhoid-paratyphoid serum for use in Viet-Nam.

Honduras

Honduras has contributed drugs and dry goods for refugees in Viet-Nam, flown there on a Honduras Air Force plane.

Uruguay

Uruguay has contributed $21,500 for relief supplies and medicines for Viet-Nam.

Venezuela

Venezuela has provided 500 tons of rice for refugee relief, and two civilian doctors are working in Viet-Nam.

AFRICA

Liberia

A contribution of $50,000 has been made by Liberia for the purchase of hospital equipment and other medical supplies for Viet-Nam.

Tunisia

Tunisia has made available 15 to 20 scholarships for Vietnamese.

NORTH AMERICA

Canada

Almost $6 million of development assistance to Viet-Nam has been provided by Canada.

1. Since 1964 Canada has supplied more than $4.5 million in economic aid. It increased its aid to South Viet-Nam this fiscal year allocating $1 million for medical assistance including providing ten 200-bed emergency hospital units. The first two units have arrived and have been installed at Phan Tiet and at Phu Tho near Saigon. A Canadian doctor and technician visited Viet-Nam in the fall to inspect potential sites. Canada has sent 650,000 doses of polio vaccine for Vietnamese school children and offered additional vaccines against polio, TB and smallpox. Consideration is being given to establishment of a children's rehabilitation center in Viet-Nam.

2. Since 1958, Canada has provided $850,000 worth of food aid for Viet-Nam. Funds generated by sales are used for capital construction projects in Viet-Nam.

3. A new science building for the medical faculty at the University of Hue is being built costing about $333,000, drawn from counterpart funds generated by sales of food supplied by Canada. Construction has passed the half-way mark.

4. The Canadians have also agreed to construct an auditorium for the Faculty of Sciences at Hue University which will cost about $125,000.

5. Canada is printing half a million copies of a social sciences textbook for Vietnamese grade school children.

6. *Personnel in Viet-Nam:* A Canadian Supervisor has been at Quang Ngai supervising construction of a small TB Clinic which the Canadians are funding. The Canadians have sent two doctors and four nurses to staff the clinic. A professor of orthopedics is working at Cho Ray Hospital, Saigon, and there is a Canadian teacher at the University of Hue.

7. *Vietnamese in Canada:* 380 Colombo Plan trainees and a total of 463 trainees under all programs, including those sponsored by other agencies and third countries (as well as Colombo Plan), have been trained in Canada. There are currently 231 Vietnamese students in Canada.

OTHER ASSISTANCE

Six other nations whose help does not fall under the Free World Assistance Program have provided valuable assistance to Viet-Nam in economic and humanitarian fields.

France

Since 1956, France has contributed about $115 million in assistance to South Viet-Nam. Present aid is running at a rate of about $4 million per year, largely in the cultural field.

In 1965 France had nearly 500 persons serving in South Viet-Nam. Among them were 65 experts under France's program of economic and technical assistance, including 32 physicians, professors and other medical personnel. Under its cultural programs, 471 professors (350 French and 121 Vietnamese) were teaching at 9 French-teaching institutions, and 30 French professors are at Vietnamese institutions. France provided in 1965 for Vietnamese to study in France, 55 fellowships for technical training and 85 academic fellowships. These programs are continuing on a somewhat reduced scale.

France has provided low-interest credits of 100 million francs ($20 million) for financing imports of French equipment for Vietnamese industry, a grant of 500,000 francs ($100,000) for equipment for L'Ecole Nationale d'Ingenieurs des Arts Industriels.

In 1960 France extended a low-interest credit of 70 million francs ($14 million) to aid construction of the major coal and chemical complex at An Hoa Nong Son south of Da Nang which is underway. It also provides a low-interest, five-year credit of 60 million francs ($12 million) for construction of Viet-Nam's largest cement-producing complex with plants at Hatien and Thu Duc. In 1964, France provided a 930,000 francs ($186,000) grant for the installation of a training center for electrical technicians and in 1965 a gift of 1.25 million francs ($250,000) for teaching equipment, primarily in the medical field.

Ireland

The Irish people have contributed 1,000£ ($2,800) for Vietnamese flood victims through their Red Cross.

Israel

Israel made a gift of pharmaceutical supplies for flood victims and will train five Vietnamese in irrigation and animal husbandry.

Norway

Norway sent a contribution through the International Red Cross for flood victims in February 1965.

Pakistan

Pakistan made a financial contribution for assistance to flood victims and donated clothing for them.

Switzerland

The Swiss have provided microscopes for the University of Saigon. The Swiss Red Cross has sent an 11-man medical team through the International Committee of the Red Cross to work in a provincial hospital in the Central Highlands of South Viet-Nam.

UN Aid to Viet-Nam

The United Nations and its specialized agencies are also making a significant contribution to the social and economic development of Viet-Nam. Under the Expanded Program of Technical Assistance of the UN Development Program, 15 technical assistance projects are scheduled for 1967 and 1968 at a cost of $724,475. These projects range across such varied fields as maternal and child health, labor administration, educational planning, telecommunications, meteorology and civil aviation. Among the participating agencies are ILO, FAO, UNESCO, WHO, ICAO, ITU, WMO, and the Department of Economic and Social Affairs of the UN. In addition UNICEF has substantially expanded its health and child care programs with the 1967 program totalling $562,000, an increase over the 1966 level of $226,000.

Several major projects financed by the Special Fund of the UN Development Program are about to get underway. A National Technical Center (total international contribution approximately $1.5 million), with UNESCO is becoming operational. The Special Fund in January approved a Fisheries Development Project including exploratory and experimental fishing in the waters of the South China Sea, to be executed by FAO at a cost of $1.3 million. Also being negotiated is a Social Welfare Training Center to be executed by the Bureau of Social Affairs of the UN. ECAFE is pressing ahead with regional projects of benefit to the nations of the Mekong Basin and has undertaken surveys of irrigation, hydroelectric facilities and bridge construction projects in Viet-Nam.

WILLIAM C. GARDNER, PRESIDENTIAL NOMINEE FOR A JUDGESHIP

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in the Washington Post, September 22 edition, appeared an article by Staffwriter Jack White concerning the filing of tax liens against William C. Gardner, a Presidential nominee for a judgeship in the court of general sessions.

The article states that informed court sources say that the White House is considering withdrawing Mr. Gardner's name from nomination in much the same way as the nomination of Washington Attorney Frank Reeves' name was withdrawn by the late President Kennedy, who had nominated him for District Commissioner.

According to the article, records in the U.S. district court show that, in the last 9 years, three Federal tax liens totaling $9,258.84 and five District of Columbia liens totaling $1,688.06 were filed against Mr. Gardner over the last 9 years. I am advised that two of these liens were filed as recently as 1966, the last one not being satisfied by the taxpayer until November of 1966.

Apparently there was no irregularity with respect to the tax returns themselves, and it was simply a case of the taxpayer not paying his taxes as shown to be due according to the returns.

The article quotes Assistant Attorney General Ernest Friesen, Jr., as saying that the Justice Department was aware of these liens and was satisfied that they were not evidence of moral turpitude. In turn, Mr. Gardner was quoted as saying he did not have any recollection of these liens; that he often had to pay his taxes late because he did not have the money on schedule; and that it would have been to his advantage to pay on time because he was charged a rate of 6 percent interest on the late payments.

First, let me say that I am shocked at the attitude expressed by one of our Assistant Attorneys General. Surely the Department of Justice should be the first to not only become aware of these liens but of what their filing signifies. It is well known that the Internal Revenue Service exercises considerable restraint in the filing of tax liens, and it does so only when there is persistent neglect on the part of a taxpayer to work out suitable arrangements to pay delinquent taxes or failure to pay taxes pursuant to such arrangements, or in case of danger that the taxes owed will not be paid at all. The number of liens filed in this case shows a pattern of disregard by the taxpayer of his responsibilities. An isolated instance of a lien or two would not represent a pattern, but that is not this case.

The statement by this prospective judge that he had to pay 6 percent interest on his late payments does not excuse his failure to pay his taxes on time, as everyone else is supposed to do, or his failure to avoid the filing of liens by working out suitable arrangements with the Internal Revenue Service. The amount of money involved would seem to indicate that Mr. Gardner saw fit to use up his income for some other purposes ahead of his obligation to pay his taxes on time. Here again, an isolated instance would not be particularly significant. A pattern of such instances is.

One of the highest duties of a citizen of our country is to pay his lawfully owing tax, and to pay it on time. Most taxpayers have their taxes withheld currently on their income, and it is not possible for them to decide to pay some other bills ahead of their taxes. As a professional person, Mr. Gardner was supposed to make payments on his estimated income, with a certain amount of leeway for underestimating his income. As a lawyer he certainly understood this. If he did not wish to comply with the law, that was his decision. But that does not mean that he should have been nominated for a judgeship, and it certainly does not mean that one of our Assistant Attorneys General should seek to excuse such disregard for the law.

Those who serve on the bench and who pass on the violations of law by others should be above reproach as far as their own personal conduct is concerned. It is not good for public confidence in our democratic institutions to have it otherwise, and if this nomination is brought before the Senate, it will prove most embarassing to all concerned.

The nomination should be withdrawn. And Assistant Attorney General Friesen should be reprimanded.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the article to which I have referred printed in the RECORD.

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

EIGHT TAX LIENS LAID TO L. B. J. COURT CHOICE

(By Jack White)

Eight Federal and District liens for late payment of taxes have been filed over the last nine years against William C. Gardner, a presidential nominee for a seat on the Court of General Sessions.

Informed court sources say that the White House is considering withdrawing Gardner's name from nomination in much the same way as the nomination of Frank D. Reeves for a District Commissionership was withdrawn six years ago.

Records in the U.S. District Court show that, in the last nine years, three Federal tax liens totaling $9258.8¢ and five D.C. liens totaling $1688.06 were filed against Gardner, who was nominated Aug. 7 by President Johnson.

Assistant Attorney General Ernest Friesen Jr. said yesterday that the Justice Department was aware of the liens and "was satisfied that they were not evidence of moral turpitude or anything like that."

There was no irregularity concerning Gardner's tax returns.

Friesen said that he did not expect the liens to have any effect on Gardner's nomination.

"We will tell the (Senate District) Committee everything we know about it," he said.

"If they repeat that (the Reeves episode)," he said, "they are doing it for the wrong reasons because they've known about other people who've come before them" and ignored tax liens.

"Some of the leading citizens in Washington have liens out against them," Friesen added.

Contacted by phone, Gardner said "I don't have any recollection of any liens being filed." He said that he had often had to pay his taxes late because "sometimes you just don't have your money on schedule."

Gardner said that he had made arrangements to pay his taxes late with the Internal Revenue Service. "Failure to pay taxes on time doesn't necessarily mean that a lien has been filed," he said.

Denying any wrong doing, Gardner said it would have been to his advantage to pay his taxes on time because paying them late meant also paying 6 per cent interest on the unpaid taxes.

Questioned further, Gardner said, and the records show, that he paid each tax bill within six months after the liens were filed.

Friesen said "almost everybody who practices law on the basis that Gardner does—sometimes bringing in a lot of money, sometimes none— has difficulty paying their taxes on the day it's due."

Gardner, 49, is a domestic relations specialist with the firm of Houston & Gardner, 615 F st. nw.

In Reeves' case, his name was withdrawn from nomination after a Senate hearing disclosed he had failed to pay his taxes on time. John B. Duncan was nominated instead.

S. 2388—TO PROVIDE AN IMPROVED ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill S. 2388, which the Senate passed today, be ordered printed as passed.

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

WARREN F. COLEMAN, JR.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on S. 985.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 985) for the relief of Warren F. Coleman, Jr., which was, on page 2, line 8, after "Act." insert:

No part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the amendment adopted by the House of Representatives simply provides that no part of the amount appropriated in the act shall be paid or delivered to any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and provides that any person violating such prohibition shall be fined in the sum of not exceeding $1,000.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from West Virginia.

The motion was agreed to.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION APPROPRIATION BILL, 1968

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 562, H.R. 12474. I do this so that the bill will become the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. H.R. 12474, making appropriations for NASA for fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from West Virginia?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, it is expected that there will be votes tomorrow on this appropriation bill.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the order previously entered, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 27 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, October 6, 1967, at 12 noon.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Salute to National 4-H Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 5, 1967

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, this week—September 30 to October 7—is designated as National 4-H Week. This is the one week of the year when not only does a very special effort go into encouraging youngsters and their parents to join a 4-H club for the coming year, it is also a time to pay recognition to the 2,153,000 youngsters and nearly 50,000 parent-leaders who have completed the 1967 program.

This great arm of the cooperative extension service has been, and will continue to be, one of the finest organizations for improving our Nation and contributing to its well being.

In Minnesota, Mr. Leonard Harkness, 4-H State leader, who has been a tremendous inspiration for the extension 4-H agents, the club leaders, and to the members, reports that over 55,000 young people had enrolled in the traditional programs. In addition, there were 21,000 others who were enrolled in any one of a variety of short-term projects. I am also advised that there is an avalanche