to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ESHLEMAN:

H.R. 13525. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to exempt students employed by institutions of higher education from the minimum wage and overtime provisions of that act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H.R. 13526. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to returns and deposits of the excise taxes on gasoline and lubricating oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 13527. A bill to designate the Tuesday next after the first Monday in November in every even numbered year as Election Day and to make it a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H.R. 13528. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDADE:

H.R. 13529. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to limit the categories of questions required to be answered under penalty of law in the decennial censuses of population, unemployment, and housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 13530. A bill to facilitate the entry into the United States of aliens who are brothers or sisters of U.S. citizens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 13531. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAFT (for himself, Mr. CLANCY, and Mr. ZION):

H.R. 13532. A bill to amend section 509 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to construction aid for certain vessels to be operated on the inland rivers and canals; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 13533. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to provide forms and amounts of remuneration to doctors, dentists, and nurses commensurate with competitive pay practices, when he finds such action is necessary to provide medical care and treatment of veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WYMAN:

H.R. 13534. A bill to exempt receipts, tickets, and other acknowledgments of any State or the District of Columbia in connection with any sweepstakes operated by such State or the District of Columbia from the provisions of section 1953 of title 18, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee:

H.R. 13535. A bill to amend section 509 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, to provide for construction aid for certain vessels operating on the inland rivers and waterways; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 13536. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to limit the categories of questions required to be answered under penalty of law in the decennial censuses of population, unemployment, and housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 13537. A bill to amend title 46, section 1159, to provide for construction aid for certain vessels operating on the inland rivers and waterways; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GETTYS:

H.R. 13538. A bill to amend the act of July 18, 1958, to provide for the expansion of Cowpens National Battleground Site; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HAGAN:

H.R. 13539. A bill to provide a comprehensive program for the control of drunkenness and the prevention and treatment of alcoholism in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. REES:

H.R. 13540. A bill to amend section 408 of the National Housing Act, as amended, to provide for the regulation of savings and loan holding companies and subsidiary companies; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. POAGE:

H.R. 13541. A bill to prohibit unfair trade practices affecting producers of agricultural products and associations of such producers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BRASCO:

H.R. 13542. A bill to amend section 8336(c) of title 5, United States Code, to include the position of customs inspector in the category of hazardous occupations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 13543. A bill to provide for orderly trade in iron and steel mill products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H.R. 13544. A bill to provide additional protection for the rights of participants in employee pension and profit-sharing retirement plans, to establish minimum standards for pension and profit-sharing retirement plan vesting and funding, to establish a pension plan reinsurance program, to provide for portability of pension credits, to provide for regulation of the administration of pension and other employee benefit plans, to establish a U.S. Pension and Employee Benefit Plan Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 13545. A bill declaring October 12 to be a legal holiday, to be known as Columbus Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDADE:

H.J. Res. 892. Joint resolution creating a Federal Committee on Nuclear Development to review and reevaluate the existing nuclear program of the United States; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. SCHNEEBELI:

H.J. Res. 893. 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. CAHILL:

H.J. Res. 894. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the third day of June of each year as Dr. Charles Richard Drew Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H. Con. Res. 535. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the elimination of the Castro Communist regime of Cuba; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WYMAN:

H. Res. 946. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Science and Astronautics to conduct an investigation and study of unidentified flying objects; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 13546. A bill for the relief of Riccardo Bazzoli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13547. A bill for the relief of Mario Bernardi; to the Committtee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13548. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Lo Monaco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 13549. A bill for the relief of Panagiotis George Coutsioucos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DADDARIO:

H.R. 13550. A bill for the relief of Rocco Pocetti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 13551. A bill for the relief of Ralph A. Passidomo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H.R. 13552. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Grispino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IRWIN:

H.R. 13553. A bill for the relief of Gino Pepoli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUPFERMAN:

H.R. 13554. A bill for the relief of Lourdes P. Manalota; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDADE:

H.R. 13555. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Campbell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 13556. A bill for the relief of Battista Sorrentino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 13557. A bill for the relief of Federica Viloria; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANDMAN:

H.R. 13558. A bill for the relief of Ioannis Stoubos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 17, 1967

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

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

O God our Father, our spirits are restless until they find the rest of Thy presence; our hearts are empty, our lives barren, our plans futile, until Thou dost possess our very souls.

We would open to Thee the secret places of our own lives.

At this high altar in the temple of public service, maintain, we beseech Thee, in those who here represent the people, the fidelity of those to whom much has been given and from whom much will be required.

We pray for Thy guidance in this solemn day of responsibility and opportunity, that as a nation we may use the vast power committed to our fallible hands in such manner as may cause all the peoples of the earth to rise up and call us blessed.

We pray in the spirit of our Lord and Master, Redeemer of the world. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of

the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, October 16, 1967, be dispensed with.

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

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolution of the Senate, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 889. An act to designate the San Rafael Wilderness, Los Padres National Forest, in the State of California; and

S.J. Res. 112. Joint resolution extending the time for filing report of Commission on Urban Problems.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1499. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 300th anniversary of the explorations of Father Jacques Marquette in what is now the United States of America;

H.R. 5910. An act to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Pawnee Indian Tribe of Oklahoma;

H.R. 10105. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 150th anniversary of the founding of the State of Mississippi;

H.R. 10160. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the founding of the American Legion;

H.R. 13048. An act to make certain technical amendments to the Library Services and Construction Act; and

H.R. 13212. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 200th anniversary of the founding of San Diego.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 2121. An act to extend the provisions of the act of October 23, 1962, relating to relief for occupants of certain unpatented mining claims;

H.R. 1572. An act for the relief of Mercedes De Toffoli;

H.R. 1653. An act for the relief of Omer Penner;

H.R. 1674. An act for the relief of Frank I. Mellin, Jr.;

H.R. 2477. An act for the relief of John J. McGrath;

H.R. 6189. An act for the relief of Fred W. Kolb, Jr.;

H.R. 6663. An act for the relief of Jesse W. Stutts, Jr.;

H.R. 6666. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marilyn Shorette;

H.R. 7324. An act for the relief of Dr. Alfredo F. Mendez;

H.R. 8254. An act for the relief of Jan Drobot; and

H.J. Res. 516. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution of March 25, 1953, to increase the number of electric typewriters which may be furnished to Members by the Clerk of the House.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1499. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 300th anniversary of the explorations of Father Jacques Marquette in what is now the United States of America;

H.R. 10105. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 150th anniversary of the founding of the State of Mississippi;

H.R. 10160. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the founding of the American Legion; and

H.R. 13212. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 200th anniversary of the founding of San Diego; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 5910. An act to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Pawnee Indian Tribe of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 13048. An act to make certain technical amendments to the Library Services and Construction Act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

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

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 noon tomorrow.

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

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 625.

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

THE 66TH ANNIVERSARY OF ARRIVAL OF THOMASITE TEACHERS IN THE PHILIPPINES

The resolution (S. Res. 160) to extend greetings to the Congress of the Philippines on the 66th anniversary of the arrival of the Thomasite teachers in the Philippines was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States extend its greetings and felicitations to the Congress of the Philippines on the sixty-sixth anniversary of the arrival of the Thomasite teachers in the Philippines.

SEC. 2. A copy of this resolution shall be transmitted to the Speaker of the Philippines House of Representatives.

The preamble was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate reconsider its action on Senate Resolution 160, agreed to earlier today, and that Senate Resolution 160 be considered and modified, on line 1, page 2, so as to change the word "Congress" to "Senate."

Mr. President, this change is necessary because the resolution is a Senate resolution, applying to the Senate only.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from West Virginia? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The resolution as amended was agreed to; and the preamble was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REPORT ON BORROWING AUTHORITY

A letter from the Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on borrowing authority, for the period ended June 30, 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the recovery from tortiously liable third persons of the cost of medical and hospital care and treatment, funeral expenses, and salary payments furnished or paid by the District of Columbia to officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and of the District of Columbia Fire Department (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting

action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. MONRONEY and Mr. CARLSON members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations, with an amendment:

S. 878. A bill to amend section 201(c) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit further Federal use and donation of exchange sale property (Rept. No. 642).

ADDITIONAL FUNDS TO STUDY AND EVALUATE THE EFFECTS OF LAWS PERTAINING TO PROPOSED REORGANIZATIONS IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. RIBICOFF, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported the following original resolution (S. Res. 178); which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That Senate Resolution 59, Ninetieth Congress, agreed to February 17, 1967 (authorizing a study of the effects of laws pertaining to proposed reorganizations in the executive branch of the Government), is hereby amended on page 2, line 21, by striking out "$110,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$115,000".

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

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

George J. Feldman, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Luxembourg;

Roger W. Tubby, of New York, to be the representative of the United States of America to the European Office of the United Nations, with the rank of Ambassador;

Harrison M. Symmes, of North Carolina, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan;

Hugh H. Smythe, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Malta; and

L. Dean Brown, of Maryland, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of Senegal, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Gambia.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, from the Committee on Commerce, I report favorably sundry nominations in the U.S. Coast Guard. Since these names have previously appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in order to save the expense of printing them 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 PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

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

William W. Peterman, and sundry other officers, to be permanent commissioned officers of the Coast Guard.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 2542. A bill for the relief of Dr. Takashi Sawa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOWER:

S. 2543. A bill for the relief of Ernesto Beltran; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOWER:

S. 2544. A bill to establish within the Department of Justice the office of Deputy Attorney General for law enforcement; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2545. A bill to assure small business concerns of the opportunity of obtaining insurance against property losses resulting from crimes and civil disorders; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. TOWER when he introduced the above bills, which appears under separate headings.)

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

S. 2546. A bill for the relief of Tino Cattabiani, Caterina Cattabiani (nee Papurello), and Pier Maria Cattabiani; and

S. 2547. A bill for the relief of Juan Antonio Lopez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTION

ADDITIONAL FUNDS TO STUDY AND EVALUATE THE EFFECTS OF LAWS PERTAINING TO PROPOSED REORGANIZATION IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Mr. RIBICOFF, from the Committee on Government Operation, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 178) to provide additional funds to study and evaluate the effects of laws pertaining to proposed reorganizations in the executive branch of the Government, which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. RIBICOFF, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

A DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, at this time I introduce a bill to establish within the Department of Justice the Office of Deputy Attorney General for law enforcement.

Last March, in his third major message to Congress on the subject of crime since he took office, President Johnson said that "public order is the first business of government." Since then, in August, we have again been informed by the FBI of the new records in crime increase set during the preceding year. The risk of becoming a victim of serious crime increased 10 percent in 1966 over 1965, with almost two victims per 100 inhabitants. During 1966, six serious crimes were committed every minute. Someone in this country was the victim of a murder, forcible rape, or aggravated assault every 2 minutes. Someone was robbed every 3½ minutes, someone was burglarized every 23 seconds, and someone's car was stolen every 57 seconds. The preliminary FBI figures for the first 6 months of this year show a 17-percent increase over the same 6-month period in 1966. Crimes of violence are up 18 percent with a startling 20-percent increase in the number of murders.

Crime has increased during the 7-year period 1960–66 at a rate almost seven times greater than the rate of population growth. And, unless substantial changes are made, all indications are that crime will continue to increase at least at this rate. Crime is associated, first of all, with the young, and our country's population is getting younger all the time. The National Crime Commission reported that 15-year-olds have the highest arrest rate in the United States, with 16-year-olds close behind. The report stated:

The problem in the years ahead is dramatically foretold by the fact that 23 per cent of the population is 10 or under.

The current trends toward urbanization and toward increased mobility are also associated with high crime rates. The number of crimes per capita tends to be highest in the large population centers and in those areas with the fastest growing populations. This is a country on the move, and for the most part it is moving to the big cities and their suburbs.

Public order is, indeed, the first business of government. The crime situation facing this country today requires more than rhetoric. The fact that major changes must be made in our approaches to crime prevention and control has been both graphically indicated by the crime statistics during the past few years, and carefully documented by the National Crime Commission and the nine supporting task force reports. In the words of the Commission report:

If this report has not conveyed the message that sweeping and costly changes in criminal administration must be made throughout the country in order to effect a significant reduction in crime, then it has not expressed what the Commission strongly believes.

To date, Federal assistance in the area of crime control has been minimal. Our lack of involvement in this field is, of course, not entirely accidental. Law enforcement and criminal justice are primarily the responsibility of State and local governments and should and must remain so. However, the fact is that State and local governments are, with very few exceptions, so heavily burdened with other expenses that, far from being in a position to develop computer technology and send their policemen to college, they have not been able to pay the salaries necessary to keep their police forces up to recommended staff quotas. The Crime Commission reported the need for 50,000 more men to fill positions authorized for 1967 alone.

The Crime Commission also reported that the median annual salary for a big city patrolman is $5,300, which is of

course far too low to attract and maintain good and adequate personnel. The local communities and the States then have no alternative; they must come forward with new plans, new programs, and difficult as it may be, more money. Also, it has been generally accepted, and I would certainly agree, that additional Federal programs to aid State and local governments in law enforcement and the administration of criminal justice is in order.

The National Crime Commission outlined an extensive eight-point program broken down as follows:

First. Increased State and local planning.

Second. Education and training of criminal justice personnel.

Third. Surveys and advisory services concerning organization and operation of criminal justice agencies.

Fourth. Development of coordinated national information systems.

Fifth. Development of a limited number of demonstration programs in agencies of justice.

Sixth. Scientific and technological research and development.

The implementation of this recommended program can only be accomplished through increased local, State, and Federal cooperation. Hopefully, such increased cooperation can be forthcoming.

Mr. President, whatever the final outcome with regard to crime legislation being acted on this year, it would seem clear that our involvement in the crime field is just beginning. The Law Enforcement Assistance Act of 1965 was of course a pioneer venture into a new and extremely important area of Federal legislation. The 90th Congress will not solve the problem of crime, nor will it exhaust the potential areas of fruitful and legitimate Federal assistance with regard to crime.

In essence, then, the crime crisis facing this Nation today is of immense proportions, and it is imperative that something be done about it immediately and by all levels of government. It is in view of these facts that I am introducing this bill to establish within the Department of Justice the office of Deputy Attorney General for Law Enforcement.

The House version of this year's anticrime bill, H.R. 5037, would establish the position of an Assistant Attorney General to assist the Attorney General in administering title I, planning grants, and title II, grants for law enforcement and criminal justice purposes. I believe that this is appropriate and in no way a duplication of the purpose of my bill.

The major functions of the Deputy Attorney General for Law Enforcement, which I am calling for, would be the overall supervision, direction, and coordination of the various bureaus, departments, and offices within the Department of Justice relating to law enforcement. This deputy would also be the chief liaison officer of the Department with regard to matters relating to law enforcement with both the Congress and other governmental departments and agencies. This liaison function would be of major importance. A study made recently by a number of my colleagues in the House revealed the existence of more than 20 law enforcement or investigative agencies of the Federal Government, ranging, as they put it, "from the Federal Bureau of Investigation to the Fish and Wildlife Service." Let me quote briefly from their report which was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Congressman JOSEPH MCDADE on March 21, and is entitled "Are We Organized To Fight Crime?"

> There appears to be little system, little method, little order in the Federal Government's approach to crime. It is a crazy-quilt of departments, bureaus and agencies with competing responsibilities, duplicating staffing, poor communications, and self-defeating jealousies . . .
>
> To combat crime we do not need a new Department, but we badly need a reorganization of the existing structure—to pull together in an orderly way the existing Federal agencies concerned—and to provide a logical framework for giving attention to aspects which today are largely ignored.

I would agree, certainly, that we do not need a new department. The logical place for such a program is the Justice Department, and the program is clearly of such scope and magnitude as to require the supervision of a full-time Deputy Attorney General.

In closing, I want to underscore the fact that for too long our tendency in this area of crime has been to drift along, relying either on the utopian reforms promised by social legislation, or on an unbased optimistic belief that tomorrow will be better.

There were 3¼ million serious crimes reported to the police in 1966, and the National Crime Commission estimates that the actual amount of crime in this country is at least twice that reflected by police statistics. The Senate Committee on Government Operations Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations has estimated that 137 cities in this country experienced riots and civil disorders in recent years. In the past 3 years, 70 cities were subjected to major incidents.

Crime and civil disorder in this country demand immediate, major, and effective action on the part of the Federal Government. I urge that this bill which I am introducing be passed as an important and necessary step in that direction.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2544) to establish within the Department of Justice the Office of Deputy Attorney General for Law Enforcement, introduced by Mr. TOWER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SMALL BUSINESS CRIME AND CIVIL DISORDER INSURANCE PROTECTION ACT

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, first I wish to state my support for a measure introduced by Senator SMATHERS, S. 1484, a bill designed to protect small businesses against criminal activity. S. 1484 furnishes Government-assisted insurance in areas where criminal activity has made it difficult, and in most cases impossible, to obtain insurance from private companies.

I am introducing a bill which I believe to be complementary to S. 1484, by providing special Government-assisted insurance which would cover all small businesses suffering losses due to civil disorders and place them in the same category with those directly identified with criminal activity.

At the present time, the Small Business Administration is using, by Presidential decree, money from the SBA disaster fund for small business rebuilding loans in the Detroit area—and, I believe, rightfully so. But, since a question might be raised as to the type of disaster for which the SBA fund was established, this proposal will spell out "civil disorders" as being eligible disasters by congressional intent.

As of June 30, 1967, the disaster fund contained a balance of $218 million, which is believed more than sufficient to meet the needs prescribed by President Johnson. In addition it is believed $250 million more can be made available within a short time through the sale of additional participations.

It will undoubtedly be necessary for the Congress to appropriate even more money for the SBA fund, due to the recent Hurricane Beulah.

The bill I am proposing would stipulate that among the insurance corporation employees provided in S. 1484 there be a force of investigators which could be assigned to study the pattern of insurance claims made under the insuring sections of S. 1484.

These investigators, operating in the same manner as private insurance company investigators, could advise the Board of the Small Business Crime Protection Insurance Corporation as to the possibility of concentration by criminals against small businesses protected against crime activity by Federal Government insurance.

Also, the bill I am introducing would expand the language in S. 1484 to cover civil disorders rather than the somewhat limited language of "criminal activity" now in the bill. It is quite possible that losses could occur to small businesses, due indirectly to criminal activity.

For example, in the Cambridge, Md., civil disorder, the basic criminal activity was an act of arson against a school. Due to the fact, however, that firemen could not get into the area because of possible acts of violence against them, adjacent small businesses were destroyed by the spreading fire.

I am sure many similar losses developed in Detroit where it appeared the fire department was hampered greatly in its work, thus reducing the efficiency of the department to contain the fires to original sources of actual criminal activity.

Testimony on S. 1484, recently heard by the Small Business Subcommittee of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee indicated the Small Business Administration prefers delaying action on this problem in order to obtain additional information on the subject.

I hesitate to believe the people who have been hurt financially and physically by the crimes and disorders which have prompted these efforts to provide assistance would look with favor on an extended delay of action.

There is precedence for such Federal insurance assistance in cases of unusual and extreme hardship which provides all the legislative experience necessary to get a program underway at once. Additional information, as in other assistance programs in the past, can be used from time to time to broaden and improve the existing program.

Mr. President, the people who are in danger of being victimized by the ever-spreading and increasing crime and disorder activities should have at least some form of protection thrown up around them.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2545) to assure small business concerns of the opportunity of obtaining insurance against property losses resulting from crimes and civil disorders, introduced by Mr. TOWER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, October 17, 1967, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 2121) to extend the provisions of the act of October 23, 1962, relating to relief for occupants of certain unpatented mining claims.

SENATOR BROOKE ADDRESSES SPRINGFIELD, MASS., ADULT EDUCATION FORUM

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, on October 11, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE] delivered an address at the Springfield, Mass., Adult Education Forum. This address attracted a great deal of comment and attention, and apparently is worthy of further circulation. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

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

PHILLIPS LECTURE ADDRESS

(By Senator EDWARD W. BROOKE)

I have been looking forward for the past several months to the honor of delivering the Phillips lecture which inaugurates the Springfield Public Forum season.

When Dr. Robinson extended the kind invitation, pride said accept quickly, humility said accept hesitatingly, commonsense said decline with regrets. I accepted quickly.

To Dr. Robinson, I convey my profound thanks for the honor you do me by extending this invitation to address the members and guests of the Springfield Adult Education Council.

To Mrs. Morner, the Council's able Executive Secretary, I express my appreciation for the arrangements so meticulously made and for being so understanding of the problems that confront a harried Senator's schedule.

To Dr. Deady, I want also to say how complimented I am that your Phillips Lecture Committee has seen fit to include me among all the distinguished individuals who have preceded me on this rostrum.

And to all the officers, members, and friends of the Springfield Adult Education Council, I express my pleasure that I have this opportunity of sharing some thoughts and ideas with you this evening. The Council enjoys an enviable and well-deserved reputation for the consistently high caliber of its forums. I feel sure that the late Alexander Phillips would take pride and satisfaction in knowing how zealously his generous testamentary instructions have been followed in the Phillips Lecture Series. The fidelity with which you have executed the trust that Mr. Phillips placed in your hands is indeed to be commended and saluted.

I want also to congratulate the Council for the high purpose of its objectives, for the outstanding service it has given the community by providing these accessible forums for free discussion and debate, and for the Council's consistent dedication to the highest standards of excellence.

I want you all to know that I really mean it when I say that I am honored to be here tonight.

America's often cited solidarity in wartime is, to some extent, a fiction. The principle that politics must stop at the water's edge has been honored as often in the breach as in the practice. Popular dissent has been a frequent part of every crisis we have faced. We need only look at the division of opinions over the issue of war with Great Britain in the Revolutionary period, or at the unpopularity of the War of 1812 and the Mexican war. The Civil War literally and tragically divided this nation, and led to the bloodiest fighting the world had ever seen. The Spanish-American war had its dissenters, who became even more vocal in the imperialistic era which followed. Anti-war parades were held in New York City in 1917, and American youths refused to be drafted even then. Some dissent from national policy appeared even in World War II, though the attack on Pearl Harbor clearly and dramatically defined our position. In the 1950's, despite a clear cut case of invasion, disagreement over our involvment in Korea was widespread. Freedom to dissent from national policy has always been a part of our national heritage.

Today we have committed 500,000 of our young men to a conflict in Southeast Asia. Our planes fly daily bombing runs over enemy territory. Our Marines are digging into embattled positions on the DMZ. Our soldiers are tracking down elusive guerrillas in the Central Highlands. We are at war in Vietnam!

But this war is different from other wars. For one thing, it is an undeclared war. It began as an attempt to help the government of the southern half of a temporarily divided nation to protect itself from an indigenous guerrilla force, supplemented and supplied by the government in the North.

We had no idea, when we first became involved in Vietnam, of the extent which our commitment would reach.

Over a two-year period, we have increased our commitment in South Vietnam from 29,100 men in March of 1965 to 500,000 at the present time. We have suffered over 100,000 casualities and nearly 17,000 American lives have been lost. The war is presently costing over $2.5 billion per month.

The cost to the nation is really much greater. For because of the war, the needs of our cities have been left untended. Conservation projects and educational programs have been postponed. The resources to effectively wage our war on poverty have been decreased. All these and more are the casualties of the Vietnam war.

More than at any other time in our nation's history, debate rages over our objectives and our means of achieving those objectives.

But dissent should not be condemned. It should be welcomed. The dialogue in which this nation has been embroiled during the last two years has in the main been informative and useful. Many aspects of our involvement in Vietnam need to be reexamined. Many shortcomings need to be brought to light and to be corrected. And out of it all, there is always the possibility that discussion will lead to discovery—that a solution will be found.

There are three basic alternatives which have been suggested as a means to end the war.

The first of these is massive escalation. There are those who see this as a military war. They say that we are engaged in a struggle against Communist aggression, and that the only way to win is to make that aggression too costly to be sustained by the enemy. They want an all-out effort that would include stepped-up bombing and the invasion of North Vietnam.

The advocates of this approach in 1965 believed that more troops would defeat the enemy in the South. Instead, more troops and supplies were brought in from the North, and the fighting became more intense.

Then it was suggested that we could stop infiltration by bombing the supply lines from the North. With the enemy thus cut off from its source of arms and equipment, victory would be assured. Instead, the North Vietnamese developed new supply lines and more elusive methods of infiltration. The amount of assistance from the Soviet Union and Communist China increased. And the enemy was able to wage a more sophisticated and effective war than before.

Now that these measures have not achieved their objective, those who favor a military solution urge that we remove all limitations. "Bomb them back to the Stone Age if necessary" is a position frequently expressed. "Mine and bomb the port of Haiphong and cut the rail and highway connections with China and the Soviet Union" is their admonition. They believe that our Allies should cease trading with North Vietnam, and that Communist nations should do so at their own risk. In this way North Vietnam will be forced to concede, and the war will be brought to an end.

But let us examine this line of reasoning. For one thing, does it not ignore the fact that each escalation on our part has brought a corresponding escalation from the North? Does it not ignore the risk of involvement in a larger, more devastating and more costly war? Can we bomb or mine the harbor of Haiphong without creating the very real possibility of direct intervention on the part of Communist China and the Soviet Union?

And perhaps most important of all, do not the advocates of a military solution ignore the fact that the real answer lies in the South, that we can literally decimate the economy and the war-making potential of the North without destroying the guerrilla infrastructure in the South?

Another alternative which has been widely recommended is withdrawal. There are those who say we should not be in Vietnam at all. They believe we were wrong to aid the French. They say we compounded the error when we refused to accept the Geneva Agreements. And they further believe we have made a bad situation progressively worse by supporting one military dictatorship after another with increasing American manpower.

The advocates of withdrawal contend that no amount of additional military pressure can defeat the Viet Cong. They regard the Viet Cong as a popular, indigenous force, supplied and assisted by the North, and operating with the support of the majority of the people in the South. They are convinced that such forces cannot—and what is more should not—be defeated. They therefore call upon the United States to admit its error and withdraw its forces as quickly and gracefully as possible.

We have stated that our purpose in Vietnam is to prevent the spread of Communist

regimes by force and by terror, and in the larger context, to show that wars of national liberation can not succeed against the combined military force of the United States and the national dedication of the threatened country. Our stated intent is to draw the line in Southeast Asia, and to provide a military shield behind which not only South Vietnam, but the other free nations of Asia as well, can devote their resources to economic and social progress.

Is not refusal to withdraw, under the circumstances, a matter of credibility rather than a matter of national pride? Is it not a question of a believable commitment, to ourselves and to our Allies—and even to our enemies? Is it enough to be the most powerful nation in the world if that power cannot be relied upon? Is not trust the essence of all human relationships which applies to nations as well as men? Would we not stand to lose far more than we might gain by simply withdrawing from the war?

The only remaining alternative, if we are not to continue the contained war indefinitely, is a negotiated peace. But what, of all the possibilities which have been suggested, is the step most likely to lead to a negotiated peace?

Great hopes were harbored that the recent South Vietnamese elections would be such a step; that freely conducted popular elections would result in the election of a government which would be understood, accepted, and supported by the majority of the South Vietnamese people; that the elections would lead to reforms, to a sense of national unity and dedication to a common cause.

But have the elections fulfilled these expectations? Is there not still censorship of the press despite Government statements to the contrary? Is not the government arresting its political factions with which it is in disagreement? Is not reform still desperately needed in the Army and the provinces?

There are those who contend that this government cannot function because it is a plurality government. But is a plurality government unique in the history of the world? Were not four American presidents chosen by plurality vote? Have not Britain, France and Germany all had plurality governments in recent decades and have they not functioned well? Is it not possible that a plurality government may prove to be the most representative form of government possible in South Vietnam? Does not the South Vietnamese government have an opportunity to form a broad coalition with a variety of political factions? Cannot the factions in South Vietnam be forged into a new national unity which can help the South to win the war and to deal with the Viet Cong or with Hanoi as at least an equal? Is this, then, not one step toward a negotiated settlement—a stable, popular and viable government in South Vietnam?

But the measure which has received the most widespread attention as leading in the direction of the alternative of a negotiated peace is a cessation of American bombing in the North.

The declared purpose of our bombing of North Vietnam is three-fold:

(a) To reduce the flow of external assistance being provided to North Vietnam;

(b) To destroy those military and industrial resources that contribute most to the support of aggression; and

(c) To harass, disrupt and impede the movement of men and material into South Vietnam.

But how effective have we been in achieving these objectives? According to the best military intelligence available, we have destroyed or disrupted half of North Vietnam's war-supporting industry, including electric power, chemical and rubber plants, and iron and steel and cement factories. Strikes on roads, railroads and water routes reportedly have taken a heavy toll.

It is estimated that 500,000 to 600,000 North Vietnamese have had to be diverted to repair these facilities. The military claim that our bombing policy has reduced infiltration from 8,000 men per month a year ago to about 6,000 men per month today. According to Admiral U. S. G. Sharp, Commander in Chief of Pacific Operations, "The ports (of North Vietnam) are congested by an almost four-fold expansion of sea imports necessitated by disruption or destruction of domestic sources. . . . (And) ship unloading time is believed to have tripled since March."

To support their contention that the bombing is essential and reduces military losses, advocates of this strategy point to the Tet, or Vietnamese New Year's truce last spring, when in four days of no bombings the North Vietnamese were reported to have brought 25,000 tons of supplies south, including the heavy artillery now in place just north of the DMZ. It is estimated that this same movement would have taken them 38 days under sustained bombing conditions.

The military is virtually unanimous in agreeing that the worst thing we could do is to halt the bombing of North Vietnam. They claim that it would be a great boost to the morale of the North Vietnamese, that it would permit the enemy to operate from a sanctuary, to repair their roads and factories, and to move anything they wanted into North Vietnam from China and the Soviet Union. According to Admiral Sharp, "We would be . . . extending the war indefinitely."

Those who support a cessation of bombing view the situation differently. They place much less emphasis on military pressure as a path to negotiations, and believe that, like us, Hanoi would like to see an end to the war as soon as possible. They contend that 25 percent of the North Vietnamese army is now fighting in South Vietnam, and that the war has been costly to North Vietnam in lives and material. They argue that an estimated three divisions are now massed just north of the DMZ, and that it must be assumed that a major reason for not moving them south has been fear of an invasion of the north. They further contend that prior to 1965, North Vietnam was moving from an agrarian to an industrially developing economy, and had a favorable balance of trade; that today most of its industrial capacity has been destroyed.

These advocates of a cessation of bombing in the North point out that while the loss to North Vietnam has been heavy, the bombing has proved to be more costly to us than to them. And most important of all, they say the bombing has not achieved its intended objectives. They cite the continuous movement of men and supplies to the South despite constant and deadly harassment by American air power. They claim that the will of the North Vietnamese to continue to fight has been strengthened by the bombing. They say that our attempts to hit the rail line with China, and the dock facilities in Haiphong, have only led the North Vietnamese and their allies to discover new methods of supplying their fighting forces.

In addition, they point to the fact that the North Vietnamese have stubbornly persisted in regarding the United States as the aggressor, and refused even to consider the possibility of negotiations until we unilaterally and unconditionally cease bombing their country.

Thus the arguments rage. We seem to have reached an impasse. The United States refuses to halt the bombing without some assurance that talks will follow. The North Vietnamese refuse to offer assurance that they will negotiate upon cessation of bombing in the North.

If there are negotiations, obviously, if successful, they could lead to peace. But what are the disadvantages and the advantages which would accrue to the United States if it assumes the risk of cessation of bombing in the North and Hanoi refuses to negotiate?

During this period of course, with only cessation of bombing of the North, the war would go on as usual and both sides would conduct combat and reconnaissance missions. Artillery pieces would still be fired. Our air force would continue to bomb military targets in the South and give close air support to our troops.

The disadvantages could be that North Vietnam would use the period of cessation for the purpose of inflicting heavy casualties on our troops and strengthening their forces. In addition, Hanoi could very well use this time to transport essential supplies both to the troops in the DMZ and to the South. They could also repair the damage to military and industrial installations in the North during the period of cessation.

What, then, are the advantages to be derived if our cessation of bombing in the North failed to produce negotiations?

It could give credence to our government's desire for peace.

It would indicate our willingness to do everything within reason and honor to bring about a negotiated peace.

It could bring more support from the American people for our position in Vietnam and thus help to unite the nation.

It could improve our position in the eyes of the world, because we will have acted consistently with the call of the nations of the world to cease bombing the North.

It could even have the result of our allies committing troops to fight with us in Vietnam.

It could place the Hanoi government in the position of defending to the world its failure to negotiate.

It could conversely remove our government from the position of defending to the world its failure to cease bombing in order to bring about negotiations.

It could unite the South Vietnamese, and at the same time create division within North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front.

It could have the effect of putting the Soviet Union in a position of proving its assertion that negotiations would take place if the bombing were stopped.

It could encourage Secretary-General U Thant and the United Nations to take up consideration of the war if Hanoi refuses or fails to negotiate after our cessation of bombing.

The debate on this issue has gone so far that personal and national pride may have become major barriers to a willingness on both sides to take the necessary steps to bring about a negotiated peace. If personal or national pride is the controlling factor in Hanoi's refusal to give assurances that it will negotiate upon cessation of the bombing in the North, that same pride must not be a factor in our government's decision as to whether we should stop the bombing. Thus the question to be resolved is what harm will accrue to American troops and to the South Vietnamese if our government assumes the risk and responsibility of a cessation of the bombing in North Vietnam.

The American people do not know how great the risk would really be. The Congress does not know. Even the military does not know.

Under our system of government, only the President of the United States has all of the facts—the vast knowledge afforded by military and civil intelligence. His is the awesome responsibility to constantly consider all of the alternatives and to make the decision as to whether the advantages of cessation of the bombing in the North outweigh the disadvantages. If there are valid reasons why we should not cease bombing of the North, then the President should make those

reasons crystal clear to the American people and to the world.

When I went to Vietnam last March, I looked for evidence to support a conclusion that Hanoi would negotiate upon our cessation of bombing in the North. But I found no such evidence. To the contrary, all the evidence that I did find supported the conclusion that Hanoi would settle for nothing less than unilateral withdrawal.

Therefore, I reluctantly concluded that our conduct of the war at that time was the only logical course that we could follow.

This conclusion was also based upon my finding that the bombing was having a salutary effect upon the morale of our troops, and was impairing the enemy's capacity to wage war.

Of course there have been bombing pauses in the past. The President has directed the cessation of bombing numerous times in the past. And it has been suggested that since negotiations did not take place during these pauses further cessation would be futile. But the situation is fluid in Vietnam. The situation has changed, both militarily and politically. And the fact that prior cessations have not brought about negotiations does not mean that cessation at this time will not be productive.

And thus we must conclude that the time has come for a reassessment, and for a new decision. So much hangs in the balance. That reassessment and decision must be made without delay.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONTOYA in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

ADDRESS BY SENATOR PEARSON ON REVITALIZING RURAL AMERICA

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, on September 16, the distinguished junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] spoke before the Southeastern Ohio Public Officials Conference at Ohio University at Athens, Ohio, on the subject of "Revitalizing Rural America." He had an outstanding and tremendously large audience in Athens, Ohio, and in the audience there were many students from Ohio University, which is one of the great universities in my State. In his magnificent address Senator PEARSON pointed to the growing national interest and concern over the need to stimulate the economic and social development of our rural communities and outlined some of the pending proposals in Congress which have been made in this area.

He noted that the growing national commitment to the economic rebirth of rural America stems not only from the conviction that the expansion of economic opportunities in our smaller towns and farm communities would be a worthwhile accomplishment itself, but that it would also contribute significantly to the alleviation of many of the problems that now plague our cities, for it is the uncontrolled migration of people and economic resources from rural areas to the metropolitan areas which has generated many of the problems now constituting the crisis of the cities. Senator PEARSON concluded that we are at the commencement stages of a growing national debate centering around what constitutes a proper rural-urban balance and he expressed the view that from this debate will come a series of national policy decisions which will have a major influence on the development of our society for several decades to come.

Mr. President, because of the importance and significance of our distinguished colleague's remarks I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JAMES B. PEARSON AT SOUTHEASTERN OHIO PUBLIC OFFICIALS CONFERENCE, OHIO UNIVERSITY, ATHENS, OHIO, SEPTEMBER 16, 1967

REVITALIZING RURAL AMERICA

It is indeed a pleasure to appear before this Conference. I always welcome the opportunity to speak on the general subject of rural economic development, and it is particularly gratifying to speak on this subject on the campus of this University which, through its various programs, has shown such initiative and capable leadership in the area of regional economic development.

My comments today will be directed to five points. First, I want to comment on some of the evidence which indicates that there is a growing national commitment to a new effort to encourage the social and economic development of rural communities. By the way, at this point let me just say that I use the term "rural area" in a rather broad sense to include not only the open countryside, but also smaller towns and cities, even those with populations of up to 25,000 or 50,000 provided they are not a part of a large metropolitan complex.

Second, I want to point to some of the reasons why we are now experiencing a national debate on this question of rural development.

Third, I want to review some of the recent legislative proposals which have already been made and fourth, to suggest some guidelines that should be kept in mind as this national debate expands in the future and as we develop additional rural oriented programs.

Fifth, I will make some observations about the role that universities can play in this effort and also discuss some of the problems and opportunities that local public officials, such as yourselves, will encounter in this growing effort.

I

In pointing to some of the factors which suggest a growing national consensus on the need to stimulate the social and economic development of rural areas and, at the same time, to slow down and better control the migration of people from rural communities to the large cities, I hope you will excuse me if I first call attention to the Rural Job Development bill which I introduced on July 21. This bill was cosponsored by Senator Fred Harris of Oklahoma and 28 of our colleagues. The support for the bill in the Senate has been completely bipartisan and has been warmly endorsed by such Senator leaders as Mike Mansfield and George Aiken.

Senator Harris and I have been particularly pleased with the very favorable public reaction to the proposal. For example, in my own case, I have received letters from all parts of the country and from all types of individuals and groups indicating their support for the bill and expressing hope that it will be enacted. Newspaper editorial support has also been extremely favorable and the lists of editorial endorsements have by no means been limited to small town or rural oriented newspapers. I find this most encouraging.

As a result of this demonstration of solid and broad based support for the proposal I am most hopeful that we will be able to get Committee hearings started on the bill sometime yet this year.

As you may know, of course, other public figures and groups, particularly in the last year, have been stressing the need to obtain more favorable balance between rural and urban communities. Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman has shown considerable leadership in this area. I also was encouraged recently when the Republican Coordinating Committee published a comprehensive report outlining the problems facing rural areas and suggesting approaches that could be taken to broaden the base of economic and social opportunities in those areas. The recent statements by Secretary Freeman and the Republican Coordinating Committee's report on, "Revitalizing our Rural Areas" have also been reviewed very favorably in the editorial columns of many of our large metropolitan newspapers. I also note that last week several of the persons testifying before the President's Commission on Urban Problems argued for the need to expand opportunities in rural areas in an effort to slow down the rural migration, thereby reducing some of the population pressures being experienced by our already overcrowded cities.

Thus the developments of the past few months make it quite clear, I believe, that a new national debate has begun. It is a debate and a discussion that is likely to continue for several years.

II

While the existence of growing public discussion is evident, it is a little more difficult to explain why it has developed at this particular time. But I would offer these suggestions. First, despite the fact that we have been a highly urbanized and industrial nation for a good number of years, we have always maintained an identification with, or a certain fondness if you like, for our rural areas. This nation was born on the farm and in the small towns and it was not really until the beginning of this century that the economic and social center of the nation shifted to the metropolitan areas. Thus, as we have become aware of the fact that poverty is not limited to the slum ghettos of the large cities, the nation has responded with considerable sympathy to proposals aimed at improving the economic lot of rural residents.

The rural areas have been in trouble for a good many years, but ironically it is the great trouble in the cities which have finally caused us to see and understand the difficulties of the countryside and small towns.

The headlines of the past two or three years have made all of us painfully aware of the gigantic social and economic problems of urban America. And the term, "crisis of the cities," has come into common usage—a crisis described in terms of festering slums, rising crime rates, disintegrating families, chronic unemployment, racial tension, congested streets, polluted air and contaminated water.

We have now begun to recognize that many of these problems can be traced to the overcrowding of people and the excessive concentration of industry with the consequent problems of air and water pollution and what have you. We are now beginning to realize that one of the most sensible and effective approaches to dealing with the crisis of the cities is to devise programs which will have the effect, hopefully, of slowing down or at least better controlling

the great rural to urban migration which has for several decades continued to depopulate the countryside and small towns and to swell the population of our already overcrowded cities.

The long, hot urban summer of 1967 has proven to be something of a catalyst, and we have begun to accept the idea that as we attempt to deal with the crisis of the cities the challenge is not simply to make the cities more efficient and more livable for more and more people, but how to keep more and more people from crowding into them.

III

Now, let me review some of the proposals that have been advanced to accomplish this goal. And here I will not attempt to review the programs that are already operating, but limit my comments to those that have been proposed in the past few months.

Again, let me first mention the Pearson-Harris Rural Job Development Act. This proposal attempts to encourage growth of new job-creating industries in rural areas by offering a series of tax incentives to the industries which would locate in these areas. The Investment Tax Credit Act of 1962 has had, and continues to have, a stimulating effect on the growth of our overall economy. The Rural Job Development bill would apply the same principle, with some additional techniques, to encourage similar growth in the rural sector of our economy.

I am confident that, if enacted, these tax incentives would serve to stimulate new industries in rural areas not simply because businessmen would find the tax benefits advantageous, but also because their mere existence would necessarily force businessmen to take a second look at our rural communities. And once they do this, I am confident they will discover a whole series of reasons why it would be in their advantage to locate there. Businessmen, like the rest of us, form notions that are hard to break. The notion that rural areas are poor locations for new industries is one that clearly needs to be broken.

A proposal of a different type is that which is being advanced by Senator Proxmire of Wisconsin and Senator Mundt of South Dakota. Their bills aim at inaugurating broad based studies by the Congress and by a special commission to analyze and evaluate all the various economic and social factors which affect the distribution and movement of people and industry. Certainly this type of study will be extremely useful in providing us with data and new insight into this basic problem which we are attempting to deal with.

There is another set of proposals which relate to this area, at least in an indirect way, and these assert the proposition that in the allotment of research and development grants and in its other procurement programs the Federal Government has the responsibility and indeed the obligation to achieve a more equitable geographic distribution of these funds, that is, wherever possible, without loss of efficiency to the Government, to channel more of these funds into smaller communities and smaller colleges and universities. Proposals along this line have been advanced by half a dozen Senators, including myself. Senator Fred Harris, Chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Government Research has been holding hearings on these proposals for over a year and while the prospects for enactment of any of the bills are not particularly good at this time the general debate in the Senate has already caused several agencies within the Executive Branch to take a fresh look at their existing practices, particularly in the area of awarding research and development grants.

There have been a number of other proposals and I hope to introduce at least two more yet this year myself; one dealing with rural housing, the other with vocational education, both necessary supplements, I believe, to my rural job proposal.

The President's Commission on Rural Poverty has also completed its study and will be reporting its findings and making recommendations in the very near future.

IV

Despite this considerable flurry of activity within the past 12 months I repeat that I think we are only at the beginning stages of a great national debate which will continue for several years. I would now like to suggest a few guidelines for this expanding national debate. First, we must be willing to question many of our old attitudes and traditional dogmas and to take a fresh and open-minded look at the forces which have shaped our present social and economic structure.

So far, there has been a general demonstration of acceptance of the idea that the historical rural to urban shift is getting out of hand and, as a result, both the rural and urban areas are suffering. But we have got to do much more. We have got to probe deeper.

We are going to have to be willing to discard several of the long held and fundamental propositions. For example, although there has always been a certain uneasiness about the continuing concentration of people and economic resources into relatively few highly urbanized areas, we have, on the other hand, assumed that the social and economic forces which underlie this concentration are not only inevitable but basically desirable over the long run. We know that we have become a great and powerful nation precisely because industry has long since replaced agriculture as the major source of economic wealth. We also have assumed that the concentration of economic resources into a relatively few geographical areas was a necessary feature of the industrial growth.

In short, we have been something of two minds on this subject. Our doubts at any given moment about the undesirable effects of massive urbanization have been counterbalanced by a general expression of faith that this overall movement toward a highly concentrated urbanized society represented economic and social progress.

It is quite clear that we are not going to discard the belief which is at the foundation of Western thought and culture that economic growth represents progress. What we must do, however, if this national debate is going to do anything more than pay lip service to the idea of achieving greater rural-urban balance, is to rethink many of our present notions about how economic growth and development occurs and what constitutes the meaning of economic efficiency.

In other words, we don't have to reject the notion of economic progress, but we do have to rethink why economic development occurs. And, above all, we have to discard the notion that the economic forces which resulted in the present rural-urban distribution are somehow inevitable and uncontrollable. We don't want to destroy these forces, but we must do a better job of controlling them for the benefit of all.

For far too long we have watched the poor migrate from the country to the city, blandly assuming that this represented the first step up the ladder of economic advancement. But in far too many instances the individual has not gained, and, consequently, society has lost.

For far too long we have sat back and watched a basic industry like coal mining in Appalachia dry up, leaving the residents of the area without a source of livelihood and said, "this is unfortunate, but inevitable and the people of the area must move to new areas to find new jobs." But we have too often ignored the fact that jobs in other areas weren't available. And we failed to realize that it is often more economically efficient *and* civilized to bring jobs to people rather than forcing people to migrate in an uncertain search for jobs.

Another example: The development of the megalopolis has generally been regarded as a product of unavoidable economic forces which inexorably demand greater and greater centralization of our productive capacities, a process deemed desirable, in part, because of supposed advantages of economies-in-scale associated with large centralized productive centers.

But it is now becoming increasingly apparent that numerous economic inefficiencies associated with this type of concentration may counteract this advantage. For example, it may well be that the overhead costs of air and water pollution, garbage treatment and disposal and other public services more than offset the productive efficiencies that are realized through concentration of resources.

Economic wastes are also associated with the movement of people to and from work. Moreover, the costs of improving commuter transportation systems are staggering. For example, it costs approximately $20,000 to develop the additional facilities needed to bring in just one more car per day during commuter hours into cities like New York and Chicago.

Moving from the general to a more specific suggested guideline, I have urged that as we propose programs to stimulate rural economic development we not limit the application of these programs only to rural poverty areas. Certainly our objective is to reduce, and to eventually eliminate, the worse pockets of rural poverty. But the goal seems to me to be much broader than this. It is an effort to stimulate the economic development of *all* rural areas, even those that, in comparison to many parts of Appalachia and the cut over areas of the Great Lakes States, are relatively well off economically. For what we are seeking here is not simply to raise the income levels of rural persons per se, but to fundamentally affect the overall national distribution of population and economic resources.

V

Now let me turn to the fifth point that I want to consider today, that being the role of universities and the local communities in the commitment to rural economic development. In regard to the universities, they can and should participate at at least two levels. First, the university faculties should take a vital and vigorous part in the national debate on rural-urban balance. We need the expertise and special knowledge of the academic community not only in regard to such technical questions as the processes of economic development and distribution of population and productive resources, but also the contributions it can make to the fundamental questions of social values which are inevitably involved in any discussion about what should our national policy be on rural-urban balance.

Secondly, the universities, I believe, have a responsibility to take a direct and active part in efforts to stimulate economic and social development of the immediately surrounding community.

We all recognize the relationship between a geographic region's system of higher education and its capacity for economic development and growth. Thus, it is quite proper, I think, that colleges and universities should attempt to gear a considerable portion of their research efforts and other activities to those endeavors which might serve to stimulate community and regional economic growth.

This activity is an important and legitimate function of institutions of higher learning, but there is, of course, an ever present danger of too great an emphasis on this type of service orientation. The college or university must avoid being caught up in a climate of parochialism, for whether it is a small community junior college or a large university its ultimate goal is always the education of minds in the broadest and best

sense of the word. And in this sense the institution's community is mankind as a whole of which the local geographic community is only a fraction.

In short, there are hazards and problems but they can be overcome if properly handled. And the universities can learn how to handle them only by trial and error, by getting their feet wet so to speak. And in this respect, I am sure Ohio University has learned a great deal.

Now a few comments concerning activities of the local communities themselves. I think the first principle that needs to be emphasized here is that if the local community wants to broaden its economic base by developing new types of industry and new types of employment it has got to work for it. Federal and state governments can act to create the proper climate and mechanisms for economic development, but that development is not going to occur to any significant degree in any community unless the community itself is committed to accomplishing that goal.

There are several reasons for this. First of all, the rural community can overcome some of the disadvantages it has in competing for new industry only if it is able to convince the owners of the prospective new enterprise that the governments and the citizens of the area are united in their desire to broaden their economic base. This is not because businessmen feel they have to be loved, but because they have learned from past experience that their enterprise would be successful over the long run in what might otherwise be considered a marginal area only if this sense of unity of commitment is prevalent in the community.

Second, despite the fact that the Federal Government goes to considerable effort to inform people of the types of programs that might be beneficial to the community, in the final analysis it is the community itself which must take the first step. Let me cite an example. We have had urban renewal programs operating in this country for several years. But it is only very recently that many of the smaller towns and cities have begun to take advantage of this program. One of the very simple and basic reasons for this is that these communities have been simply unaware that the program might be available to them. In addition, it has often been the case even though there was a general awareness of the urban renewal program, the local government simply didn't know how to go about applying for a renewal grant.

This problem of the local community either not being aware of the availability of Federal programs or not knowing how to apply for them continues to get worse as each year we enact new legislation in Congress. And in this respect I must say that one of our faults in the Congress is that we have not paid enough attention to the necessity of designing programs that are easily understood and easily administered and also we have too often added new programs with no serious attempt to coordinate them with programs already in operation.

Thus, one of the advantages that large cities have over smaller communities, to put it quite frankly, is that they simply know how to do a better job of taking advantage of Federal programs that are available. They are more likely to have expert staff officials who can devote their time to keeping informed about current programs and who have the skill and the know-how for applying and securing Federal grants and aid of various types.

Thus, I think very serious thought should be given to efforts to encourage local governments in a given region to get together in some type of cooperative association which would make it possible for them to employ the services of the administrative staff capable of advising and coordinating the efforts of the region to maximize its programs for economic development.

In conclusion, let me express again the belief that we are at the beginning stages of a great national debate centering around what constitutes a proper rural-urban balance. What this means basically is that we are to have an opportunity to discuss, from a new perspective, the characteristics of our present society and to raise fundamental questions about what type of society we want to build in the future. There will be no precise blueprint for the future emerging from this national debate. The American political system simply doesn't work that way and properly so because it is, of course, only under totalitarian political regimes that such a national blueprint can be made and adhered to. But gradually out of this discussion certain old attitudes and beliefs will be discarded; new ones will take their place. Out of this period will come a whole series of national policy decisions which will have a major influence on the development of our society for several decades to come. It is an exciting period and I am happy to be a part of it.

LOOPHOLE IN TAX STRUCTURE DENIED BY TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in the August issue of the Esquire magazine there appeared an advertisement which proclaimed that savings deposited in the Bahamas by U.S. citizens could earn a 6-percent tax-free income.

Recognizing that if this were true it represented a substantial loophole in our tax structure, I called this advertisement to the attention of the Treasury Department and under date of September 28, 1967, received a reply stating that the advertisement was in error, that this interest income would not be tax exempt as claimed, and that the Esquire magazine was being notified accordingly of the erroneous advertisement. To avoid any American citizen being misled by this erroneous advertising I would suggest that Esquire owes it to its readers to give prominent display to the Treasury Department's letter.

I ask unanimous consent that the advertisement which appeared in the August issue of Esquire, my letter to the Treasury Department under date of August 31, 1967, and the reply thereto, dated September 27, signed by Mr. Stanley S. Surrey, assistant secretary, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

[From Esquire magazine, August 1967]

SAVINGS EARN 6-PERCENT TAX-FREE AT COMMONWEALTH TRUST (BAHAMAS) LIMITED BANKERS

Interest credited quarterly.

7% on 3-year Term Deposits.

Valuable premiums on Savings accounts and Term Deposits.

Deposits accepted in U.S. and Canadian dollars and sterling (repayable in same currency); other currencies after approval.

All banking and trust services.

Confidential accounts.

COMMONWEALTH TRUST (BAHAMAS) LIMITED
French Building, E 2/67
Marlborough & George St.,
P.O. Box 4093, Nassau, Bahamas

Please provide details on the following type of tax-free account:

Savings account
Term Deposit

Name _____
Address _____

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., August 31, 1967.

Mr. STANLEY S. SURREY,
Assistant Secretary of Treasury,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SURREY: Enclosed is an advertisement which appeared in the August 1967 Esquire concerning six per cent tax-free savings on deposits in the Bahamas.

Is it possible for an American citizen to deposit money in the Bahamas and the interest received therefrom to be tax exempt?

If so does this not constitute quite a loophole in our tax laws, and what suggestions do you or the Department have for correction?

Yours sincerely,

JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D.C., September 27, 1967.

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

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This is in reply to your letter of August 31, 1967 regarding the advertisement which appeared in the August 1967 edition of Esquire magazine stating that "Savings earn 6% tax-free at Commonwealth Trust (Bahamas) Limited". As you suggest, if a United States citizen or resident or a domestic corporation could earn such interest free of United States income tax it would indeed constitute a significant loophole in our tax laws. However, a United States citizen or resident or a domestic corporation is subject to United States income tax on all income (with certain limited exceptions) from whatever source derived. Therefore, United States income tax would be due on interest received from the Commonwealth Trust (Bahamas) Limited by a United States citizen, resident or domestic corporation.

It is noted that in addition to income tax liability, a term deposit for one year or more would subject the citizen resident or corporation to the interest equalization tax.

We have referred the advertisement to the Internal Revenue Service and they have informed us that they would inform Esquire magazine of the tax liabilities of an American depositing funds in the Commonwealth Trust (Bahamas) Limited.

Sincerely yours,

STANLEY S. SURREY.

OVER APPRAISAL OF ART CREATES TAX ABUSE

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in the Washington Daily News of July 20, 1967, there appeared an editorial entitled "Art for Tax Sake." This editorial calls attention to what at first appeared to be a glaring loophole in our tax structure.

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

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

ART FOR TAX SAKE

You are in the 70 per cent income tax bracket. You buy a painting for $1000, give it to a museum at a valuation of $5000 and take the $5000 off your tax as a charitable donation. Original cost, $1000; tax saving, $3500; net profit, $2500.

There is the case of an artist who donated three of his own paintings and claimed a $75,000 deduction. It developed he actually had been trying to sell his paintings for less than $200 each, with no takers.

This business of phony art appraisals to dodge taxes is one of the "loopholes" in the system which the Internal Revenue Service is trying to close. It is setting up a panel of art experts to review suspicious appraisals

and fix fair market value. It's a good idea and we hope it works.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, under date of July 21 I wrote the Treasury Department asking for a report as to whether or not this loophole did exist and if so what recommendations it had for legislative correction.

Under date of August 18, 1967, I received a letter from Mr. Sheldon S. Cohen, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, in which he stated that while certain taxpayers may be attempting to evade taxes in the manner described, nevertheless under the existing law they do have adequate authority to cope with this problem.

I ask unanimous consent that both my letter of July 21 and the Department's reply of August 18, 1967, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., July 21, 1967.

Hon. HENRY H. FOWLER,
Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In yesterday's issue of the Washington Daily News there appeared an editorial (a copy of which is enclosed) entitled "Art for Tax Sake." This editorial comments upon an abuse of our tax laws whereby taxpayers are granted an overappraisal of the art being donated and thereby actually making money by contributing.

It was and still is my understanding that under our existing law such excessive allowances are specifically prohibited under penalties; however, will you please examine this situation and advise whether or not the law is adequate and the fault lies in loose enforcement.

If there is a loophole in the law then please forward your legislative recommendations for correction.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

U.S. TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE,
Washington, D.C., August 18, 1967.

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

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: Secretary Fowler has asked me to reply to your letter of July 21, 1967, enclosing a recent editorial from the Washington Daily News on the subject of tax deductions for contributions of art and similar items to certain charitable and educational organizations.

Existing law allows taxpayers to deduct the fair market value of non-cash property contributed to museums and other charitable or educational organizations. The establishment of this value is, as you can well imagine, a more difficult problem for paintings and other types of art objects than for the more conventional types of non-cash property. In many cases art experts themselves cannot agree on the value of specific art objects.

An excellent example of the potential for abuse in this area is the case of *Hilla Rebay* v. *Commissioner*, which was tried in the Tax Court in 1963 (22 TCM 181). Over a five-year period the taxpayer, who was an amateur artist, claimed deductions of $169,000 for donation of her own works to various charitable organizations. The Internal Revenue Service considered the valuation excessive by over $162,000 and determined tax deficiencies of nearly $120,000. The Tax Court determined that the claimed deductions were excessive by nearly $160,000 and adjusted the tax deficiency accordingly. That determination was not appealed by the taxpayer.

In recognition of the difficulties inherent in the valuation of art objects the Service has taken appropriate steps to fairly determine the fair market value of contributions in kind. For example, the individual income tax return for the year 1965 and subsequent years has been revised to provide the Internal Revenue Service with detailed information regarding non-cash property in order to permit more efficient review of tax deductions claimed for this type of item. The method utilized in determining the fair market value of the property must be shown on the return, and if the value is established by appraisal, a signed copy of the appraiser's report is required. This modification of the income tax return was made in accordance with recent revisions to section 1.170–1(a) of the Income Tax Regulations dealing with Charitable Contributions and Gifts. These revisions to the regulations require that detailed information be submitted with the income tax return.

In addition, the Service has taken other steps to encourage voluntary compliance and tighten enforcement, including the recent publication of Revenue Procedure 66–49 which provides information and guidance for taxpayers in this area. I am enclosing a copy of this publication for your information.

Finally, the Association of Art Museum Directors has recently offered to aid the Service by giving us the benefit of their knowledge and that of their staff people, on the valuation of art objects, in the form of an advisory group. This suggestion is being explored by the Service and may prove of considerable help in the direct enforcement activities of the Service and in encouraging voluntary compliance.

In summary, I acknowledge that the problem of inflated art appraisals is a difficult one from the standpoint of efficient tax administration, but I believe that the Service's enforcement efforts are effective to prevent avoidance of existing law. Undoubtedly, certain changes in existing law would simplify the enforcement problems in this area but this, I think, is a much broader problem. You may wish to discuss this aspect directly with Assistant Secretary Surrey.

Sincerely,

SHELDON S. COHEN,
Commissioner.

ONE-THOUSAND-DOLLAR-A-COUPLE CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE PRESIDENT'S FUNDRAISING CAMPAIGN

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, on October 7, the President spoke at a $1,000 a couple ticket political fundraising dinner in Washington.

According to the press a series of cocktail parties were given prior to this dinner by certain Cabinet officers and department officials, at which time the lobbyists who represented industries coming under the jurisdiction of their particular department were asked to buy tickets to the dinner.

For example, it is said that the Transportation Secretary, Alan S. Boyd, attended one of these meetings and gave a pep talk to the lobbyists of the transportation industry as to just how bad the Nation needs a Democratic administration.

Similar functions were held by other cabinet officers with the same purpose in mind; namely, get the lobbyists together and impress upon them the importance of their $1,000 a couple contributions to the President's fundraising campaign.

At a time when so much is being said by this administration about its interest in divorcing presidential campaigns from the evil of private contributions, these pressure tactics are hard to understand. In this connection there appeared in the Wall Street Journal of October 2 an appropriate editorial entitled "Makes You Wonder."

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD, followed by an article commenting on the same subject which appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of September 24, 1967.

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

MAKES YOU WONDER

The campaign subsidy bill the Administration is backing, you may remember, is intended to protect public officials from the sordid lure of lobbyists.

Everyone knows how the lobbyists work. Just when the bedraggled candidate's last dollar is gone and the TV network is about to pull the plug on its cameras, the lobbyist arrives with his Mephistophelian offer. "I'll pay the rent," he proclaims, but only with the tacit understanding that he will also call the votes. Trapped between evil forces, the poor candidate weeps as he trudges off to perpetual captivity.

To prevent such awful tragedies, the Administration has proposed to have the public pay the rent, at least for 60 days before and 30 days after elections. The candidate would be freed from the crushing necessity to accept the lobbyists' tainted money, except maybe for a few little early expenses like winning the nomination, and except maybe to pay off loans coming due after the 30-day limit and except maybe for some independent committees working for but not "authorized by" the candidate.

Admittedly, the Administration hasn't got around to doing anything to let the TV networks provide a lot of free rent, which they would be glad to do if somebody repealed the stupid law making them give frivolous candidates equal time with real ones. But then you have to stade somewhere, so why not with tax money? And who can object to the trifling sum of, say, $50 million for the ironclad protection the bill provides?

While the bill is pending, high Administration officials are circumspectly protecting themselves from lobbyists. Why, according to a recent report in the New York Times, Transportation Secretary Alan S. Boyd only had one drink at a meeting of lobbyists in a Georgetown club the other day. And he left right after he gave a little pep talk about how badly the nation needs President Johnson.

Secretary Boyd didn't have anything to do with rounding up a lot of lobbyists from the industry he helps regulate to attend the meeting with him; someone from the Democratic Party had to do that. And of course, Secretary Boyd didn't mention the tainted subject of money. It was after he was gone that somebody suggested that everyone buy $1,000-a-couple tickets to the President's Ball, intended to raise money for the forthcoming campaign and other things.

Now, we know people who think that the Administration's fear of lobbyists isn't the real reason it suggests campaign subsidies. These people think the Administration mostly wants more money for politicking and sees the public purse as an easy mark. These people even think that if the bill passes, the public will pay but relations between lobbyists and politicians will go on like always.

But maybe that isn't so. Maybe if the subsidy bill is passed President Johnson will announce that he and his party will not accept any money raised at the ball, that it will all be given to the Red Cross and the United Fund.

He'd almost have to do something like that. Otherwise, it'd make you wonder, wouldn't it?

DEMOCRATS SEEK TREATY FUNDS FROM U.S.-REGULATED FIRMS

(By John Herbers)

WASHINGTON, September 23.—A number of lobbyists for Government-regulated transportation industries was invited by the Democratic National Committee to attend an informal reception for the Secretary of Transportation, Alan S. Boyd, last Monday evening in a private club in Georgetown.

Boyd urged them to support President Lyndon B. Johnson for another term in office. Then, after the Secretary left, they were asked by a committee officer to buy $1000-a-couple tickets to a party fund-raising dinner and dance here Oct. 7.

The dinner, to be held in the Washington Hilton Hotel, has been billed as a President's ball in honor of Mr. Johnson and his wife. It is to be attended by contributors to the Democratic party from throughout the country.

FUNDS FOR CAMPAIGN

The Georgetown reception was part of the drive that party leaders are conducting quietly to assure a good turnout for the ball. At least part of the proceeds will go into next year's presidential campaign.

Invitations to the Georgetown reception were sent out under the signature of John Criswell, acting treasurer of the committee. They said: "Secretary Boyd will discuss matters of interest to you and to this Administration at this small, informal gathering."

The reception was made known by someone in attendance who asked that his name be withheld. He said it was his belief that the party improperly used the office of the Transportation Secretary to seek political support for the president from a Government regulated industry.

The source said the list of guests was weighted by representatives of shippers, truckers and airlines, most of whom lobby for their interests in Congress.

Both Boyd and Criswell said in interviews that there was nothing improper in the reception. Criswell said the reception was not arranged for representatives of the transportation industry but for a "cross section" of people who had contributed to the party in the past, both Democrats and Republicans.

The source declined to provide a list of those attending, saying he did not want to embarrass them.

BOYD SPEAKER

The reception was held in the Georgetown Club. The facilities of the club were made available by one of the club's members. About 40 persons attended.

Boyd, who arrived after a cocktail party was under way, gave a brief talk, describing how well off the country was under Mr. Johnson and saying that the country needed the President four more years.

Boyd left after the talk, almost abruptly, the source thought.

Criswell spoke next, reciting the party's past financial troubles. He said that the financial picture was looking up, but that he was convinced that contributors might get the idea that there were no money problems remaining.

Criswell then suggested that those present buy tickets to the dinner. The President would not only be at the dinner, the audience was told, he would stay and dance.

No attempt was made to sell tickets at the meeting. The informant said that most of those attending could not afford to buy tickets themselves and presumably were expected to pass the word to their corporate officers. Under the Corrupt Practices Act, corporations are forbidden to make political contributions, but it is common practice for businesses to do so through individuals.

SOLICITATIONS REPORTED

At least two of those attending the reception, it was learned, agreed to buy tickets. Later it was learned that Jack J. Valenti had solicited others in their companies in New York to buy tickets. Valenti, a former special assistant to the President, is president of the Motion Picture Association of America.

Boyd was appointed the first Secretary of the Department of Transportation last Nov. 6. Economic regulatory functions are exercised outside the Transportation Department by independent agencies such as the Civil Aeronautics Board. Members of these agencies, however, are appointed by the President and the Administration has some advisory influence over rates and routes.

A former member and chairman of the CAB, Boyd has a reputation as an official who cannot be swayed by political pressures. When he was informed that word of his appearance at the Georgetown reception was to be published, Boyd invited a reporter to his office and said he would be glad to answer any questions.

"I am glad to do anything I can honestly and ethically to help Lyndon Johnson," he said. "I knew this speech was indorsed and encouraged by the Democratic National Committee. I was asked to talk about our programs and urge support for the President."

He stressed that no plea for funds was made in his presence and that he expected never to know who at the meeting made a party contribution and who did not.

The invitation to appear came to him through an assistant who had been contacted by the committee, Boyd said.

Had the White House suggested that he make such appearances?

"Absolutely not," Boyd replied. "I bet Lyndon Johnson never had any idea that the meeting was being held."

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Is there further morning business?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be able to speak for 5 minutes during the morning hour.

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

SEPTEMBER DROP IN INDUSTRIAL PRODUCTION WEAKENS THE CASE FOR TAX INCREASE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the argument that this country is suffering a runaway, demand-pressured inflation was dealt another blow yesterday when the Federal Reserve Board disclosed that industrial production fell in September. I repeat—fell, dropped—in September by 1.5 points.

Mr. President, this is not the kind of performance that occurs in an economy in which the pressure of demand is excessive. September was the third month in fiscal year 1968, a year in which the big deficit is supposed to be so inflationary; yet we are producing less, production in September was not only lower than in August, it was actually below the level of 1 year ago.

Mr. President, keep in mind the fact that American manpower is expanding at the rate of one and a half million workers per year. Recognize that the productivity of all this Nation's workers is increasing at the rate of more than 3 percent per year, so that even if the work force were stationary, not expanding—and it is expanding—they could produce 3 percent more or at the present level of the industrial production index, about 4.5 points more each year. Recognize, Mr. President that our plant and facilities are expanding their potential at the rate of 6 percent or 7 percent per year—on the basis of present investment in plant and equipment—and we can appreciate that this latest statistic showing a drop in industrial production last month and a lower figure for production this year than 1 year ago, shows the economy to be suffering from too much slack, not too much demand.

I am sure that, in the coming months—very possibly this month—there will be an increase in industrial production. I invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that we are producing less than we produced a year ago, with our expanding economy, with our expanding plants, with our expanding work force, and with our rising productivity, so that we can afford to increase demand substantially without getting into anything like demand inflation.

Furthermore, in the last few days, we have also been informed that the level of unemployment increased last month, the sharpest climb in 5 years, to a level of 4.1 percent. Is this evidence of an exuberant economy? Does the unemployment increase show a need to slow down the economy?

It is clear that the argument for a tax increase cannot be based on current economic conditions. None of this is to argue, Mr. President, that we do not have a serious inflationary problem. We do indeed. Prices have been going up, and going up at an unacceptable and growing rate. But it is the result of increasing cost and the pressure of that cost on prices, not the result of a demand that outpaces the economy's capacity to produce enough to meet that demand.

None of this is to argue that we do not have a serious Federal deficit. We do, indeed, face this problem too.

But a tax increase may not help us solve either the inflation problem or the deficit problem. Taxes are costs. The tax increase will add to costs. The corporate tax increase will add to business costs and to the prices that business must charge. The personal income tax increase will add to consumer costs and to the cost of living for most consumers, because taxes must be paid just as surely as food must be bought.

The tax increase will not restrain inflation. Yes, it will diminish demand; but demand is already inadequate. A further reduction in demand with less industrial production, with more idle plant facilities, with additional unemployment is hardly the sensible way to bring down prices.

Mr. President, the tax increase may not reduce the deficit very much, if at all. Economists almost unanimously agree that the 1964 tax cut actually increased rather than reduced Federal revenues, by increasing incomes and profits

sufficiently so that even at the lower rates revenues were higher.

That is, we reduced taxes in 1964 and Federal revenues increased sharply in 1965 and 1966. They argue that this happened because it raised income and made more profits, so that even with the lower rate, revenues increased.

It is clear that if this can work to increase revenue when there is a tax cut, it can also work—although not inevitably—but it can also work so that if we increase taxes, we may reduce revenues. It can very possibly have that effect, especially in view of the drop in industrial production and the increase in unemployment, even without the tax increase.

Similarly a tax increase now could very possibly depress income so that even at higher rates the net revenues would be lower than without the tax increase.

At any rate, Mr. President, there is no economic case for a tax increase now.

I ask unanimous consent that the National Summary of Business Conditions compiled by the Federal Reserve Board, dated October 16, 1967, be printed in the RECORD; together with a single page of tables from this release of the Federal Reserve Board, and an excellent editorial from this morning's Washington Post putting the present economic situation in perspective.

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

FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD NATIONAL SUMMARY OF BUSINESS CONDITIONS, OCTOBER 16, 1967

Industrial production and factory employment declined in September partly as a result of work stoppages. The value of retail sales rose slightly further and prices of industrial products generally showed advances. Bank credit, time deposits, and the money supply showed less increase than earlier in the quarter. Yields on public and corporate securities generally rose further by mid-October.

INDUSTRIAL PRODUCTION

The index of industrial production was 156.3 per cent of the 1957–59 average in September, influenced by the direct and indirect effects of work stoppages in the auto, copper, and steel transportation industries. The September total was 1.5 points below the downward revised August rate of output. Output of ordnance and other defense equipment continued to expand in September. Appliances and TV set production showed little further change following a sharp recovery earlier from work stoppages and inventory liquidation.

Auto assemblies, which reached a seasonally adjusted annual rate of 8.4 million units in August, were curtailed to 6.8 million units in September. Reflecting partly the lowered rate of capacity utilization, output of industrial equipment has fallen off somewhat further since June and total business equipment has shown little change.

Output of steel and some other industrial materials was reduced in September by work stoppages. As a result of the improved Mid-East supply, the curtailment of domestic crude oil output continued in the first week of October.

EMPLOYMENT

Employment in nonfarm establishments declined by 115,000 in September as work stoppages contributed to a net reduction in manufacturing employment of 180,000. This decline was only partially offset in the total by a net rise of 65,000 in non-manufacturing activities. The average factory workweek continued to change little but was about 2 per cent shorter than a year earlier. Employment gains continued in private service industries and were resumed in retail trade, but strikes of teachers in some cities temporarily reduced local government employment. The unemployment rate rose to 4.1 per cent from 3.8 per cent in August, reflecting a sharp rise in the number of women entering the labor force.

DISTRIBUTION

The value of retail sales edged up further in September and remained 4 per cent above a year earlier, according to advance Census estimates. The September increase reflected mainly a 2 per cent rise in sales at durable goods stores as a result partly of the earlier introduction of new model autos and at higher prices. The level of retail sales at nondurable goods stores was about unchanged.

COMMODITY PRICES

There were widespread increases in prices of intermediate products and various consumer items including new autos and appliances in September and in early October. Prices of speculative commodities meanwhile generally continued to change little, and lumber and plywood reversed part of their earlier run-up as supplies improved. Prices of farm products declined somewhat further reflecting mainly decreases in feed grains and hogs.

BANK CREDIT, DEPOSITS, AND RESERVES

Commercial bank credit expanded $2.2 billion in September—much less rapidly than over the preceding two months but close to the strong average rate of the first half year. In contrast to the large security acquisitions in July and August, banks reduced slightly their holdings of Treasury issues in September and added only modestly to portfolios of other securities. Total loans rose $2 billion over the month—only slightly below the average July-August increase—with business loan growth continuing modest for the second consecutive month.

The money supply showed little further rise in September, resulting in a third-quarter annual rate of increase of 7.0 per cent, about the same as that over the first half of the year. Time and savings deposits rose $1.7 billion, about one-third less than the unusually large increase in August. U.S. Government deposits continued to rise on balance.

Total and required reserves increased somewhat further. Net free reserves dropped slightly to an average of about $250 million over the four statement weeks ending September 27, as a small decline in excess reserves exceeded that in borrowings.

SECURITY MARKETS

Over the past month yields have risen in all maturity areas of the U.S. Government securities market. At mid-October, yields were about 4.60 per cent on 3-month Treasury bills, 5.50 per cent on some intermediate-term issues, and 5.25 per cent on long-term bonds. Recent issues of short- and intermediate-term Federal Agency obligations have been marketed at yields ranging from 5.50 per cent to 5.88 per cent.

Yields on corporate and municipal bonds have advanced fairly steadily since mid-September; new issue yields have advanced especially sharply, and are currently at levels clearly above those reached last year. In heavy trading volume, common stock prices also moved up to all-time highs near the end of September, but since then have fluctuated within a narrow range.

Series	Seasonally adjusted				Not seasonally adjusted			
	1967			1966	1967			1966
	September [1]	August	July	September	September [1]	August	July	September
Industrial production, total	156.0	158.0	157.0	158.0	160.0	158.0	151.0	161.0
Market groupings:								
Final products	157.0	158.0	157.0	156.0	162.0	[2] 157.0	[2] 151.0	161.0
Consumer goods	146.0	148.0	147.0	147.0	154.0	148.0	140.0	154.0
Business equipment	180.0	[2] 181.0	[2] 181.0	177.0	182.0	[2] 178.0	[2] 177.0	178.0
Materials	156.0	[2] 157.0	156.0	159.0	157.0	158.0	[2] 150.0	161.0
Industry groupings:								
Manufacturing	158.0	159.0	158.0	160.0	161.0	158.0	151.0	164.0
Durable goods	161.0	164.0	[2] 162.0	167.0	163.0	159.0	155.0	170.0
Nondurable goods	154.0	[2] 154.0	152.0	151.0	159.0	157.0	[2] 145.0	156.0
Mining	125.0	[2] 128.0	128.0	121.0	127.0	[2] 129.0	125.0	123.0
Utilities	182.0	[2] 182.0	[2] 182.0	177.0	----	----	----	----
Employment and payrolls:								
Nonagricultural, total	125.8	126.1	[2] 125.5	122.6	127.0	[2] 126.5	125.9	123.8
Manufacturing, production workers:								
Employment	111.4	112.9	111.6	114.0	113.7	[2] 113.5	111.1	116.4
Payrolls [3]	154.0	[2] 155.5	[2] 151.4	154.6	157.1	[2] 155.0	150.5	157.7
Freight carloadings	90.2	89.7	85.2	95.0	94.0	93.9	82.4	99.2

[1] Preliminary. [2] Revised. [3] Value data.

EXPANSION AND CONFUSION

The Administration continues to insist that a tax increase is the only alternative to economic ruin, but people are more likely to be confused than persuaded by that argument. Consider two items in last week's news. On Wednesday it was announced that unemployment in September rose from 3.8 to 4.1 per cent of the civilian labor force, the highest level since late 1965. That announcement brought no audible sounds of concern from exalted places. Yet on Friday, with the news that the gross national product advanced at the annual rate of $15 billion during the third quarter, a "high administration official" declared "that the economy is going forward too quickly, at an unsustainable rate" and added the familiar bit about the "compelling logic for a tax increase." But how is a perilously rapid growth of total demand reconciled with rising unemployment? When that puzzle is solved the case for higher taxes collapses.

The point at which to begin is the fallacious characterization of the third quarter advance in GNP. As a result of prior monetary restraint, the growth of the GNP was halted in the first quarter of this year and slowed in the second. But now that the economy is again undergoing a pervasive expansion, the GNP is growing rapidly as it does in every recovery from a recession or slowdown.

If the current rate of GNP growth were sustained, if over the next 12 months $60 billion were added to the total demand for goods and services, few of the nightmares conjured up by Administration economists would materialize. A $60 billion advance from the second quarter of 1967 implies a 7.75 per cent growth rate in current prices and a "real" growth rate (measured in constant price) of less than 5 per cent. Nothing in recent experience suggests that such a pace is fraught with danger.

But although a $60 billion advance is sustainable, it is not likely to be realized over the next year for the following reasons. Consumer expenditures, especially for goods,

continue to be sluggish, and so long as they are, businesses are not likely to make large additions to a total stock of inventories that is already high in relation to sales. Fixed investment—residences, industrial structures and capital equipment—has increased modestly. But with disappointing profits in manufacturing industries and high mortgage rates, the upsurge of investment outlays necessary to sustain a rapid growth of GNP is nowhere in sight. A stimulus from defense outlays, which increased by less than $2 billion in the third quarter, seems unlikely at the moment.

When the rise in the unemployment rate—which is accounted for by adult females—is viewed in the context of a pervasive but far from spectacular recovery, the underlying cause is apparent. The entry and exit of married women from the labor force hinges on the employment opportunities. Having dropped out of the labor force in large numbers during the mini-cession, women are again seeking jobs but are not finding them as quickly as they did in the 1965–66 period. The sharp rise in female unemployment, which may in part be due to a definitional change, suggests that talk about an overheated economy with tight labor markets is somewhat premature.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The gross national product is now estimated to be $15 billion which, with the Ford strike, is something that should concern us.

In a memorandum some time ago entitled "Proposed Tax Surcharges," the staff of the Joint Economic Committee estimated that the third quarter gross national product rise was likely to be $16 billion higher and for the fourth quarter another increase of $20 billion is estimated. Preliminary third quarter data, the staff of the Joint Economic Committee informs me, confirms that estimate and a $20 billion fourth quarter is still very likely.

As I say, this increase in gross national product is something to be concerned about, but if we simply take the billion dollar increase, without any analysis, we are going to deceive ourselves, because a great deal of that increase is the result of the fact that prices have risen, and risen quite sharply, in the third quarter, and they are going to increase again in the fourth quarter. Much of this increase is not an increase in additional goods and services, but simply an increase in prices.

It is possible to have a substantial increase in the gross national product without an increase in business activity. This is the nature of a significant part of the increase in the gross national product.

At any rate, as the fine Washington Post editorial which I just placed in the RECORD stated, we could have a growth of 5 percent in real terms in the coming year, in view of the slack in our economy, without significant inflationary pressures.

At the same time, I would agree with the staff of the Joint Economic Committee, which has informed me that the rate of monetary expansion is excessive and inflationary. It is above that which was recommended unanimously by the Joint Economic Committee in its economic report. The rate of increase in the money supply by the Federal Reserve Board is almost as high as it has ever been. The last time the Federal Reserve Board had this kind of increase in the monetary supply, we ended up with the beginning of the credit crisis in 1966.

I would hope the Federal Reserve Board would slow down its rate of monetary increase. I realize that the Federal Reserve Board has great problems, but if it can slow down the rate of monetary increase it can help us have economic stability and remove the necessity for a tax increase.

There are some cynics who say that the reason why the Federal Reserve Board is doing what it is is to give ammunition to those who want a tax increase, but I am sure that the Federal Reserve Board consists of men of integrity and that the Board is proceeding in this case, as it has in the past, based on what the Board thinks is the best prescription for our economy.

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. I ask unanimous consent that I may have 2 additional minutes.

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. At any rate, I would hope the increase in the monetary supply, which has contributed to the increase in prices, could be slowed down.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDENT'S STATEMENT ON THE SMALL BUSINESS ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1967

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, when President Johnson signed the Small Business Act Amendments of 1967 into law last week, he placed his signature to a written expression of the confidence which the Federal Government has in small business investment companies as mechanisms for supplying the equity needs of small business.

As the President pointed out in his statement of the time of the signing, 95 percent of the businesses in the United States are small. These businesses are, and always have been, the mainstay of our system of free enterprise. They deserve the full support of the Congress and the administration, for they represent the very foundation of our economy.

The Congress still has more work to do to help the small businesses of America. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Small Business of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I shall do what I can to give the Senate the opportunity to vote, during the present Congress, on legislation to help small businessmen who are subject to loss from crime, or riots in our cities. I hope that companion measures to S. 1862, dealing with necessary tax incentive for small business investment companies, will soon be before us.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that President Johnson's remarks on the signing of S. 1862 be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

PRESIDENTIAL STATEMENT ON S. 1862, SMALL BUSINESS ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1967

America itself began as a small business. The first Virginia settlers came to these shores as a joint stock company.

As the Nation grew, so did the shops and factories that gave it commercial life. The earliest American dream—of being one's own boss in a land of unbounded opportunity—has remained a pillar of our economic strength.

Today, 95% of the businesses in the United States are small. They employ 4 out of every 10 of our wage earners. They provide a family income for more than 75 million Americans.

Through the Small Business Administration, your Government helps small businesses to grow and prosper. The neighborhood furniture store, the machine shop downtown, the new manufacturing plant in a depressed rural area—these and thousands of other small businesses have been given life through loans generated by the SBA.

Such loans have also helped many disadvantaged citizens take a productive role in our national life. Over 5000 men and women with the will and talents and energy for business—but blocked by poverty—have started the road to success with SBA help.

Businesses ravaged by flood or disaster have been restored.

All this has meant better products for the consumer. It has brought jobs and broader opportunities.

The bill I sign today—S. 1862—shows this Nation's faith in the future of small business.

It continues and expands the many worthwhile programs administered by SBA.

It allows SBA to make more loans from its own funds, up $650 million to a new high of $2.65 billion. No increase in appropriations is involved.

It extends from 10 to 15 years the repayment time for construction and renovation loans.

It improves the Small Business Investment Companies which provide a vital flow of private capital to small businesses.

It enlists the services of more retired businessmen, so that their still valuable skills and knowledge can be made available to greater numbers of small concerns.

It will help to bring more businesses and more jobs into the ghettos, through lease guarantees. This is a vital part of our new program to engage private industry in special job training programs for the hard-core unemployed.

It launches a comprehensive study of ways to protect the small businessman against criminal acts which endanger his business and often his life.

This bill, in short, strengthens the helping hand America extends to the Nation's small businessmen.

But I must point out that it becomes law at a time when the business community is imperiled by the threat of tight money.

To the businessman, a soaring interest rate is Public Enemy No. 1.

It affects all commerce, but its harshest impact falls on the little man who runs a small business. He feels it. He feels it hardest. He feels it longest.

The tax surcharge proposal now pending before the Congress can work to remove this threat.

No businessman welcomes a tax increase. No President enjoys proposing one.

But I believe that most businessmen would rather pay a little more in taxes than expose themselves to the uncertain and uneven effects of tight money and spiraling interest rates.

The tax measure I proposed last August will provide the restraint our economy needs in a fair and equitable way. It will permit businesses large and small to get the credit they need to continue to grow and prosper.

I remind the Congress and the country that the greatest service the Congress can now perform for American business, in my judgment, is to enact that legislation promptly before it is too late.

When that is done, the full potential of the bill I sign today will be unlocked.

Ours is a land where individual enterprise is highly honored. And the bill recognizes that no investment pays greater dividends to the taxpayer than this—to give a man the tools with which he can shape his own success.

WOODROW WILSON GUTHRIE

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, when a great American dies, each of us shares in the sorrow of his passing. But in recalling him and his work, we also solidify for ourselves and our children a part of our heritage and tradition.

So it is with the death on Tuesday, October 3, 1967, of Woodrow Wilson Guthrie, one of the foremost folk singers and composers of this or any age.

Although he was not from my State of Indiana, I share a sense of loss in his death. For one thing, he was from my wife's native State of Oklahoma. But, more important, his life—as exemplified in his music and his deeds—transcended state boundaries and reached to the soul of our Nation.

Woody Guthrie was a personification of America—of the trials and challenges of the poor, the weary, the neglected.

He wandered across the length and breadth of this great land, jabbing the conscience of the complacent, portraying the pathos of poverty, urging his fellow man to new hope through utilization of the great opportunity that America held out to him.

While he sang of the cruel desert dust storms, and the pain and deprivation of the great depression, and the lonely burdens of the poor farmer, and the travail of the city's sweatshops, he never lost sight of the blessings of America—blessings which he knew instinctively would be shared eventually by the vast majority of his countrymen.

So while he characterized the blemishes on the face of America, he did so with love—and he also sang of her beauty:

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.

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.

Woody Guthrie sought to improve America, not to condemn her. When her freedom was imperiled in World War II, he joined the merchant marine, participated in three invasions and twice sailed on ships that were torpedoed by the enemy. And he wrote songs of the gallant men who gave their lives to defend this land.

Woody Guthrie will be remembered as long as there are men to sing songs and as long as there are men who believe in America and strive to make it an even better place in which to live and work.

THE COPPER STRIKE

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, as you know, a nationwide copper strike is crippling a vital segment of our economy. In my State of Arizona, where more than 50 percent of all domestically produced copper originates, many communities have been severely hit.

On August 28, a number of Senators from States affected by this strike filed before this body, Senate Resolution 161, pleading with the President of the United States to invoke the emergency provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act in order to at least temporarily halt this strike.

Just yesterday, I received a letter from an Arizonan which I feel spells out far better than I am able exactly how hard pressed many of our people are becoming as a result of this protracted strike. I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

ROAD MACHINERY CO.,
Phoenix, Ariz., October 13, 1967.

U.S. Senator PAUL FANNIN,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PAUL: Last week our small company had 60 employees. This week our staff has been reduced to 50 because of what effect the copper strike is having in our industry as a machinery supplier. Practically all of the other 14 machinery firms in Arizona have had to make similar reductions in personnel.

In addition to letting 10 faithful and good people go, we had to reduce the salaries of the remaining 50 people from 5% to as high as 25% in an attempt to keep our costs within our income.

I fully appreciate that you, individually, can do little about this situation, but it is illustrative of what private enterprise must do to keep alive.

After taking action like this, which necessitates dealing in peoples lives, I think about what our Government is doing in having a 29 billion dollar deficit and yet little is ever done to reduce expenses. In the past year, it appears that something approaching 230,000 people have been added to the Governmental payroll—and now consideration is being given to adding Television production to the cost of government—consideration is being given to spend tax money to pay for election campaign costs—and it appears our Government is attempting to be all things to all people.

Then we read about the necessity of increasing taxes with no action taken to reduce expenditures.

Our "gang" here at our company discuss our government and the direction we see it taking quite often and everyone I know is quite disturbed over the fact that it is spend, spend—tax and tax but nothing ever done about reducing expenditures.

It seems that all of us agree it is hopeless to expect Congress to do anything about this and the result is anger which is expressed at the local level which, unfortunately, results in school bond issues, public works bond issues and hospital bond issues being defeated at the ballot box.

Many of these bond issues are deserving of full support of all citizens but since this seems to be the only effective voice of protest anyone can make, it results in defeat for these bond issues.

No one I know would complain about additional taxes IF it was needed to properly support our men in Viet Nam. Our young men over there are deserving of the best that this nation can provide for them, as long as they are being subjected to losing their lives or being seriously wounded. Many of us are confused as to whether or not our nation should be involved in Viet Nam but as long as our young men are there, we MUST fully support them in all of their needs—and if taxes must be increased to do this, then we must increase taxes.

A tax increase without a reduction in non-defense spending would be a most serious blow to the morale of our nation which is already at a rather low level.

President Johnson recently was quoted as saying he was not of the opinion the morale of the citizens of our nation had lessened. If he would contact the "people" and ignore the advice of those who will tell him only what they know in advance he wants to hear, I feel quite positive he will find there is considerable unrest in our nation, especially as it applies to our government trying to be all things to all people and thus end up spending more money than what is collected.

This, I grant you, is only one man's opinion but I can assure you there are many, many people who believe as I do. Only recently I returned to Phoenix from a two week business trip to Philadelphia, St. Louis, Minneapolis and San Francisco where I found many, many responsible people expressing similar thoughts as I have written in this letter.

May I hope that somehow, someway Congress will take the necessary steps to stop adding non-defense expenditures to our nation's budget and reduce the non-defense expenditures already appropriated.

Yours very truly,

HAROLD R. BONE,
President.

A VISIT TO THE SYLVANIA TRACT

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, recently I received from a constituent of mine, Mrs. Ruth Stolle, a column by Mr. Cedric Vig called Wisconsin Woodsmoke. In this column Mr. Vig describes his first trip into the beautiful Sylvania tract in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan.

The trip is reported not only through Mr. Vig's eyes but also through the eyes of some friends who accompanied him on the trip. All of these men are experienced outdoorsmen who know and appreciate the great out of doors. I think that their reflections on the trip clearly show that the Sylvania tract represents one of the most significant natural resource acquisitions in recent years.

Careful and tasteful development of this spectacular area by the Forest Service will insure its preservation for generations to come. I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Vig's column be printed in the RECORD.

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

WISCONSIN WOODSMOKE

(By C. A. Vig)

Tonight our fireplace is kicking up a big fuss—crackling and sputtering—banging and spitting. We're burning a couple of chunks of cedar from Sylvania.

"Sylvania!" Ever since we heard this word we've wanted to go there. "Untouched, unspoiled, a wilderness of pristine beauty." That's how they described it.

The news stories, a talk at Rotary, and an article on Sylvania in the July-August issue of "Better Camping" written by J. L. O'Sullivan sparked our interest. We wanted to dip our paddles in those unpolluted waters; carry our canoes over the portages; watch the eagles soar in Michigan's blue skies.

Last Saturday we went!

SYLVANIA

According to our speedometer, it's a 60-mile jaunt from Rhinelander to this 18,870 acre tract west of Watersmeet, Michigan.

As we drove into the area, we realized that we had seen a similar landscape and forest cover in the Phillips-Park Falls area. Yellow

birch, maple and hemlock were the predominate trees.

At the information center an attendant helped us map out a canoe route—the summer's most popular water trail—a five-hour jaunt encompassing six lakes and several portages.

Since this Federal park boasts a number of lakes and ponds, it would be easy to spend a few days canoeing, portaging and camping. This is not practical this summer since there is a ban on overnight camping.

Next year camping will be allowed in certain designated areas. However, if one expects to get back into the heart of this wilderness retreat, one will have to expend some energy in the form of hiking or paddling since motorized vehicles will not be permissible on the trails and lakes.

CROOKED LAKE

Nice lake—clear water—surrounded by conifers, principally leaning cedars—something like the Upper Brule.

The overflow from this lake gives rise to the middle branch of the Ontonagon—the stream with the North Country's prettiest waterfalls—Bond and Agate.

As we paddled across Crooked Lake, we realized that here was a land of trees and water. It has been estimated that the timber is valued at somewhere between four and five million dollars—that one-fifth of the area is covered with water.

To us the lakes were similar to those in northern Wisconsin. The forest was similar to Nicolet, Flambeau and the Porkies. However, the big difference was that there was an area that was relatively untouched by man and his axe, plow and bulldozer. There has been a minimum of man-made activity in the forest since the white pine was removed back in the 1880's.

During our push across Crooked lake we saw wildlife that is typical of a wilderness area. A pair of loons were spotted out fishing. Across our path a pileated woodpecker was seen. Above us a pair of bald eagles were soaring and screaming in the September skies. A flight of mallards rose from the wild rice beds—leaving in perfect flight formation. Other visitors have seen bear, coyotes and timber wolves.

MANSIONS

Included in the purchase price ($5,740,000) were several large mansions of the former owners. They were huge and hotel-like—symbols of the wealth and affluence of their builders.

The largest lodge was more than 200 feet in length—so large that it boasted an indoor gymnasium. The cedar logs for this lodge were shipped in from the West coast and put together by Finnish carpenters whose skill for matching and fitting logs approached perfection.

Scattered throughout the area, especially on the portages between lakes, were smaller and more livable cabins used by the guards whose job it was to keep the poachers out of this private estate.

OVER THE GROAN TRAILS

A day of lake paddling can be a monotonous affair. It takes a portage every now and then to add a bit of zest to the adventure—to take the kinks out of those canoe-cramped legs.

Our little safari took us from Crooked lake to East Bear, West Bear, Kerr, High and back to Crooked. The portages were short and easy—13–96–40–97–38–22 rods each. On the longest portages the U.S. Forest Service has erected "resting platforms" where one can perch his canoe while taking a "five."

Up in the Canadian bush a portage is frequently measured in chains. A chain is 66 feet long. There are 80 chains in a mile. Know what a quarter chain is? A rod!

On some of the old maps we've noticed that portages were measured in "carries." From what we have read about the endurance of the Indians and Voyageurs, chances are that a carry might involve a long distance—many chains.

EVALUATION

This evening as we sit before our cedar fire we have a good opportunity to evaluate our Saturday in Sylvania.

Harlan, who whetted his canoeing appetite on the Brule a few weeks ago, prefers shooting rapids to lake canoeing.

Leigh Steinman, the most ardent fisherman of the group, would like to go back and throw some hardware in some of the lakes in the area—lakes where it is said one can catch a bass with every cast—or those deep clear lakes that abound in lake trout. (High lake was the prize of the trip.)

Don thinks it a wonderful place to bring his canoeing-camping club members for their first lesson in paddling and portaging.

The rest of us would like to pay another visit to the area when the forest is covered with yellow and red leaf paint and hike the many excellent trails that are available to the visitors.

P.S.—It was a good day—one that you would have enjoyed!

IT IS TIME TO CHANGE OUR PROCEDURES IN EVALUATING PUBLIC WORKS PROJECTS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, within the past weeks, demands have increased for improved Government budgeting priorities. Business Week magazine, the Washington Post, and the Wall Street Journal—to name just a few leading publications—have pointed out the current need for Congress to insist that spending proposals reflect optimal resource allocations.

Present long-range cost-benefit evaluations are based on a 1962 document written under the auspices of the Water Resources Council set up by President Kennedy. This report, known generally as Senate Document No. 97, is entitled "Policies, Standards, and Procedures in the Formulation, Evaluation, and Review of Plans for Use and Development of Water and Related Land Resources," and establishes practices to be followed in analyzing public works projects.

Four executive agencies cooperated in drawing up the policies of Senate Document No. 97; these four agencies—the Department of the Army, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of the Interior, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—along with the Bureau of the Budget, hold the principal statutory responsibilities for Federal activities concerned with water and land resources conservation.

In Senate Document No. 97, discount rate policies for cost-benefit studies were stated in this manner:

2. *Discount rate.*—The interest rate to be used in plan formulation and evaluation for discounting future benefits and computing costs, or otherwise converting benefits and costs to a common time basis shall be based upon the average rate of interest payable by the Treasury on interest-bearing marketable securities of the United States outstanding at the end of the fiscal year preceding such computation which, upon original issue, had terms to maturity of 15 years or more. Where the average rate so calculated is not a multiple of one-eighth of 1 percent, the rate of interest shall be the multiple of one-eighth of 1 percent next lower than such average rate.

This procedure shall be subject to adjustment when and if this is found desirable as a result of continuing analysis of all factors pertinent to selection of a discount rate for these purposes.

Mr. President, witnesses during the recent Joint Economic Committee hearings on planning, programing, budgeting systems—PPBS—stressed that these policies established in Senate Document No. 97 are wrong. According to their testimony, use of the coupon rate at the date of issue of long-term Government securities leads to overestimating project benefits. Were a more realistic discount rate employed—the witnesses proposed that the expected rate of return to funds in the private sector, which is at least 10 percent instead of the 3¼-percent rate presently used—it would be possible to see which long-range spending projects actually contribute to the economy and which projects represent significant drains on the economy.

I call attention to the second paragraph of the Senate Document No. 97 discount rate policy. It says:

This procedure shall be subject to adjustment when and if this is found desirable as a result of continuing analysis of all factors pertinent to selection of a discount rate for these purposes.

There is need today for such analysis; there is need today for adjustment of the discount rate procedure spelled out in Senate Document No. 97. The possibility of a tax increase and of lower economic growth, certainly make such adjustment desirable. A few agencies already have made studies, which I have requested, utilizing alternative discount rates on public work projects. Such evaluations must be continued and encouraged by Congress. Indeed, if we agree with the testimony in the PPBS hearings, there is a clear need to revamp completely the whole policy structure established in Senate Document No. 97.

DEVELOPMENT OF WATER RESOURCES IN OKLAHOMA

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, Oklahoma has long been in the forefront in the development of water resources. A large number of multipurpose projects are under construction or completed in Oklahoma. These projects provide flood control, irrigation, hydroelectric power, municipal and industrial water supplies, and recreational benefits. We also are a leader in the upstream dam program which has been so effective in stopping soil erosion. The Arkansas River navigation program, which is vital to Oklahoma's continuing economic development, is proceeding on schedule and barges are due to come up the Arkansas to eastern Oklahoma by 1970.

I am proud of the progress Oklahoma has made in development of its water resources. Since my election to the Senate in 1964, I have worked closely with my distinguished colleague, the senior Sena-

tor from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], Congressman CARL ALBERT, the majority leader, TOM STEED, ED EDMONDSON, JOHN JARMAN, and other members of the State delegation in carrying this water development program forward. Much credit for Oklahoma's outstanding record in water development goes to the late Senator Robert S. Kerr, who envisaged 20 years ago the tremendous benefits which would come from making the Arkansas River navigable. Unfortunately, Senator Kerr did not live to see all his dream become reality.

Much of the water development work in Oklahoma is being done by the U.S. Corps of Engineers. During this fiscal year the Corps of Engineers will spend about $91.6 million on public works projects in Oklahoma. The Tulsa district engineer's office is one of the busiest in the Nation and, I might add, one of the best.

The Tulsa district engineer recently gave me fiscal information on civil works projects in Oklahoma, and I ask unanimous consent that this data be placed in the RECORD.

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

FISCAL INFORMATION ON CIVIL WORKS PROJECTS IN OKLAHOMA

SUMMARY SHEET

[In thousands of dollars]

Category	Expenditures prior to fiscal year 1961	Expenditures, fiscal year 1961 to fiscal year 1967	Expenditures projected for fiscal year 1968	Total
Construction, general	226,777	359,965	85,639	672,381
Operation and maintenance, general	15,941	22,947	5,503	44,391
General investigations	2,448	4,203	505	7,156
Total	245,166	387,115	91,647	723,928

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

[In thousands of dollars]

Project	Status	Expenditures prior to fiscal year 1961	Expenditures, fiscal year 1961 through fiscal year 1967	Expenditures projected for fiscal year 1968	Total	Fiscal year of first expenditure if subsequent to fiscal year 1961
Arkansas River and tributaries, general studies	Complete	454	52	------	506	1957
Bank stabilization (Sequoyah and Le Flore Counties)	Under construction	6,230	5,676	534	12,440	1952
Broken Bow Reservoir (McCurtain County)	----do	306	28,975	5,361	34,642	1959
Optima Reservoir (Texas County)	----do	212	2,720	1,464	4,396	1945
Lukfata Reservoir (McCurtain County)	Planning	20	285	129	434	1960
Pine Creek Reservoir (McCurtain County)	Under construction	52	9,445	5,629	15,126	1960
Crutcho Creek (LP) (Oklahoma County)	Planning	15	26	74	115	1957
Oologah Reservoir (Rogers and Nowata Counties)	Under construction	27,080	9,731	1,774	38,585	1939
Keystone Reservoir (Tulsa, Osage, Creek, Pawnee, and Payne Counties).	----do	18,797	98,966	4,669	122,432	1939
Canton Reservoir (Blaine and Dewey Counties)	In operation	10,432	698	40	11,170	1939
Fort Supply Reservoir (Woodward County)	----do	7,413	147	30	7,590	1938
Hulah Reservoir (Osage County)	----do	10,972	422	42	11,436	1938
Tenkiller Reservoir (Sequoyah and Cherokee Counties)	----do	22,264	1,155	75	23,494	1939
Eufaula Reservoir (Haskell, McIntosh, Pittsburg, Okmulgee, and Muskogee Counties).	----do	18,842	102,270	278	121,390	1948
Denison Reservoir (Johnston, Marshall, Bryan, and Love Counties.)	----do	61,416	2,100	310	63,826	1939
Fort Gibson Reservoir (Wagoner, Cherokee, and Mayes Counties.)	----do	41,485	698	101	42,284	1942
Robert S. Kerr L. & D. (Sequoyah, Le Flore, Haskell, and Muskogee Counties.)	Under construction	----------	50,107	15,570	65,677	----------
Navigational locks and dams (Wagoner and Rogers Counties)	Under construction	----------	13,971	28,211	42,182	----------
Markham Ferry Reservoir (Mayes County)	Complete	504	6,405	----------	6,909	1942
Birch Reservoir (Osage County)	Planning	----------	303	2	305	----------
Kaw Reservoir (Kay and Osage Counties)	Under construction	----------	2,573	4,822	7,395	----------
Webbers Falls L. & D. (Muskogee County)	----do	----------	18,828	13,544	32,372	----------
Copan Reservoir (Washington County)	Planning	----------	610	32	642	----------
Hugo Reservoir (Choctaw and Pushmataha Counties)	Under construction	----------	791	1,789	2,580	----------
Skiatook Reservoir (Osage County)	Planning	----------	543	57	600	----------
Waurika Reservoir (Jefferson, Stephens, and Cotton Counties)	----do	----------	238	212	450	----------
Maintenance and repair fleet and terminal (Sequoyah County)	Under construction	----------	74	376	450	----------
Shidler Reservoir (Osage County)	Planning	----------	23	127	150	----------
Heyburn Reservoir (Creek County)	In operation	30	43	20	93	1948
Enid, Okla. (LP) (Garfield County)	Complete	251	493	----------	744	1956
Washita River, Ardmore, Okla	----do	----------	29	----------	29	----------
Ponca City, Okla	----do	----------	47	----------	47	----------
Pond Creek, Okla. (Pottowatomie County)	----do	----------	14	----------	14	----------
Salt Fork Red River, Altus, Okla	----do	----------	6	----------	6	----------
Blackwell, Okla	----do	----------	49	----------	49	----------
Coyle, Okla	----do	----------	16	----------	16	----------
Cherry and Red Fork Creeks, Tulsa, Okla	Continuing	2	40	114	156	1960
Cottonwood Creek (Logan County)	Complete	----------	2	----------	2	----------
Bull Creek, Vinita, Okla	----do	----------	1	----------	1	----------
Turkey Creek, Bartlesville, Okla	Continuing	----------	65	138	203	----------
Flat Rock Creek, Tulsa, Okla	----do	----------	23	5	28	----------
Arkansas-Red salinity control	Complete	----------	300	----------	300	----------
Bird Creek, Skiatook, Okla	Continuing	----------	40	4	44	----------
East Cache Creek, Lawton, Okla	----do	----------	47	10	57	----------
Fourche Maline Creek, Wilburton, Okla	Complete	----------	1	----------	1	----------
Joe Creek, Tulsa, Okla	Continuing	----------	123	13	136	----------
Mountain Creek, Wister, Okla	Complete	----------	22	----------	22	----------
Black Bear Creek, Pawnee, Okla	----do	----------	2	----------	2	----------
Stillwater Creek and tributaries, Stillwater, Okla	Continuing	----------	56	11	67	----------
Tiger Creek, Drumright, Okla	Complete	----------	4	----------	4	----------
Turtle Creek, Yukon, Okla	Continuing	----------	31	12	43	----------
Cottonwood Canyon Creek, Cherokee, Okla	----do	----------	13	21	34	----------
Dog Creek, Waynoka, Okla	----do	----------	6	19	25	----------
Mud Creek, Idabel, Okla	----do	----------	3	20	23	----------
Nowata, Okla	Complete	----------	1	----------	1	----------
Deer Creek, Shawnee, Okla	----do	----------	38	----------	38	----------
Civil defense shelter program	----do	----------	168	----------	168	----------
Total, construction general	----------	226,777	359,965	85,639	672,381	----------

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

[In thousands of dollars]

Project	Status	Expenditures prior to fiscal year 1961	Expenditures, fiscal year 1961 through fiscal year 1967	Expenditures projected for fiscal year 1968	Total	Fiscal year of first expenditure if subsequent to fiscal year 1961
Flood control rescue operations	Continuing	30	410	119	559	
Inspection of completed work (LP)	do	13	39	23	75	
National emergency activities	Complete		9		9	
General regulatory functions			12		12	
Emergency bank stabilization, Arkansas River and tributaries	Continuing	424	1,423	305	2,152	
Advance preparation of flood emergencies		13	55		68	
Flood emergency operations		75	112		187	
Great Salt Plains Reservoir (Alfalfa County)	do	857	480	67	1,404	1941
Fort Supply Reservoir (Woodward County)	do	887	802	129	1,818	1941
Canton Reservoir (Blaine and Dewey Counties)	do	1,066	1,230	183	2,479	1948
Hulah Reservoir (Osage County)	do	617	910	174	1,701	1950
Wister Reservoir (Le Flore County)	do	838	823	188	1,849	1949
Oologah Reservoir (Rogers and Nowata Counties)	do	32	977	254	1,263	
Heyburn Reservoir (Creek County)	do	352	527	142	1,021	1950
Tenkiller Reservoir (Sequoyah and Cherokee Counties)	do	1,390	2,463	534	4,387	1953
Fort Gibson Reservoir (Wagoner, Cherokee, and Mayes Counties)	do	2,580	3,469	738	6,787	1953
Pensacola Reservoir (Mayes, Delaware, and Ottowa Counties)	do	43	61	14	118	1940
Denison Reservoir (Johnston, Marshall, Bryan and Love Counties)	do	6,639	5,409	940	12,988	1944
Eufaula Reservoir (Haskell, McIntosh, Pittsburg, Okmulgee and Muskogee Counties)	do		2,152	966	3,118	
Keystone Reservoir (Tulsa, Osage, Creek, Pawnee, and Payne Counties)	do		1,205	711	1,916	
Repair and Restoration of levees		85	197		282	
Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma			180		180	
Arkansas-Red salinity control			2	16	18	
Total operation and maintenance, general		15,941	22,947	5,503	44,391	

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS, CIVIL

Hydrologic studies	Continuing	2,103	68	17	2,188	1939
Arkansas River to Oklahoma City	Complete	49	144		193	1958
Verdigris River, Kans. and Okla	do	54	64		118	1957
Boswell Reservoir	do	18	61		79	1958
Shidler Reservoir	do	9	31		40	1959
Hugo Reservoir	do	88	3		91	1957
Kaw Reservoir	do	22	51		73	1959
Oklahoma City floodway (extension)	do	4	25		29	1960
Coordination w/other agencies (SCS)	Continuing	1	58	10	69	1960
Red River below Denison	do		736	84	820	
Chewey Reservoir	Complete		2		2	
Sallisaw Creek	do		1		1	
Sans Bois Creek (Tamaha)	do		1		1	
Pryor Creek	do		1		1	
Civil works investigation No. 154	do	58	15		73	1957
Arkansas-Red River pollution	do	42	1,127		1,169	1960
Coordination with Bureau of Reclamation	Continuing		29	5	34	
Arkansas River (Eufaula)	Complete		7		7	
Squirrel and Crutcho Creeks	do		33		33	
Cimarron River	Continuing		320	51	371	
Poteau River	Complete		222		222	
Red River Power (Broken Bow)	do		2		2	
Grand Neosho River	do		20		20	
Verdigris River	do		21		21	
Central Oklahoma project	do		807		807	
Head of navigation, Arkansas River	do		1		1	
Arkansas River, Wybark and Choska	do		15		15	
Sherwood Reservoir	do		75		75	
Waurika Reservoir	do		26		26	
Eufaula and Keystone Reservoir, Arkansas River Basin water supply, McAlester and Yale	do		2		2	
Grand Neosho River Basin	Continuing		1	50	51	
Verdigris River Basin, including navigation	do		2	70	72	
Arkansas River and tributaries, Great Bend to Tulsa	do		225	100	325	
Flood plain management	do		7	40	47	
Flood plain technical services	do			10	10	
Brush Creek flood plain	do			11	11	
Stillwater Creek flood plain	do			22	22	
Arkansas River, Keystone to Webbers Falls	do			15	15	
Tenkiller Reservoir	do			20	20	
Total, general investigations		2,448	4,203	505	7,156	

NOMINATION OF CLIFFORD L. ALEXANDER TO BE CHAIRMAN OF EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, President Johnson recently nominated an outstanding New Yorker, Mr. Clifford L. Alexander, Jr., as Chairman of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. Business Week for July 15 tells of Mr. Alexander's career and possible plans for that agency. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

A BROADER EFFORT ON JOB BIAS

Clifford L. Alexander, Jr., a tall, handsome, 33-year-old Negro who grew up in Harlem and moved smoothly through an Ivy League education into a staff job in the White House, may have lots to say about company hiring practices in the next few years.

Alexander has been picked by President Johnson to fill a five-year term as chairman of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, and will take over EEOC at a turning point in the agency's dealings with business.

For two years, EEOC has been hard put to keep ahead of an avalanche of job discrimination complaints. Now officials expect to have their caseload under control by fall, and the commission is planning to put greater emphasis on technical assistance programs to get more workers from minority groups into better jobs.

Broader scope technical assistance programs encompass a wide variety of efforts to encourage employers and unions to go beyond the letter of the law in upgrading the employment status of Negroes.

In the future, the commission will do more than investigate complaints from rejected job applicants. It will also instigate its own programs designed to get companies to change basic hiring and promotion policies that may lead to unintentional discrimination.

Companies willing to help in hiring minority workers will come under such programs voluntarily. In other cases, EEOC is expected to employ the full panoply of publicity to spotlight industries that are lagging behind in an effort to get key companies to cooperate.

In some instances, EEOC has already con-

ducted such operations, including a program to help companies building new plants to find and hire minority workers. Another example is a forum it set up in South Carolina where state, city, local, and company officials met to talk about upgrading Negro jobs in the textile industry.

But these programs have fallen behind while the agency struggled with a deluge of complaints.

Scrutiny. EEOC will begin singling out new areas for technical assistance later this summer when it finishes a computer analysis of employment patterns in individual industries. The analysis will show an industry's percentage of minority workers as compared with the population of such workers in the surrounding area. For example, one such analysis already released by the commission shows that Negro employment in petroleum refining was only about 1.5% in the San Francisco-Oakland area even though Negroes accounted for 14% and 31% of the population in the two cities, respectively.

At the same time, the National Urban League is making a study for EEOC which it will use as a basis for recommending priority areas on which the agency should focus. One of Alexander's own ideas is to create close ties between EEOC and federal job training programs. Then, if a particular company is unable to find qualified Negroes to employ, the commission could help link the company with a federal training program.

Alexander, whose parents were Harlem community leaders, was president of the student council in his Harvard undergraduate days where he received his B.A. (cum laude) in 1955, and president of the Phi Delta Phi international legal fraternity at Yale (LL.B., 1958). The fact that he is a Negro puts him one up with civil rights leaders who have been critical of EEOC in the days when it was helplessly overburdened.

Big move. His Harvard contact with McGeorge Bundy brought Alexander to Washington in 1963. He was a struggling lawyer on New York's West 55th Street when Bundy asked him to join the staff of the National Security Council. "I almost didn't accept," he recalls. He had been practicing just long enough to be gypped on a fee by a client in a criminal case, but he still saw a promising future as a lawyer. Once in the White House, he gradually phased out of Southeast Asian affairs and into such domestic problems as civil rights.

In his first test as an administrator, Alexander will be able to lean on another long-time Bundy aide and Harvard honors grad, Gordon Chase, 34, who is the agency's staff director.

Friends who work with Alexander at the White House do not think he will fall down as an administrator. "He's even-handed and well balanced," says Lee C. White, who moved from the White House himself to become chairman of the Federal Power Commission. "Cliff has the easy-going type of personality it takes to get members of a commission moving together without friction."

Focus on data. Alexander says he does not plan to go around "branding Company X a bigot." Instead, he will rely on factual information—such as EEOC's computer survey—to speak for itself.

Alexander's predecessor, Stephen N. Shulman, gets much of the credit for readying EEOC for a move into new programs. Aside from being bogged down in a backlog of cases during its first year of operation, the agency was also inexperienced, understaffed, and under financed. Moreover, the agency's first chairman, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., quit before his term expired to run for governor of New York.

Shulman, who succeeded Roosevelt, quickly whipped EEOC into businesslike trim. A tough, hard-working former McNamara "Whiz Kid," he applied the lessons of cost-effectiveness, computerization, and efficiency he had learned at the Pentagon. The number of job discrimination complaints conciliated by EEOC jumped fourfold, and before he left the job this month, Shulman predicted that the commission would be operating on schedule by fall.

Power of persuasion. EEOC, which has no legal power to force employers to change discriminatory employment and promotion policies, must rely on conciliation and persuasion. In doing so, it takes four steps:

Analyzes complaints, approximately 17,000 in its first two years of operation.

Investigates those falling within its jurisdiction.

Decides, in written opinions by the five commission members, which cases are worthy of action.

Negotiates with employers, unions, and employees to correct discriminatory situations, which may range from segregated facilities to segregated seniority lines.

Shulman claims "great changes" in streamlining each step. He saved eight days by eliminating double analysis procedures in which complaints were reviewed both in the field and in Washington. He conducted time and motion studies of investigations and came up with a model format for investigators. This has already chopped 10% to 15% off the time needed for investigations, he says, and he predicts the agency's productivity will double by late fall.

Breaking the jam. Today, EEOC has a backlog of 400 to 500 cases awaiting decisions, and this bottleneck threatens to worsen as the speed of investigations picks up. Before leaving, Shulman hired 25 students about to enter their final year of law school to help write decisions and thus to help eliminate the backlog. Shulman also set into motion the training of investigators in conciliation techniques, and increased the conciliation staff from five to 31 men. He also asked Congress for 110 additional people (the House has authorized 75), which, it is hoped, will prevent a recurrence of the backlog.

Meanwhile, EEOC, in a contract with the University of Pittsburgh, is putting its decisions, conciliation agreements, and general counsel opinions on magnetic tape for storage. At a push of a button, this information will be retrieved by EEOC headquarters in Washington and by its 11 regional headquarters. This will not only speed up decision-making but enable regional directors to make their own decisions if the commission members decide to delegate this responsibility.

Shulman believes that putting EEOC on a business-like basis will open the way for more dramatic moves into new technical assistance programs.

Obstacles. Still, despite Shulman's reforms, Alexander will face obstacles. EEOC will need more money as the number of complaints continues to mount, and Congressional conservatives may prove reluctant to give it more.

In addition, the lack of power to issue cease-and-desist orders has been a thorn in the agency's side. EEOC has settled only 43% of its conciliation efforts successfully to date. This means that nearly six out of every 10 complainants do not get the justice in jobs to which the commission believes they are entitled.

A bill to give EEOC cease-and-desist powers faces difficulty in the relatively conservative 90th Congress. Alexander is sure to keep pressing for this legislation, however, and he has the necessary access to the President to be assured of White House support.

EEOC officials say that there is a compelling reason for cease-and-desist powers. Their argument is that such powers would improve the conciliation process since businessmen, union leaders, and employment agencies will be more willing to bargain when they know the government carries a big stick.

NEMDA LABOR STUDY PROMOTES INDUSTRIAL GROWTH IN NORTHEASTERN MINNESOTA

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, in an effort to create jobs, attract industry, and promote a more diversified economy, a broadly based, privately financed $1 million industrial development corporation was formed in northeastern Minnesota 3 years ago. Named the Northeastern Minnesota Development Corporation—NEMDA—this organization is based on a concept of local cooperation involving the six counties and 50 communities which make up northeastern Minnesota and every major element in the region's economy—mining, utilities, news media, labor unions, transportation, banks, manufacturing, forest products, and retail and service firms.

As a part of the effort to attract and assist industries which might be interested in locating in northeastern Minnesota, NEMDA recently completed a systematic survey of regional labor resources. This survey points up the availability of thousands of skilled Minnesotans within the six-county region and details their experience, education, age, and willingness to undergo retraining and commute various distances for new employment. As the Duluth News-Tribune noted in a recent editorial, the NEMDA labor survey provides businesses and industries interested in northeastern Minnesota with "a completeness and abundance of detail which few, if any, comparable organizations could approach."

I commend NEMDA for its fine work and ask unanimous consent that the editorial, entitled "Workers Industry Needs," be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Duluth News-Tribune, Sept. 26, 1967]

WORKERS INDUSTRY NEEDS

Officials of industries, impressed with other resources of our region, naturally ask about the available labor supply. Thanks to a detailed and elaborate study, unique in some ways, NEMDA—the Northeastern Minnesota Development Association—can answer those questions. It can do so with a completeness and an abundance of detail which few, if any, comparable organizations could approach.

The six-county region has 3,933 men and 2,937 women who would be interested in the employment a new industry could offer. Some are unemployed, many have work now but would be interested in new jobs. Many are willing to train for this new employment.

Using the resources of ultra-modern computers, the survey includes a wealth of tabulations. Experience, education, age and willingness to commute various distances to and from work are among the points covered.

The survey is an integral part of one of NEMDA's chief purposes—more jobs, and good ones, for the people of this six-county region. We have many men and women who want to stay in this part of the country, but who would like to be working, or to be making greater use of their energies and abilities than they now find possible. The NEMDA survey of labor availability is the

equivalent of a massive application for employment.

The alert, prompt and intelligent response by those sending in the questionnaires is impressive evidence of the quality of employables that we have here.

With this new abundance of information about the workers to be found here, NEMDA can answer all the questions usually asked by executives planning a new plant, a move or an expansion. Skilled researchers can gather much of that information—and have done so—by dealing with key people in industries and government. Transportation, taxes, utility rates, availability of land and buildings are information vital to industrial planners. Much of this information NEMDA already can supply.

But knowing all that, concerns can still ask, "What kind of job applicants and trainees can we expect? How many? Where do they live? What background do they have?" Now NEMDA has those answers, too. They make up an exceedingly strong appeal, and one which will be presented with skill and persistence and intimate knowledge of this immense and constantly changing subject—one which any region outside a few highly congested areas must master to get its share of the industrial growth and dispersal which is one of the amazing aspects of American industry today.

THE ARROGANCE OF POWER

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the literary supplement of the London Times carried on October 5 a review of Senator FULBRIGHT's book, "The Arrogance of Power." The article is of interest and value not only as a perceptive review of Senator FULBRIGHT's ideas on Senate reponsibility for formation of foreign policy but also as a reflection on the constitutional issue by an "outside" observer from a nation which is a trusted and friendly ally. I ask unanimous consent that the review be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the London Times, literary supplement, Oct. 5, 1967]

WORLD AFFAIRS: FIGHTING FOR THE HILL

J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT: *The Arrogance of Power*, 264 pp. Cape. 30s.

Senator Fulbright's latest book, *The Arrogance of Power*, has a double importance. It is another shot in his campaign against the foreign policy of the Johnson Administration and he has long passed the time of ranging shots, near misses, and the rest. He is now on target. His book suffers a little, it is possible to argue, from the fact that the Senator has so many disciples, and there is an obvious similarity in *The Arrogance of Power* and Ronald Steel's *Pax Americana*. The Senator, as befits one in his position, is slightly less savage and slightly less contemptuous of the accepted wisdom of the White House and the State Department. But the politeness of his manner does not conceal the depth of his dislike and even contempt for American foreign policy and a degree of disillusionment with the leadership of his own party.

But equally important—perhaps more important and more novel to an English reader—is the revelation of the clash of powers in the American constitutional system. Senator Fulbright holds the very important and, to us, rather mysterious office of Chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. It is an office that many eminent men have held. It is an office that has been held by men who perhaps did not, in the long run, increase their prestige with the office: for example, Charles Sumner, Henry Cabot Lodge I, and William A. Borah. It has, of course, been held by nonentities. It has been almost totally eclipsed by forceful Presidents like Woodrow Wilson and F. D. Roosevelt. But the office remains—and the residuum of power.

But Senator Fulbright is not content with the residuum of power left to him and his committee. He wants to redress the imbalance of power which has grown up in Washington. From the beginning, there has been a clash between the White House and "the Hill". Senator Fulbright makes a lot of the failure of President Johnson to notice the duty of the Senate to "advise and consent" to the projects of the Executive. But this breakdown in the formal organization of American foreign policy dates back to President Washington. There have been oscillations between the power of the Executive and the power of the Senate. In a famous passage in *The Education of Henry Adams*, John Hay, a flashy if not very successful Secretary of State, complained bitterly of the way he was treated by the Senate of his time. His sympathetic and uncritical friend Adams noted:

"The fathers had intended to neutralize the energy of government and had succeeded, but their machine was never meant to do the work of a twenty-million horsepower society in the twentieth century, where much work needed to be quickly and efficiently done."

It was a one-sided view, and very soon, by their ingenuity and disregard of the letter and perhaps the spirit of the Constitution, Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson transferred power from the Hill to the White House. There were oscillations after that. The Senate got its revenge on Wilson. It sometimes thwarted Franklin Delano Roosevelt. But the whole trend in this century has been towards the uncontrolled exercise of presidential power. In this dangerous age some transfer of power was inevitable. Senator Fulbright recognizes this:

"The cause of the change is crisis. The President has the authority and resources to make decisions and take actions in an emergency; the Congress does not. Nor, in my opinion, should it; the proper responsibilities of the Congress are those spelled out by Mill—to reflect and review, to advise and criticize, to grant or withhold consent. . . . This situation is not fundamentally the fault of individuals. It is primarily the result of events, and the problem is not one of apportioning blame but of finding a way to restore the constitutional balance, of finding ways by which the Senate can discharge its *duty* of advice and consent in an era of permanent crisis."

Although Senator Fulbright was a distinguished academic and perhaps has hankered, from time to time, after British solutions to the problem (did not President Truman once declare that Senator Fulbright had been brainwashed as a Rhodes scholar at Oxford?), this is a far from academic book. It is a call to action and to immediate action. For as Senator Fulbright sees the situation, the United States has been led deeper and deeper into the Serbonian bog and led not only by the bad judgment and possibly the usurpations of President Johnson, but by the illusions, if not by the bad faith, of the President and of his Secretary of State, Dean Rusk (he too a Rhodes scholar).

Senator Fulbright goes back, historically, to various examples of the failure of the Executive to be candid or competent in its dealings with the Senate. We learn that President Kennedy consulted (of course among others) Senator Fulbright on the Bay of Pigs, but that the consultation was more or less accidental, and he was the only Senator consulted. He gave good advice which was not listened to; but President Kennedy did not avenge himself on the Senator for being proved right when the Persident had been so disastrously wrong. It may be suspected that Senator Fulbright wishes to underline the contrast of attitude between President Kennedy and his successor.

Senator Fulbright also tells us that, in the second Cuban crisis of 1962, he advised the invasion of Cuba, advice which most people will agree was fortunately not taken, and Senator Fulbright himself seems to think that had he known as much then as he does now, he would have accepted the superior wisdom of the President. So far Senator Fulbright is not recounting any breakdown of a vital character in the relationship between the President and a body which contains one main group, at any rate, of his constitutional advisers.

But with the coming of the Johnson Administration things changed. Like many other people in America and even outside it, the Senator was more shocked in 1965 by the intervention in the Dominican Republic, and by the nonsensical reasons given for it, than he was by the stepping up of American intervention in South Vietnam. The Dominican intervention did a great deal of harm, but not as much harm as the Senator had feared. And the situation in the Dominician Republic (not, as the British press almost unanimously has insisted on calling it, Dominica, thus slandering an innocent British colony) has not been totally disastrous.

It is very different when we turn to Vietnam. Here the Senator reproaches the President. For Senator Fulbright supported the famous Gulf of Tonkin resolution in which many senators see the *fons et origo mali* of the present situation. Based on insufficient knowledge, perhaps on deliberately misleading information, the senators, apart from Senator Morse and Senator Gruening, gave, whether they meant it or not, a blank cheque to President Johnson. Since then, the United States has been drawn further and further into a war which it was warned against both by General MacArthur and by his successor General Matthew Ridgway, a war which no one wants and which, starting as a version of the Mexican expedition of Napoleon III, is getting more like the Spanish ulcer of Napoleon I.

It is this situation which endangers the peace of the world, and endangers and perhaps destroys the international position of the United States. Senator Fulbright, with great wisdom, suggests a policy by which the United States could defuse the increasingly dangerous time-bomb which is still ticking away and possibly ticking louder than ever. The Senator insists that the main business is to reduce tension, and that dealing with specific problems like German unification is to be approached as a means of reducing the tensions rather than as an end in itself. For the isolating of certain problems and even their solution might, in fact, increase tensions.

In order to reduce tensions, the United States must shed "the arrogance of power". It is in his analysis of that arrogance, and of the dangers or even crimes it has led the United States into that the Senator preaches the most effective sermon. He asks, and he is asking a great deal of the Johnson Administration and the American people, that they should develop empathy with the people of Vietnam, with the Chinese, with the Russians, one is tempted to say, with the human race. He wants the United States to offer to the Soviet Union many kinds of political cooperation (and not to waste resources in a moon race). He wants foreign aid to be channelled through international organs and the United States to be content to do without effusive gratitude. He asks his countrymen to consider how they would like to have their affairs managed, possibly even improved in management, by superior out-

siders obviously taking them over, no doubt for their own good, but certainly with very little consideration for their feelings.

One of the examples he gives of a possible American reaction to having an institution taken over and remodelled for the general good is a possible proposal to get German experts to take over and run the New Haven Railroad. How completely this goes to the heart of the question only Americans or, indeed, only customers of the New Haven can fully understand!

Senator Fulbright answers very convincingly the charge that what he is preaching is a "new isolationism". It is not that, but it is a refusal to believe that all the world's problems can or should be solved by the United States. There are many things that the United States can do which perhaps it should not do, and there are many things it simply cannot do. Nor is he impressed with the argument that the United States must not lose face in Vietnam. He even dares to suggest that the United States should take the advice of General de Gaulle (who ranks at the moment as almost as much of a fabulous monster as Chairman Mao or Ho Chi-minh in the American demonology). He can be blandly ironical in contemplating some of the most belligerent publicists in the United States. He notes that the famous hearings of his committee that he called in 1966 to discuss policy in Thailand produced a violent attack from Mr. Joseph Alsop "in an obviously over-excited condition because, no doubt, of the war".

Senator Fulbright is not totally devoid of hope for his country and for the world. He notes that the United States has now a very large population of young people who do not share the fears, or possibly the overweening ambitions, of their elders. He takes over from Professor Galbraith the theory of three generations, and the least hopeful of these generations is the middle generation, the realists of the 1950s, the hard-boiled nuclear theorists, who can calculate "'acceptable' levels of 'megadeaths'". For what Georges Bernanos called in another connexion *ces petits mufles realistes*, even for their eminent professors, even a professor at Harvard, Senator Fulbright has no use. He puts his hope in the nearly sixty million people born in the United States since the end of the Second World War, an increase of population greater than the total population of France or Britain. Domestic problems of the United States are overwhelmingly important and may indeed overwhelm the United States, if many more resources are diverted to building a dyke in South-east Asia against a Chinese power that may itself be crumbling. The United States in Latin America, for instance, is very largely defending social structures that are morally indefensible, and probably in the not very long run, practically indefensible (the parallel with South Arabia may strike some British readers). Addressed mainly to his countrymen, and addressed to them less as lectures given in the John Hopkins University than as the kind of instruction about the realities of power that he feels that the Senate should give to the White House as well as to the American people, this book is a brilliant tract for the times. But it is also a tract for our times as long as we are the most trusted ally of the United States or, at any rate, of the Johnson Administration.

This is a tract for the times in more than that it is an attack on the foreign policy of the United States. It is especially timely for us since it recalls to the forgetful British public the realities of the American constitutional system. It is perfectly true that power has been sliding down an inclined plane from the Hill to the White House for a very long time. It is probably true that Senator Fulbright does not think he can do more than delay this transfer of power and do more than restore the function of the Senate as a place in which the policies of the United States are at least debated and explained with less of a credibility gap than is involved in White House press conferences. It is easy, contemplating presidential power, to murmur "No Winter shall abate this Spring's increase".

In a sense, this is true. For the reasons given by Senator Fulbright, the presidential initiative and power of sudden decision cannot and, indeed, should not be taken away. But it is educational for the President to have to justify, even if after the event, his decisions. It is also educational for the American people. And it is one of the paradoxes of the present situation that President Johnson owed his whole political career and fame to his legendary skill as a Senate manager and "undertaker" and yet has become so singularly unsuccessful in this role. (It is now not only a matter of managing the Senate, for the House Foreign Affairs Committee is far more important than it was in the days of Sol Bloom.) Senator Fulbright is not—and does not try to be—an autocrat like Henry Cabot Lodge I packing the Senate Committee. He has far more support in the Senate than has yet been publicly disclosed; and it is largely due to him that the role of a loyal opposition has fallen so much to members of the President's own party, and that the President can rely far more on Senator Dirksen, the Republican leader, than on Senators Fulbright, Mansfield, Clark and the rest. And since it is most important that we should understand the reality of the American political system, this book has a double value for today and tomorrow.

EUGENE V. DEBS AND NEGRO RIGHTS

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, on Saturday, September 23, I had the pleasure of participating in the dedication of the Eugene V. Debs Home in Terre Haute, Ind., as a national historic landmark. The Honorable Stewart L. Udall, Secretary of the Interior, gave the principal address on this momentous occasion, and many other notables, including the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] the Governor of the State, Rober Branigin, and the mayor of Terre Haute, Ralph Tucker, took part.

In the evening of the same day an Eugene V. Debs Awards dinner was held in honor of A. Philip Randolph, president of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, AFL–CIO. At this event one of the speakers was Dr. Bernard J. Brommel, a member of the history committee of the Debs Foundation and of the department of speech at the University of North Dakota. Professor Brommel presented a very fine but brief comment on the strong belief of Eugene V. Debs in civil rights, his opposition to discrimination and segregation, and his insistence that labor unions should admit persons to membership regardless of race.

Professor Brommel has for some years been engaged in research for and writing a biography of Eugene V. Debs. In his remarks he vividly portrayed the equalitarian philosophy of this great American labor leader and quoted several revealing excerpts from speeches and writings which well illustrate his compassion for his fellow man. Mr. President, in order to counteract any misconception or myths that may exist about his views, I ask unanimous consent that this short essay entitled, "Debs and Negro Rights" be printed in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

DEBS AND NEGRO RIGHTS

(By Bernard J. Brommel)

Early in his career Eugene V. Debs recognized the problems that Negroes faced in America. As a young Democratic legislator in the Indiana General Assembly, Debs objected to the manner in which many of his colleagues campaigned for Negro votes in 1885. He discovered that they considered a thousand Negro votes worth one job on the police force or post office, and five hundred votes worth a "spittoon cleaning job" at the court house. At the first convention of the American Railway Union in 1893, Debs asked the delegates to admit Negro workers. He failed, but thereafter he never missed an opportunity in his union-organizing career to plead for equality in the unions.

After the failure of the Pullman Strike in 1894, Debs often told audiences that one of the reasons the A.R.U. failed was because they refused to accept Negroes, and thus encouraged the railroad owners to hire Negroes as strikebreakers. He repeated the same arguments to the mining union organizers and cited numerous examples of strikes in Illinois, West Virginia, and other states in which mine owners deliberately hired Negro workers for brief periods of time to end strikes. In a 1903 article in the *American Labor Journal*, Debs recounted his efforts on behalf of Negroes. ". . . All my life I have opposed discrimination," he stated. "The first requisite in elevating the Negro is to get off his back."[1] In another the Negro should not be satisfied with equality with reservations. "Why should he be?" he question. "Suppose you change places with the Negro just a year, then let us hear from you." He concluded by wisely stating that he knew that race prejudice in the North was often as intense as in the South. "Any man," he declared, "who advised the white wage worker to look down upon the black wage worker was the enemy of both."[2]

Although Debs' manuscripts contained many references to his work for the Negro, his speech. "An Appeal to Negro Workers," delivered at Commonwealth Casino in New York City on October 30, 1923, best summarized his attitude and efforts on their behalf. Debs' address followed preliminary speeches by James O'Neal, Lucille Randolph, Frank R. Crosswaith, and A. Phillip Randolph, then editor of *The Messenger*, a publication Debs read and praised. In this speech Debs demonstrated his considerable knowledge of Negro history. "I do not speak to my colored friends in any patronizing sense; I meet them upon a common basis of equality; they are my brothers and sisters, and I want nothing that is denied them, and if there is any one of them who will shine my shoes, and I am not willing to shine his, he is my moral superior," Debs announced to the large crowd. Prophetically Debs outlined a course of action for the Negro to gain his rights. ". . . There is nothing that you cannot do for yourselves," he advised. "You can compel the respect of others only when you respect yourselves." "As long as you are unorganized; as long as you are indifferent; as long as you are satisfied to remain ignorant; you will invite contempt and receive it," he continued. "Everything depends upon education".[3]

Fundamentally Debs believed that if you provided the Negro the same chance, the same opportunity that you gave a white man,

[1] "The Negro Question," July 9, 1903, p. 7. statement a year later, Debs declared that

[2] "The Negro and His Nemesis," *International Socialist Review*, February 1904, p. 391.

[3] "Appeal to Negro Workers" Debs Ms., Tamiment Library, New York City.

"he would register as high upon the mental and moral thermometer of civilization." [4] Debs refused to speak in the cities in the South that enforced segregation in auditoriums. He preferred to speak in a park to prevent this disgraceful practice. Debs admonished the Negroes not to accept charity. "Charity is degrading," he declared. "What the Negro wants is individual freedom and then he will attend to his own needs." [5] Late in life, Debs made this comment, "I know no race, no color, and no creed. At the roots we are all alike, depending upon the circumstances in which we find ourselves placed." Through the practice of this philosophy Debs made a contribution to mankind.

TAX CREDITS AND THE NEED TO REVITALIZE STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, the costs of government are growing rapidly. This is particularly true of our State and local administrations which are struggling to cope with a host of 20th-century challenges on 19th-century budgets. Significant help must be provided if they are not to be innundated by the problems of urban America.

Thus, it is with great pleasure that I note former North Carolina Governor Terry Sanford's call for a major effort to improve the revenue bases of these vital units of government. Governor Sanford, who has been conducting a 2-year, $280,000 study at Duke University on the problems of State administration, has urged that the Federal Government grant a substantial credit for State income taxes against Federal income tax payments.

On May 10, I introduced a bill—S. 1743—the Tax Credit Act of 1967, which would provide a 50-percent credit against Federal income tax payment for all income levies imposed by State and local governments.

Governor Sanford's endorsement of this approach to governmental reform is heartening recognition by a noted State administrator of the value of a creative Federal stimulus to supplement, if not supplant, an expansion of the Federal grant-in-aid system. I wholeheartedly agree that further uncontrolled growth of these programs could only add to the confusion already besetting the States.

As Mr. Sanford said:

Federal programs are uncoordinated, leading to overlapping, duplication, triplication, conflicting goals, cross-purposes, lack of consistency and loss of direction.

Mr. President, State and local governments know their own problems best. By giving them the option of raising more of their own revenue through the increased tax base made available by a partial Federal credit, they can experiment with new techniques and expand creative programs as they prove their effectiveness.

I also concur with Mr. Sanford's view that the much talked about proposal for Federal revenue sharing with the States is an extremely interesting approach and one which might prove of great value in the future. Unfortunately, as he observes, the high costs of the Vietnam war make it impossible to enact such a large-scale effort now.

While the tax credit program may only be a part of a long-term effort to spur State and local government, one of its greatest assets is that we need not wait to begin. For the cost of such a system will not be prohibitive and will certainly generate far more money for State and local programs than the present conglomeration of Federal grants. The Federal Government already sustains a tax loss under the current systen. of permitting taxpayers to deduct their State and local taxes. In fact, it is estimated that every dollar of income tax currently collected by State and local governments results in about a 24-cent reduction of Federal income tax liability. Thus, the initial cost of a partial Federal credit would be far less than is sometimes presumed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a recent article from the New York Times discussing Mr. Sanford's suggestion 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 New York Times, Oct. 16, 1967]

REPORT DEMANDS BIG EFFORT TO REVITALIZE STATES—SANFORD WARNS OF POSSIBLE ABUSES OF CENTRAL POWER—TAX SHARING AND GUIDANCE TO URBAN AREAS PROPOSED

(By Peter Kihss)

A major effort to revitalize the states was called for yesterday on the eve of the National Governors Conference. The object of the plan is to defend the nation's Federal system against "possible abuses of centralized power" and to meet the staggering "challenge of the urban areas."

An outline for reform was made public by Terry Sanford, former Governor of North Carolina, as the result of a two-year, $280,000 study he conducted at Duke University with grants from the Ford Foundation and the Carnegie Corporation of New York. He gave copies of his report, published as a McGraw-Hill Book Company book, "Storm Over the States," to conference members at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel yesterday.

One four-point proposal dealt with how to pay for the project. This suggested, first that the states "get their tax houses in order." Mr. Sanford said 13 states still had no individual income tax, 11 had no corporate income tax and seven had no broad-based sales tax.

SUBSTANTIAL TAX CREDIT

The proposal also called for a "substantial" credit for state income taxes that would be allowed against the Federal income tax.

It further proposed a relaxation of Federal regulations on grant programs.

Only thereafter would Congress be asked to let the states share in perhaps 1 or 2 per cent of Federal income tax revenues for general funds as proposed by Walter W. Heller while he was chairman of the President's Council on Economic Advisers.

Mr. Sanford said that the cost of the Vietnam war in any event would delay Federal tax-sharing. However, he told a news conference that he would consider it "very great progress" if the Heller plan was being seriously debated "five years from now."

Only the use of state powers can "bring order to urban growth" and "avoid the unordered piling up of problems upon problems," Mr. Sanford wrote in his report. He added:

ADVICE FOR NEW YORK

"New York City, like a fat man, needs to change to a more healthful diet and take off weight under the doctor's orders and supervision. It doesn't need more industry. It needs less. It doesn't need to gain population in the next decade. It needs to lose population."

"One of the first things the states can do is help and guide the cities to stop, look around and start over," he went on.

Each state, he proposed, should set up its own department for urban affairs. The states, he said, should use their powers of taxing, annexation, eminent domain and zoning and their over-all view to encourage proper land use, halt "overrunning of open land by urban sprawl," promote mass transit and encourage better housing and "separated city clusters of the future."

Like other cities, New York, Mr. Sanford said to newsmen, has "urban problems" going beyond city borders. Now, he said, every major city is competing for new industry to "get everything it can on the tax books," whereas he held that, "ideally, parts of a metropolitan area should be kept open or used for single-family dwellings."

Mr. Sanford, who was the Democratic Governor of North Carolina from 1961 to 1965, is now a lawyer in Raleigh, N.C.

The new report, he said, was the third and last phase of his two-year study. The first helped start an Education Commission of the States, with offices in Denver, and the second led to an Institute on State Programming for the Seventies, directed by former Governor Jack M. Campbell of New Mexico.

In the new report, Mr. Sanford wrote:

"Federal programs are uncoordinated, leading to overlapping, duplication, triplication, conflicting goals, cross-purposes, lack of consistency and loss of direction."

The states, he said, have traditionally been experimenters and innovators. Currently, he said, California is exploring space-age techniques for problems of transportation, waste disposal, crime and correction and information collection and control, while New York State is pioneering against water pollution.

In his recommendations to states, he proposed that they act as coordinators for local governments in their relationships with the Federal Government, free localities from undue restraints, act against "local fiscal crisis" and strengthen their Governors.

With regard to the Federal Government, he proposed a new White House office on intergovernmental affairs, and consultation with state and local executives before grant programs are made.

TV POLL SHOWS STRONG SUPPORT FOR U.S. POSITION ON BOMBING OF TARGETS IN NORTH VIETNAM

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, on the evening of October 9, television stations in 11 major cities conducted a poll, asking their viewers to vote "Yes" or "No" on the following question: "Do you think we should immediately stop bombing North Vietnam?"

More than 40,000 people responded in these cities, and 60 percent voted "No" while 40 percent voted "Yes."

This is a clear majority approval of the administration's policies in Vietnam which demonstrates that the American public understands there can be no unilateral deescalation of the war and that cessation of the bombing must be accompanied by a similar deescalation by Hanoi.

That is my position and that is the administration's position. As I have said many times, the suggestion that the

[4] *Ibid.*

[5] "Behind Prison Walls," *The Century Magazine*, July 1922, p. 367. Copy on Debs Ms. collection, Indiana State University Library, Terre Haute, Indiana. (Debs disapproved of Booker T. Washington because charity supported his Institute.)

bombing be halted without seeking any commitments from Hanoi is a totally unrealistic one; it is a proposal which would mean the loss of more American lives.

For, as we have seen on past occasions, the Communist forces would use the bombing pause to rush in more troops and more supplies.

I think a majority of Americans recognize this fact, as indicated by the poll. I note, too, that three of the cities in which the poll took place were Florida communities—and in each one, the sentiment was overwhelmingly opposed to an immediate bombing halt.

At this point, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the body of the RECORD following my remarks, the results of the poll.

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

OCTOBER 9, 1967.

Results: First multi-city public opinion inquiry by participating Television Stations:

Question: "Do you think we should immediately stop bombing North Viet Nam?"

[In percent]

	Yes	No
WMAR–TV, Baltimore, Md	42	58
WFIL–TV, Philadelphia	45	55
KSTP–TV, St. Paul-Minneapolis	38	62
WZZM–TV, Grand Rapids, Mich	33	67
WFTV–TV, Orlando, Fla	19	81
WVUE–TV, New Orleans, La	41	59
WIIC–TV, Pittsburgh	40	60
WLBW–TV, Miami, Fla	39	61
KOB–TV, Albuquerque	43	57
WNDU–TV, South Bend, Ind	31	69
KCPX–TV, Salt Lake City	40	60
Consensus above cities	40	60

Also: two cities had asked the same question within the past two weeks, and chose not to repeat it so quickly. However, their results are similar:

[In percent]

	Yes	No
WLWI–TV, Indianapolis	27	73
WFLA–TV, Tampa	31	69
Including these two cities, total percentage is	38	62

VIETNAM—A BOMBING PAUSE

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the editorial in the October 20 edition of Life magazine entitled "The Case for Bombing Pause No. 7" is a reasoned plea to the administration to take this initiative toward negotiations for an honorable peace in Vietnam. In many respects the proposal made by the editors of Life that the United States should unconditionally cease the bombing of North Vietnam is similar to the proposals I have made in speeches on the Senate floor for over a year.

Pointing out that there are risks, the editors of Life argue:

There is a remote possibility that a pause now could be the first step toward an acceptable diplomatic settlement of the war. There is a strong probability that a bombing pause would improve the posture of the U.S. in Vietnam, in the eyes of many other nations and indeed of many Americans, and thus ultimately improve our chances of achieving our purposes in Vietnam.

. . . the Administration very soon must act—and speak—to recapture domestic political and intellectual respect for its Vietnam policy and to rally more diplomatic and moral support abroad. We believe the initiation of a bombing pause is a gesture of forbearance and conciliation which might accomplish that. America has the strength to do it.

I have argued that the chief reason for taking this initiative is to determine if negotiations, a cease fire, and a just settlement can be obtained. This is, I believe, the objective we seek.

I hope the administration will heed the growing consensus both here at home as well as abroad to take an initiative that might lead to peace.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this 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:

THE CASE FOR BOMBING PAUSE NO. 7

Six times in 32 months of bombing North Vietnam, the U.S. has held its fire. Three times it was for a brief holiday respite. The three other bombing pauses were ordered to allow Hanoi to signal a willingness to talk peace. No clear signal came. Then, three weeks ago, President Johnson announced the U.S.'s willingness "to stop all aerial and naval bombardment of North Vietnam when this will lead promptly to productive discussion." Hanoi came back with its standard reply: the U.S. must stop bombing "unconditionally," and North Vietnam will promise nothing in return.

Notwithstanding, we believe it would be worthwhile for the U.S. to take the initiative in another bombing pause. We think the U.S. should declare a respite in the attack against the areas north of the battle zones, confining bombing to the Ho Chi Minh Trail complex in Laos and to the southern provinces of North Vietnam, the immediate rear of the enemy forces pressing against the DMZ. There should be no publicly announced "conditions" that carry the whiff of an ultimatum. But this should not be a commitment to stop the bombing indefinitely. In taking this diplomatic and political initiative, the U.S. administration would have clearly in mind the kind of North Vietnamese response we would consider constructive, and how long we were willing to wait for it.

In advocating a bombing pause, with no advance promise of any reciprocal move by North Vietnam, we must acknowledge that almost all U.S. military opinion opposes such a course. The U.S. would be reducing pressure on the enemy, and that is not ordinarily the way to win a war. This, of course, is not an ordinary war. U.S. bombing is in a sense a reprisal against the North for the destruction and terrorism the Vietcong work in South Vietnam. Bombing damage and strain is an important price the North is forced to pay for continuing its support of Communist aggression in the South. The more direct military benefit for the U.S. and our allies is, of course, the interference with the flow of men and matériel from the North. There is much argument as to exactly how effective the bombing is, but in stopping most of it, we would unquestionably be giving up a weapon of some value.

Life believes, however, that the benefits of a bombing pause at this time outweigh the short-term military cost:

There is a remote possibility that a pause now could be the first step toward an acceptable diplomatic settlement of the war.

There is a strong probability that a bombing pause would improve the posture of the U.S. in Vietnam, in the eyes of many other nations and indeed of many Americans, and thus ultimately improve our chances of achieving our purposes in Vietnam.

As to the possibility of a pause leading to meaningful negotiations, Secretary Rusk tirelessly points out, "I have yet to hear anyone tell us that if we did stop the bombing they could definitely deliver Hanoi to the conference table. I have asked a number of governments, 'All right, if we stop the bombing, what can you deliver?' I get no response."

Hanoi itself has denounced past bombing pauses as U.S. "hoaxes." There is a danger that they would take a new bombing pause as a sign that the U.S. is caving in. There is considerable precedent in Communist diplomacy for *raising* your terms when the other side offers any concession.

Yet there do come times in wars when belligerents change policies and positions, sometimes shortly after swearing they never would. The fact that Hanoi will not promise anything in advance, in return for a bombing pause that hasn't happened yet, does not necessarily foreshadow their actual reaction to a pause that had gone on, say, for several weeks. Such a pause could stir up hopes all over the world, including the East European branches of Communism, and could put considerable diplomatic pressure on Hanoi. Probably Hanoi would say No again, to everybody—Canada, India, Denmark, U Thant, etc. But it is worth finding out.

The more weighty reason for a bombing pause is to recapture support for the U.S. presence and commitment in Vietnam. The bombing has isolated the U.S. from most of its friends and allies throughout the world (there are a few stout exceptions in Asia), and in this country the bombing is the focus and catalyst of most of the opposition to the war. There is the "bully" image—the most powerful nation on earth pouring World War II-scale bomb loads onto a primitive little country. The U.S. has never been bombed; countries that have been tend to identify with the targets rather than with the bomber crews.

The fear that the bombing might bring China into the war, even bring on nuclear war, naturally increases as the U.S. goes after North Vietnamese targets which are only 60 seconds' jet-time from the China border. It may be foolish of so many Japanese, Indians, Indonesians, etc., to worry about this. But they do.

In the U.N., over 30 non-Communist nations, among them several of our NATO allies, have now advocated stopping the bombing (with many variations of formula as to "conditions" or no-conditions). Perhaps the most thoughtful proposal was the Canadian suggestion of a bombing halt followed by restoration of the DMZ's neutralized status under international inspection. In later phases of the plan would come freezing of military "capabilities" throughout Vietnam and an eventual cease-fire.

Naively or not, many millions of ordinary citizens, and not a few ambassadors, foreign ministers and U.S. senators, think a bombing halt *could* lead to peace in Vietnam, and they are increasingly critical of the U.S. for not trying it again. If we did try it for a reasonable time, accompanied it with an energetic diplomatic probing, and then nothing came of it, the air would have been cleared. Support for a resumption of bombing, even for an escalation, would be stronger than for our present policy. But much would depend on what the Administration said about the new policy, and how it said it, not just to Hanoi but to the U.S. and the world.

Life believes that the U.S. is in Vietnam for honorable and sensible reasons. What the U.S. has undertaken there is obviously harder, longer, more complicated than the U.S. leadership foresaw. And in 1967 we are having another hard, complicated year out there. There is the encouraging fact of the Vietnamese elections, small blemishes and all; there is straight military progress; but there is the maddeningly slow work of translating these advances into pacification at the "rice-roots level." We are trying to defend not a fully born nation but a situation and

a people from which an independent nation might emerge. We are also trying to maintain a highly important—but in the last analysis not absolutely imperative—strategic interest of the U.S. and the free world. This is a tough combination to ask young Americans to die for.

Home-front support for the war is eroding. One may discount some maneuvering among U.S. politicians as 1968 politics, but even the most patently partisan of these noises represents somebody's rather professional judgment of how the voters are feeling.

Life has more than once expressed its admiration for the Johnson administration's coolness and courage in its Vietnam policy. In action the President himself has shown a remarkable blend of resolution and restraint. But in articulation of the policy—which in the end is inseparable from policy itself—the President and his administration have become more and more glaringly unsuccessful.

The President is said to be subdued these days, inclined to "hunker down" and let the Vietnam criticism beat over him. Dean Rusk is infinitely patient and courteous in explaining to critics and questioners "Your quarrel is really with Hanoi." A confusing circumstance is that the other most influential Cabinet officer, Robert McNamara, clearly is less convinced of the efficacy of bombing the North than are the Joint Chiefs of Staff, or Rusk. Nothing inspiring or eloquent and not much that is simply informative is being said from Washington.

We believe the Administration very soon must act—and speak—to recapture domestic, political and intellectual respect for its Vietnam policy and to rally more diplomatic and moral support abroad. We believe the initiation of a bombing pause is a gesture of forbearance and conciliation which might accomplish that. America has the strength to do it.

PHARMACEUTICAL AND NUTRITIONAL RESEARCH AT MEAD JOHNSON & CO.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, tremendous gains have been made in the fields of pharmaceutical and nutritional research in the last two or three decades. The health and welfare of untold millions of people have been improved and countless lives of future generations have been extended through basic research, clinical studies, and the development of new products by the drug industry.

One of the leading pioneers in this remarkable advancement in human knowledge and betterment is Mead Johnson & Co., a firm which has been located in Evansville, Ind., for more than 50 years. In the September 22 issue of Medical World News, an article reported in some depth on the outstanding discoveries and achievements which have resulted from the investigations conducted by this Hoosier company. To the ordinary layman the scope and methods pursued by those engaged in pharmaceutical and nutritional research are not only fascinating but also somewhat awesome.

Mr. President, as a tribute to those dedicated scientists who spend their lives in laboratories seeking new and better ways to combat disease and to improve health, I ask unanimous consent that this impressive article, entitled "Creating Drugs To Guard All Ages of Man," be printed in full at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

CREATING DRUGS TO GUARD ALL AGES OF MAN

As U.S. Highway 41 approaches Evansville, Ind., it cuts over to the Ohio River and runs through miles of cornfields. Just outside the city, a freshly painted Chamber of Commerce welcome booth sits alongside the road. The motorist who stops receives a pleasant Hoosier greeting, some maps, a couple of pamphlets on the history and customs of the region, and a can of *Metrecal*.

Metrecal is a fairly recent addition to Mead Johnson & Company's products, but the cornfields and the river have figured in the firm's history since 1915. That was the year the company moved to the Midwest from New Jersey to be nearer the source of a principal ingredient in its major product, *Dextri-Maltose*, a carbohydrate infant-formula modifier obtained by the enzymatic hydrolysis of cornstarch. Before the days of air freight, the river furnished a fast and easy transportation route for the cans of powder designed to bolster the formulas of full-term and premature babies.

The company had begun to concentrate on *Dextri-Maltose* shortly after the firm was founded by E. Mead Johnson, Sr. He was one of three brothers who had previously established the surgical supply firm of Johnson & Johnson in New Brunswick, N.J., in 1893. In an amicable parting. E. Mead left the business of bandages, plasters, and surgical dressings to his brothers and struck out on his own. He established Mead Johnson & Company in 1905 in Jersey City.

Six years later, Mead Johnson's first detail man learned of a German product called *Nährzucker* from a New York City pediatrician who had been studying in Europe. The detailer promptly told E. Mead Johnson about it. Trademarked *Dextri-Maltose* in this country, the 42% dextrin and 56% maltose mixture was the mainstay of the young company for many years. The latest annual report calls it "The Mother Product" and notes it is still an important item.

The *Dextri-Maltose* experience shaped the policy of the company for the next half century. From the beginning, the product was promoted only to pediatricians or GPs who treated babies. The company has followed this practice with other nutritional products—including *Pablum*—unless demand dictates otherwise.

Dextri-Maltose is the subject of over 400 references in the medical literature, and they show that over the years, the art of nutrition has become a science, drawing on latest advances in biochemistry, physiology, and medicine. These papers reflect the growing sophistication of nutritional research since the relatively simple early studies comparing various formulas for premature infants. Recent studies, for example, evaluate specific functions of added carbohydrates in milk and water mixtures, touching upon such subjects as the reduction of renal solute load and nitrogen retention.

SOME VITAMIN FIRSTS

"Over the years, well babies have flourished on our products. This has given us the resources to aid sick babies," says Dr. Warren M. Cox Jr., vice president for nutritional sciences. "Our nutritional experience, for example, gives us the research background for special foods like *Nutramigen*, a hypoallergenic formula for children sensitive to intact milk proteins, and *Lonalac*, a low-fat, low-salt formulation for children and adults with hypertension and kidney problems."

A native Mississippian, Dr. Cox came to Evansville in 1928 after a stint as a chemistry professor in China. "Vitamin D was the big subject then," he recalls. "Mead Johnson had introduced the first standardized cod liver oil. We took on a new project—trying to figure out how to get ergosterol out of yeast and how to make it into vitamin D. In a year, we had developed *Acterol*, the first semisynthetic vitamin D preparation."

At Mead Johnson in the 1920s and 1930s, "there were only a couple of PhDs in the Lab," Dr. Cox recalls. "The tenor of our early research effort was to develop therapeutic foods. We did not think of them as drugs."

But a laboratory flight of fancy by Dr. Rudolph Ellingson in 1940 resulted in the synthesis of sulfapyrazine, an antibacterial. "It was as good as sulfadiazine, and we had a lot of favorable comments and many publications on it," Dr. Cox says. "But the company never sold the drug, probably because it was in an area in which we had little experience. Sulfapyrazine was carried in the AMA's *New and Nonofficial Drugs* for 20 years, but was never available commercially."

Another early cautious exploration led to far-ranging results. "In the early 1940s, we started searching for an intravenous food for sick babies. Our first thought was to purify amino acids and put them back together, to avoid the possibility of anaphylactic shock that might result from injecting proteins. After a year's work, we knew that for us, this was practically impossible, economically speaking. We wound up with an enzymatic hydrolysate of casein, using pancreatic enzymes. It turned out to be *Amigen*, a very effective parenteral food.

"Mead Johnson subsequently sold its parenteral division but still manufactures bulk casein hydrolysate for use by other companies."

In 1952, the company's experience in nutrition served as one of the rocks on which to build a full-fledged pharmaceutical research program. "We wanted to expand our interest to include the whole family, not only the babies," says D. Mead Johnson, grandson of the founder and current president and chief executive officer. "We wanted to follow the baby through his whole life cycle. We thought of it as research for life.

"Fifteen years ago, we saw research as part of our self-renewal program. We were certain decay would result from standing still. We have found that research is expensive, time-consuming, and unpredictable. The rate of failure exceeds the rate of success. Research is a genuine business risk, but a risk we must continuously undertake within the framework of prudent financial management. Since 1952, we have spent about $10 million on projects that were finally canceled. Another $26 million has been spent on projects from which products may—or may not—be developed.

"But we have also found that productive research is today the hard core of our business and the basis for our economic survival. Our research and development in the last 15 years has cost $51 million, and it has yielded products accounting for 83% of last year's sales. The 1966 research budget was $6 million, the highest in our history, and it will be topped by this year's."

Mead Johnson will continue to be both a nutritional and pharmaceutical house, its president says. "Nutrition is primarily concerned with the maintenance and preservation of health. Pharmaceuticals are generally concerned with the return to health after illness. Both are concerned with life.

"In the next five years, we expect to invest $30 million worldwide to speed our growth. Of this, $20 million will be for new research, manufacturing, and administrative facilities in Evansville."

One of the early important compounds synthesized in the new program evolved from the company's background in nutrition and enzyme work. The project had its beginnings in a way that has become common in Evansville. Company scientists had been mulling over a problem that pediatricians were writing and calling about—excessive mucus accumulation in the respiratory tracts of infants. For an adult, this is a minor annoyance. For an infant, this can be fatal.

Dr. Ben King Harned, then vice president for research, approved the idea of seeking a

compound that could dissolve mucus. From its earliest phases, the project was a team effort, drawing upon the talents of scientists from various disciplines.

Dr. A. Leonard Sheffner's biochemistry group and Dr. Walter Zygmunt's microbiology group designed a program seeking microbial enzymes that digest mucus. But there was a small hitch in the timetable. The scientists found that the microbial enzymes would not be available for a while. In the meantime, they began investigating the mucus-digesting properties of common enzymes like trypsin, papain, hyaluronidase, lysozyme, and bromelain. The enzymes that liquefy mucus were also irritating to the respiratory tract.

As a first step, the scientists isolated from porcine gastric mucin a fraction rich in mucoprotein. This material was used as a substrate because it had certain basic similarities to sputum. Next, to catalogue the exact effect of each agent in the experiment, Dr. Sheffner studied the sulfhydryl-containing amino acid, L-cysteine, used as an activator for the enzyme bromelain.

SIX-YEAR PROJECT SUCCEEDS

Using only this simple compound on the porcine mucin fraction, he found it could reduce the viscosity of the substance without any help from an enzyme. Then Dr. Sheffner realized that previous investigators had not seen the significance of an important point. They had noted that L-cysteine could dissolve viscous intestinal juice, but dismissed this by assuming that the compound activated some intestinal enzyme which was responsible for the actual dissolving.

Because the Mead Johnson work had proceeded along careful, classic scientific lines, there was proof that a seemingly innocuous compound such as L-cysteine could luiquify mucus. The enzyme project was abandoned. Instead, researchers began an intensive study of the mucolytic action of various sulfhydryl compounds. The work of these various teams finally resulted in *Mucomyst* (acetylcysteine). From start to finish, the project had taken nearly six years.

Mucomyst is in wide use today to help remove excessive secretions in chronic and acute pulmonary disease, the pulmonary complications of cystic fibrosis, or those asociated wtih tracheostomy, surgery, anesthesia, and diagnostic bronchial studies. A recent *JAMA* news report suggests that acetylcysteine might also increase serum sulfhydryl content in patients wtih rheumatoid disease, and this might result in clinical improvement.

Today, the company's worldwide scientific work is guided by the Mead Johnson Research Center, housed in a three-story, sprawling red-brick building that faces on the Ohio River. From a staff of ten PhDs and 27 other professionals in 1952, it has grown to 61 PhDs and about 380 other scientists and auxiliary personnel.

The company has research agreements with laboratories in various countries and owns a 35% interest in BDH Group Limited, of London, formerly the British Drug Houses Limited. Today, BDH is one of the family. Scientists from Evansville are frequently in London, and the BDH counterparts are often to be seen at the Evansville Research Center.

The BDH alliance accounts for dimethisterone, the progestational agent in *Oracon*, the first sequential contraceptive. *Oracon* received FDA approval two years ago and beat the Lilly pill to the market by a full month. The *Oracon* regimen consists of 16 ethinyl estradiol tablets followed by five dimethisterone and ethinyl estardiol tablets.

Clinical studies on *Oracon* are entering their sixth year in this country, reports Dr. W. Thomas Spain, associate director of clinical research. "We constantly seek to improve our steroids and their methods of administration for efficacy, safety, and simplicity. Our five-year study of progestational steroids in the treatment of a typical and adenomatous endometrail hyperplasia has been gratifying. We are encouraged by similar studies in the palliative management of recurrent endometrial adenocarcinoma."

A clinical study of another promising compound is going on in Europe, and preliminary reports are beginning to appear in the Belgian medical literature, Dr. Spain notes. "Our BHD colleagues have synthesized a progestational compound that may be used to treat benign prostatic hypertrophy, a condition that affects about 20% of men over 50 years of age. In studies of 30 males followed for at least two years, there was demonstrable reduction of gland size with no objective or subjective signs of feminization or change in libido."

Thus, steriods will figure large in Mead Johnsons future, says Dr. James M. Tuholski, group executive vice president. "BDH has been a steroid research leader for years. It holds basic patents on the steroid nucleus with substituents in the C_6 position. That is, the six-methyl group can be put on any class of steroid and seems to make the action of a drug longer lasting. The group doesn't appreciably influence the quality of the progestogen, estrogen, or whatever.

"At the research level, we work with BDH in the way we work with the people down the hall. They are also doing considerable biological studies along with their chemical work. BDH has a steroid team comparable to the good ones in the U.S."

ANTICANCER AGENT IMPROVED

Mead Johnson does not have a male steroid contraceptive anywhere near clinical trials, but the company is thinking along these lines, Dr. Tuholski says. "We're looking for a new method of blocking the maturation of the sperm, which takes about 30 to 60 days in the body. We're trying to block the enzymines that trigger sperm maturation. But this may not be possible without blocking other enzymes, and without producing toxicity. That's where we are at the moment."

Another product to come out of European agreements is *Cytoxan* (cyclophosphamide), an alykylating agent used to treat a wide variety of cancers, including some leukemias, lymphomas, myelomas, carcinomas, and sarcomas. The compound, brought to the company's attention by Dr. Kenneth N. Campbell, was acquired in 1958 from Asta-Werke in Germany, but much of the work to improve its breadth of usefulness and minimize its side effects was done in Evansville.

Evansville research frequently enlarges the scope of a compound. This is particularly true of compounds that act on the adrenergic receptors of the autonomic nervous system, one of the earliest subjects tackled by the new research center, *Vasodilan* (isoxuprine hydrochloride) was obtained from the Dutch company Philips-Duphar in 1956 and marketed in 1959 as a vasodilator. Although the functions of the beta- and alpha-adrenergic receptors are still under intensive investigation all over the world, it is generally agreed that adrenergic vasodilation is controlled by the beta receptors and vasoconstriction by the alpha receptors. This does not necessarily mean that all excitory functions in the various organs are controlled by either of the receptors. The response to activation of the receptor varies from organ to organ and depends partly upon the density of occurrence of the alpha or beta receptors.

A team of Evansville pharmacologists under the direction of Dr. Paul M. Lish went to work on the mechanism of action of the compound. They were not satisfied with the relatively weak action and hoped to improve it. The pharmacologists soon discovered that isoxsuprine not only stimulated the beta receptors but also blocked the alpha receptors and had even a third component of action that relaxed smooth muscles. It was this third component which attracted the attention of chemist, pharmacologist, and clinician alike. Clinicians tested *Vasodilan* as a uterine relaxant during labor. It worked well.

Chemists studied several classes of compounds in this area. An exciting new chemical train of thought eventually crossed the lines of the growing pharmacologic and clinical knowledge, opening up an entire new area of adrenergic research.

One chemist began with the observation that epinephrine and norepinephrine both contain phenolic hydroxyl groups. Removal or masking of the acidic nature of these groups results in a marked lowering or alteration of their physiologic action. Therefore, these groups must play some role in the drug-receptor interactions. Since phenolic groups are weak acids, the chemist wondered, "How about replacing one or more of them with a methanesulfonamide moiety, which is chemically and structurally similar to the phenolic hydroxyl group?"

"It started out with my very simple question," says Dr. Aubrey A. Larsen, chemical research director. "This was purely a chemical speculation, applied to a biological environment. And it worked. We turned out a whole new class of compounds which are now in various stages of becoming clinical drugs. The class includes bronchodilators, cardiac accelerators, beta-blockers, vasodilators for vein disorders, and uterine relaxants."

CYNICS AND SKEPTICS

Dr. Larsen encourages the same type of speculation today. Our job is to beat the odds. Statistically speaking, the average PhD who does reasonably sophisticated work for a pharmaceutical company needs five or six lifetimes to get a marketable product. The odds are all against us, because we must work with thousands of compounds before we find one with real therapeutic advantage."

The entire pharmaceutical industry will find it increasingly harder to beat the odds, Dr. Larsen predicts. "Chemists and biologists in the industry must get down to the molecular level. Some day, all biological activity will be explained in chemical terms. Even now it's not enough for a chemist to come up with new compounds. He's got to go further. He's got to know why they are active, how they are detoxified, what enxymes they interact with."

Another chemical group being explored for answers to these questions are the pyrrolidines. Synthesized by senior research fellows Yao-Hua M. Wu and Rolland F. Feldkamp, the group includes a nucleus of small-ring compounds that fit into larger, more complex molecules. The pyrrolidines generally show antispasmodic and non-narcotic analgesic activity. Some of the substances stimulate the central nervous system. Others depress smooth muscles selectively in the bronchioles, uterus, gut, coronary system, and peripheral vascular system.

The pyrrolidines and the methane-sulfonamides comprise the two largest single chemical projects in Evansville, Dr. Larsen says. "They are not the biggest portion of our work, but they are two big productive areas. We are working with other compounds that act on the central nervous system, including tranquilizers and antidepressants. We are also doing cardiovascular work, including screening for diuretics, that does not relate to the adrenergic project."

Dr. Larsen notes that so far the Evansville researchers have been pretty lucky in the active-compound sweepstakes. "To beat the odds, you have to be a cynic and a skeptic. You have to be a rebel. Once people get established in a certain area, inertia tends to defend the status quo." Then he grins. "But I'm happy to report there's no inertia in Evansville."

Still another area of research is being explored by Dr. Homer Eaton Stavely, director of biological chemistry, whose background includes a decade at the Squibb Institute

for Medical Research. He has been experimenting with two small polypeptide hormones, oxytocin and vasopressin. Both are formed by the neuronal cells of the hypothalamic nuclei and stored in the posterior lobe of the hypophysis. Oxytocin stimulates the contraction of the muscular tissue of the capillaries and arterioles, raising blood pressure.

"We've been building up analogues of these two hormones, hoping to attack the job differently from other workers," says Dr. Stavely. "Other researchers are taking a natural hormone and replacing one peptide at a time and seeing what the properties of the analogues might be. Our idea was to build the simplest possible analogues while maintaining the general shape of the molecule. In this approach, we would use as many glycine units as possible because glycine is the simplest amino acid. We haven't gotten too far along. Hopefully, compounds of this kind would be inhibitors of hormones. If we do get a peptide that is an inhibitor of oxytocin, we might be able to stop threatened abortion. An inhibitor of vasopressin might be able to do something for hypertension."

METABOLIC DEFECTS PROJECT

As the range and depth of the pharmaceutical research activities have expanded over the years, nutritional studies have also become more basic, delving deep into biochemistry, physiology, and medicine. "When I first came to the company about 15 years ago, I started work on a new research project on nutritional factors involved in metabolic defects," says Dr. Herbert P. Sarett, nutritional research director. "We knew it would never make much money. Only a small part of the popultion is afflicted with these biochemical defects which make it impossible for them to properly metabolize substances like galactose, phenylalanine, cystine, or other important nutrients. These generally lead to physical and mental defects. The company wanted to do this research as a service to the medical profession. We wanted to give the doctor something to help fight this waste of human resources."

In the early 1950s, some preliminary studies showed that removing excess phenylalanine from the diet, leaving only a minimal amount essential for growth, might help prevent mental damage in patients with phenylketonuria (PKU). "We began work on a special diet which would contain a little phenylalanine to start the child with," says Dr. Sarett. "We already had a product called *Amigen*, an enzymatic hydrolysate of casein, and we had to find out how to remove most of the phenylalanine while leaving the rest of the essential amino acids.

"At that time, we estimated that this would take the time of two men working for six months, or about 2,000 hours. Well, this produced the low-phenylalanine formula *Lofenalac* and opened a program that's lasted roughly 15 years and isn't finished yet. We've learned a lot about these diets, and whenever a pediatrician anywhere in this country or in Canada runs into an enzyme deficiency, he often calls us for help."

Despite present knowledge on how to prevent brain damage to PKU children, some misconceptions have crept into the medical literature, Dr. Sarett notes. "The important point about treating PKU is not to remove all of he phenylalanine from the diet. The important point is to give each infant as *much of this* amino acid as he can handle without getting into trouble. The diets are sometimes misused. You don't send a child with PKU home with a prescription for a low-phenylalanine diet and forget about him.

"Each child must be monitored every day. You've got to keep adding foods which he can tolerate and analyze his blood and urine frequently. The most critical period is during the first six months of life, when the infant grows rapidly. Phenylalanine requirements may increase rapidly during this period, and they must be met. Too little phenylalanine may bring stunted growth, anemia, and bone changes. Too much may result in damage to the brain and central nervous system. However, a growing number of reputable, responsible investigators report normal growth and normal development of PKU children when properly controlled.

HOMOCYSTINURIA RESEARCH

"Many infants have high plasma tyrosine levels, but in most cases, the levels soon return to normal. A few have a defect in metabolism of tyrosine. The doctor must keep a close watch and decide which child needs a special diet and which one doesn't."

Currently, another Mead Johnson nutritional research product is being used on a very limited scale to manage a newly discovered metabolic defect called homocystinuria. This condition involves an enzymatic block in the metabolism of the essential amino acid methionine. "We've developed a prototype product moderately low in methionine, but we're really not satisfied with it," Dr. Sarett says. "We still haven't developed one ideally low enough in this amino acid. We are nowhere near ready to supply physicians, even for trial purposes."

Nutritional research is done largely on rats, chicks, and pigs, Dr. Sarett reports. "Rats have their shortcomings. You usually can't feed rats until they're 21 days old, which corresponds to a fairly old infant. They have a lot of hair, which babies don't have. This means their amino acid requirements are not completely comparable to man's. Besides, they're rats."

Monkeys and dogs are also difficult to feed until sometimes after birth. Pigs are closer to human beings, particularly in their cardiovascular system. A newborn pig can be artifically fed right away, just as a baby can.

Mead Johnson scientists work in aseptic quarters with a breed of specially developed, pathogen-free pigs taken by cesarean section before their scheduled delivery. "We find that 20 pigs in a study comprise a meaningful experiment, giving us good, solid data related to infant feeding, cholesterol synthesis, or atherosclerosis."

As the firm's nutritional research has grown in sophistication over the years, it has also expanded to include other age groups, Dr. Sarett points out. "After five years of work, we are now marketing *Portagen*, a food that contains medium-chain triglycerides for adults and children who have difficulty in absorbing conventional fats. These medium-chain triglycerides are absorbed rapidly through the portal venous system instead of through the lymphatic system as other fats are."

Another product of these studies is *Questran* (cholestyramine), a prescription pharmaceutical for the relief of pruritus associated with partial biliary obstruction. The compound is a basic anion exchange resin with a strong affinity for bile acids. It sequesters bile acids in the intestinal tract, preventing their reabsorption and ensuring their excretion. In clinical trials, some physicians noted that the drug also markedly reduced serum cholesterol levels. This fact seems to expand Mead Johnson's interest into still another age group—those in their middle years, whose arteries are perhaps less resilient than earlier.

RESEARCH NEEDS SOPHISTICATION

"We have something needed by every age," says vice president Tuholski. "Be it a dietary product or a pharmaceutical, we have it. And we also have a broad and encompassing outlook on just about everything that affects health." The company's future is practically unlimited in both nutritionals and pharmaceuticals, Dr. Tuholski says. "There's a real need for disposable feeding units for hospital nurseries at one end of the age scale, and for prepackaged meals for nursing homes at the other end. There's a continuing need for drugs with new mechanisms of action. Take diuretics, for instance. After the first important discoveries, many people thought there would be nothing further. Then chlorothiazide came along and proved differently. This might happen again.

"It will probably also happen with steroids. We've just scratched the surface when it comes to their anti-inflammatory and antidepressant actions. These important contributions will come about because the entire pharmaceutical industry realizes you can't succeed—you can't even stay afloat—without a high degree of sophistication in your research program. Check this by looking through the annual reports of almost any drug company. Research costs are disproportionate to the cost of doing business. Why? Because management realizes that research builds a solid base for the future."

This solid base in Evansville, adds Dr Richard T. Arnold, chairman of the company's scientific advisory board, may be surrounded by the cornfields of Indiana, but its influence will be felt all over the world. "Sure we see *Metrecal* and *Dextri-Maltose* in our future. We also see antifungal and antibacterial agents, a new antibiotic effective against staph, and the beginnings of an antiviral program. We also realize that even with the latest streamlined computers, there are still some things about research that will be totally unexpected. As new methods of testing evolve, we may find that we've got compounds sitting on our shelves totally ineffective in animals, but magnificantly helpful to human beings."

Increasingly, foreign countries will be impressed with a Food and Drug Administration approval, notes Dr. D. J. Buddrus, vice president for biomedical sciences. "An FDA approval right now is the best selling point a drug can have in just about any foreign country. They look upon our FDA as a standard-bearer. They will probably be modeling their regultory bodies along U.S. lines in the future."

And a bench chemist, given to flights of creative fancy, sees the future from still another angle. "What we'll be able to do someday with a computer and some yeast, only God knows."

THE DOMESTIC FISHING INDUSTRY

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I have received a resolution from the National Maritime Union in the Port of Galveston concerning the state of the fishing industry in the United States. I certainly share their concern in this regard, as evidenced by my remarks on this subject of September 27, 1967. I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be entered at this point in the RECORD so that all may take notice of it.

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

RESOLUTION

Whereas the Soviet Union has made sensational progress in using the wealth of the seas to make hay among the hungry peoples of the world; and

Whereas our domestic fishing industry continues to decline and suffer as the fishing fleet diminishes; and

Whereas this means a loss of jobs and a loss of tax revenues to seaport cities such as Galveston; and

Whereas the rise in fishing imports and the expansion of Russian, Norwegian, and Japanese fishing fleets poses a financial threat to Gulf Coast fishing;

Now, therefore, be it resolved: That the Johnson Administration be called upon to grant long-range, "low interest" loans to do-

mestic fishermen so that they can build larger fleets and compete more equally with other nations; and

Be it further resolved: That the approximate sixty (60) percent import of our fish consumption be made a maximum and the quota be adjusted downward annually as United States fish production is increased; and

Be it also further resolved: That there be a development of new shipyards specializing in fishing vessel construction, one each on the East and West Coast and a development of ocean fish farms in eleven (11) areas of all coasts of the mainland of the U.S., Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico.

We, the undersigned, ask the Congressional leaders to hold prompt hearings to develop a program such as the above resolution for the fishing industry.

Adopted by the membership of the National Maritime Union in the Port of Galveston on the 28th day of August, 1967.

JOHN T. KELLY,
Agent.

SECRETARY RUSK'S STATEMENT ON VIETNAM

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, last week Secretary of State Rusk stated clearly and concisely the reasons why our Nation is engaged in Vietnam.

Mr. Rusk did not attempt to minimize the problems Vietnam has caused the United States. He pointed out that Americans are an impatient people, and that it is not easy for our people to wage a struggle by limited means for limited objectives. He said that the present impatience about Vietnam is thoroughly understandable.

As the debate over Vietnam continues in our country, it appears that the issue centers on variation of a single theme. I am persuaded that this is the case. That theme is a central position resting upon the following considerations:

First. The pursuit of our limited objectives by limited means.

Second. The need to meet our commitments and defend our vital national interests.

Third. Our earnest desire to bring this conflict to a peaceful conclusion as soon as possible.

Our enemies should not misunderstand the character of this debate. Secretary Rusk made this point very clear. But it is a point which will be valid for as long as debate over Vietnam continues. Our system of government not only tolerates debate, but encourages it. Our conflicting views will continue to receive widespread attention throughout the world. Friends and enemies alike in other countries may be encouraged to equate dissent in the United States with a lack of resolve. This could lead to miscalculations which in turn could lead to actions or responses of tragic proportions.

As the Secretary said, there is no significant body of American opinion which would have us withdraw from Vietnam and abandon Southeast Asia to the dictates of Asian communism. I also share his view that there is no significant opinion among us which wishes to transform this struggle into a general war. This is a message of vital importance to world peace.

COUNTY POVERTY PROGRAMS

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, recently I received a letter from Mr. Dominic Gacetta, program director for the Knox County Community Action Committee in Rockland, Maine, in which he reports on developments in the county poverty programs.

I think my colleagues will be interested in learning of these highly successful programs which are enriching the lives of many families in the county.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Gacetta's letter be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

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

KNOX COUNTY COMMUNITY ACTION COMMITTEE,
Rockland, Maine, October 6, 1967.

Hon. EDMUND S. MUSKIE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MUSKIE: The Knox County Community Action Committee, after evaluating the progress of our current poverty programs, is pleased with the developments and want to share them with you to keep you better informed on these programs in our area.

Our Neighborhood Youth Corps Program is funded for 20 out-of-school placements. Of this group, four have returned to school to continue their education. Three returned to local public high schools and one is enrolled in a leading prep school after receiving a $500.00 scholarship on the basis of his aptitude tests.

Eight youths on the program have left Neighborhood Youth Corps for permanent employment. Two of this group left for training related employment and six entered employment outside the training related area.

Two girls with dependent children on ADC left the program after referral to Work Experience for further training. One is being trained in printing and the other as a baker.

One boy training as a Landscape Aide has been offered seasonal employment at the Rockland Country Club. He will continue his training during the off season with the Soil and Conservation Service locally.

As enrollees of this program return to school or leave for various reasons, we are always recruiting in an attempt to keep our 20 placements occupied.

Our Homemaker Service Program consists of a Director and six Homemakers in Knox County. Although this program has only been in operation since June of this year, we have received many favorable comments for the variety of service provided. Over eighty families have received benefit of Homemakers and they are currently serving over 60 families with regularity. Their services include meal planning, budgeting, food preparation, cleanliness of the home and person and other necessary duties of this type. Homemakers will soon be demonstrating the use of surplus foods to mothers who will meet in groups for this purpose.

We completed a successful Summer Head Start Program, with 163 children in 11 classrooms throughout the County. These children, in addition to the training habits they received and experiences provided them, also received Dental and Medical Services which will prove beneficial to all of them throughout their lives. In addition, parents through participation in this program also experienced new ideas and knowledge which will help them in their parent-child relationship.

Our Work Study Program provided summer jobs for 5 needy college students and paid them a total of $3,140.00 which will be helpful in the coming school year.

Funds from the Older Americans Act have made it possible to provide stereo, television, and other furniture and equipment in the West Room of the Rockland Community Center for the relaxation and enjoyment of the Senior Citizens in this area. They also have recently enjoyed 3 excursions which accommodated 65 to 75 people on each trip. In March a large group of Senior Citizens enjoyed a trip to the Ice Follies in Boston. This trip was followed up in April with an excursion to the Flower Show in Boston. In August an excursion to Cabbage Island was enjoyed by all. A foliage trip to the Rangley Lakes Region is planned for Wednesday, October 11, and a large turn out is expected for this trip also.

Sincerely yours,

DOMINIC J. GACETTA,
Program Director.

THE IMPORTANCE OF BLACK-OWNED FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, among the crucial needs of the Negro community in America is the rapid expansion of black-owned financial institutions and the development of black administrative and entrepreneurial talent to manage them.

The current role of black-owned financial institutions in promoting urban rehabilitation has recently been surveyed and assessed by Andrew F. Brimmer, member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. In a little noticed but very important address to the National Bankers Association in Kansas City on September 22, Dr. Brimmer made a number of cogent observations, based on a wealth of factual matter. Among them are the following, in paraphrase:

First. Rising income in the Negro community in attracting national businesses into a market hitherto the primary preserve of Negro businessmen; as a result "Negro business and professional men in traditional fields are declining relative to the population."

Second. This new influx of national business into the Negro community "may be resulting in a net drain on the savings of the urban ghetto."

Third. Although the Negro middleclass is expanding rapidly, the new jobs are most likely to be in salaried occupations which are not promising sources of community leadership.

Mr. Brimmer's conclusion, based on these and related observations, is that large white-owned national institutions, such as life insurance companies, must develop new avenues of cooperations with community-based, black-owned institutions and companies "to build not simply physical structures but human bridges as well in the ghetto."

As an example, Dr. Brimmer points to the recent announcement that the life insurance industry will invest $1 billion in housing for slum areas.

It is my impression—

He says—

based on considerable checking with industry officials, that so far no major life insurance company has designated any of the Negro mortgage bankers as correspondents.

He advocates a conscious effort by the life insurance companies to strengthen Negro-owned financial institutions by

cooperating with them in the origination and servicing of mortgage loans under this new program. And at the same time, he points out, the experience of Negro businessmen familiar with conditions in central city slum areas can be of invaluable assistance to investors entering those areas for the first time.

Mr. President, the theme of Dr. Brimmer's remarks is reflected in a bill which I have joined 39 other Senators in sponsoring. The National Home Ownership Foundation Act (S. 1592) would charter a private nonprofit foundation to make or participate in mortgage loans in credit-short areas to encourage home ownership for lower income families. The bill would require the Foundation to retain 3 percent of the proceeds from the sale of its bonds as a reserve. Ordinarily, as a matter of normal banking practice, such reserves would be invested in U.S. Treasury obligations or other high grade securities. But in section 109(f) of S. 1592 we included a highly important provision. It says:

In managing such reserve account, the Foundation shall give preference to making deposits in those financial institutions actively engaged in making loans or otherwise carrying on activities in furtherance of the purposes of this Act.

What this means, Mr. President, is that up to $60 million of the foundation's reserve capital would be deposited in lending institutions actively making loans in urban slums. The consequence of this provision, I am sure, would be a new source of capital for black-owned financial institutions, which would enable them to expand their lending activities in their own communities. The amount—$60 million—is certainly not sufficient to the needs. But I think it does establish an important principle, in line with Dr. Brimmer's recommendation to the National Bankers Association.

There are those who say that forthcoming amendments to Federal Housing Administration laws, coupled with a new willingness among capital investors as exemplified by the insurance companies, will produce a sharp upturn in mortgage lending and home ownership in the ghettos. I hope they are right. One crucial factor is the determination of the FHA to move boldly forward to insure mortgages in these areas in which, in many cases, no FHA underwriter has set foot for years. Another crucial factor is the need for public and private agencies to prepare lower income families to become owners of their own homes or apartments. Near the end of his remarks Dr. Brimmer touches on these important points in describing the experience of four Philadelphia savings banks, which, because of FHA reluctance and insufficient homeowner preparation, have been able to commit only $1½ million out of an allocated $20 million in mortgage loans over an 18-month period.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Brimmer's excellent address, "Financial Institutions and Urban Rehabilitation" be included at this point in the RECORD.

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

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS AND URBAN REHABILITATION

(Remarks by Andrew F. Brimmer, member, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, before the annual convention of the National Bankers Association, Hotel Continental, Kansas City, Mo., September 22, 1967)

The recent announcement by the nation's leading life insurance companies that they plan to invest $1 billion in urban rehabilitation has thrown into sharp focus a number of questions relating to the role of financial institutions in the core areas of our cities. This meeting of bankers who devote their energies almost entirely to meeting some of the financial needs of the citizens of these areas provides a good forum for the discussion of several of these issues.

The principal points in the remarks which follow can be summarized briefly:

With the steady (though mixed) improvement in employment opportunities, the income of the Negro community is rising more rapidly than for the nation as a whole.

This rising income is attracting more and more national businesses (including life insurance companies and other financial institutions) to a market which was previously the primary preserve of Negro businessmen.

The results are not unexpected: with the decline in the protective tariff of segregation, Negro business and professional men in traditional fields are declining relative to the population.

Negro-owned financial institutions, with the exception of a few recently chartered banks, are making only limited progress in the face of growing competition from the larger institutions active in the general market.

The results are also disturbing: although the Negro middle class is expanding at a rapid pace, the new job opportunities are concentrated in the middle grade technical and professional occupations. While these are clearly improvements over the low-skill and low-paid traditionally held by the average Negro, they ordinarily are not a promising source of community leadership.

The vigorous competition of the major institutions (especially the competition from the life insurance companies) for business in the Negro community—combined with their investment patterns—may be resulting in a net drain on the savings of the urban ghetto.

These trends suggest strongly that the nation's leading financial institutions should re-examine carefully their techniques of doing business in the ghetto. For example, the move by the insurance companies to invest $1 billion in urban areas could be supplemented through a more direct involvement with financial institutions already operating in the ghetto.

As far as I can determine from personal conversations in the industry, no leading life insurance company has designated a Negro mortgage banker as a local correspondent. Since a major share of the mortgage origination and servicing business is done through such correspondence, the establishment of such links would facilitate the flow of investment into the ghetto.

The Negro-owned banks can also play an expanded role in the creation of new job opportunities in urban areas through joint ventures with white-owned banks and other financial institutions. An actual project now under active consideration will illustrate clearly how this can be done.

TRENDS IN PERSONAL INCOME

Before examining more closely the expanded opportunities for financial institutions in the ghetto, let us review recent developments in the income and employment patterns for nonwhites. In the last few years, the personal income of the nonwhite community (of which Negroes make up well over 90 percent) has risen substantially in absolute terms and in comparison with that for the white community. The actual figures showing the median income of families are:

Year	Total	White	Nonwhite	Nonwhite as percent of white
1960	$5,620	$5,835	$3,233	0.55
1961	5,737	5,981	3,191	.53
1962	5,956	6,237	3,330	.53
1963	6,249	6,548	3,465	.53
1964	6,569	6,858	3,839	.56
1965	6,882	7,170	3,971	.55
1966	7,436	7,722	4,628	.60

Several conclusions can be drawn from these figures. During the first three years of the 1960's, the gap between the median income of white and nonwhite families actually widened; the ratio of nonwhite to white income fell from .55 in 1960 to .53 in 1963. This deterioration was a direct reflection of the slow pace of the economy following the 1960–61 recession. Between 1960 and 1963, the median income of white families rose by $713, or by 12 per cent. The corresponding changes for nonwhites were $232 or 7 per cent. However, following the general tax reduction of 1964, the national economy expanded much more vigorously and was further stimulated by the acceleration of the military effort in Vietnam. One result was a sharp climb in personal income. For white families, the gain amounted to $1,174 (or 18 per cent) between 1963 and 1966. In this same period, however, the gain in the median income of nonwhite families was almost as large in absolute terms—an increase of $1,163—and represented a rise of 34 per cent, or nearly double that recorded for white families. In these most recent years, nonwhites made substantial gains in employment, and again the gap between white and nonwhite income was narrowed.

These improvements in the income of nonwhite families obviously have meant a further substantial rise in the aggregate purchasing power of the Negro community. In 1963, total money income of families and unrelated individuals amounted to $371.1 billion, of which $347.5 billion was earned by whites and $23.6 billion by nonwhites. Thus nonwhites accounted for 6.4 per cent of the total. By 1965, the total had climbed to $419.1 billion; the income of whites amounted to $391.7 billion and that of nonwhites to $27.4 billion. So, the nonwhites' share had risen to 6.6 per cent. With the large relative gains in family income registered last year, the total purchasing power of the nonwhite community has undoubtedly expanded further. Thus, the Negro market offers an even stronger inducement for merchants selling to the general community.

TRENDS IN MIDDLE CLASS EMPLOYMENT AMONG NONWHITES

The pattern of income changes described above has been the result of significant progress in the upgrading of nonwhite employment opportunities. Between 1963 and 1966, employment of nonwhite workers increased by 10.1 per cent—from a monthly average of 7,234 thousand to 7,968 thousand. For white workers, the corresponding gain was 7.3 per cent—from 61,575 thousand to 66,097 thousand. Thus, Negroes obtained about 14 per cent of the net increase in employment, although they represented just over 10 per cent of the total labor force. The unemployment rate for nonwhites fell by one-third between 1963 and 1966—from 10.8 per cent to

7.3 per cent of the labor force. White workers experienced the identical relative decline in their unemployment rate—from 5.0 per cent to 3.3 per cent.

But, as also mentioned above, there was a noticeable change in the pattern of employment growth among nonwhites. Between 1963 and 1966, total nonwhite employment rose by 734 thousand. About one-half of this gain centered in white collar jobs, although only 18 per cent of employed nonwhites were holding such jobs in 1963. Among white collar occupations, the gains were particularly striking for clerical and professional and technical workers.

In contrast, the increases registered for managers, officials and proprietors were quite modest. Those receiving salaries rose by 22 thousand, but there was a decrease of 6 thousand among those who were self-employed—all of which was concentrated in the retail trade sector. Thus, nonwhite businessmen in areas other than retail trade apparently about held their own. If this pattern of employment changes can be believed, it is of some significance. It could mean that the apparent downtrend in self employment among nonwhites observed since about 1950 may be moderating. While the tendency for the number of nonwhite owner-operators in the retail sector to decline as public accommodations become generally open to Negroes may continue, other business opportunities may grow more rapidly.

But the adverse changes in white collar employment have not been restricted to businessmen. The number of Negro lawyers is growing slowly, while the number of Negro physicians and dentists is actually declining in relation to total Negro employment. Even the number of school teachers is declining relative to the Negro labor force. In contrast, as observed above, the number of Negro clerical, sales and non-professional technical workers has shown remarkable expansion in recent years. By 1966, nonwhites (who constituted 10.8 per cent of total employment) represented 5.0 per cent of all white collar workers and 6.3 per cent of all clerical workers. On the other hand, they represented only 4.3 per cent of the professional and technical workers, aside from those employed in teaching and the health professions. Other examples could be cited, but the basic point still holds: white collar employment among Negroes is becoming increasingly concentrated in the middle grade salary categories, especially in nursing, retail sales, data processing, clerical and similar activities.

These trends are disturbing. *While these occupations are obviously improvements over the traditional low-paying jobs as operatives, laborers and service workers, they are not particularly promising sources of community leadership.* For instance, although a computer programmer may earn as much (or more) than a high school principal, he clearly has less weight in the community's affairs. A Negro reservations clerk in a leading downtown hotel is in the same business as the former Negro hotel owner, but here, also, his community role is less significant. In my opinion, the expansion of opportunities for Negroes in the truly professional and managerial occupations should be a prime goal of the Negro business community.

TRENDS AMONG NEGRO-OWNED FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

At this point, let us return to the promising role which financial institutions can play in the reconstruction of our urban centers. As I stressed above, the Negro-owned financial institutions, with the exception of the newly-chartered banks, have been falling behind relative to the growth of the income of the Negro community at large.

This can be seen clearly in the following summary table:

COMPOUNDED ANNUAL AVERAGE RATES OF CHANGE

[In percent]

Personal income	1961–65	1961–63	1963–65
Total	5.4	4.6	6.3
White	5.3	4.5	6.2
Nonwhite	7.1	6.5	7.7
Life insurance companies	**1961–66**	**1961–63**	**1963–66**
Insurance in force:			
All companies	9.4	7.7	10.5
Negro-owned companies	2.9	2.1	3.4
Total assets:			
All companies	5.7	5.5	5.8
Negro-owned companies	2.6	2.6	2.6
Insured commercial banks [1]	**1957–66**	**1957–63**	**1963–66**
All banks	5.0	3.2	8.9
Federal Reserve members with total deposits between $5,000,000 and $10,000,000	2.2	1.4	3.9
Negro-owned banks	11.4	9.0	16.6
Excluding newly chartered banks	-------	-------	5.8

[1] Total assets.

The first thing to note is that, as shown earlier, the personal income of the nonwhite community has grown about one-quarter to one-third faster than that of the nation as a whole since the beginning of the 1960's. On the other hand, the Negro-owned life insurance companies have grown only about one-third to one-half as fast as the life insurance industry as a whole. The experience of the Negro-owned banks has been mixed.

Those institutions which were in business prior to 1963 have grown much more slowly than all insured commercial banks. However, their growth rate has exceeded that for the small member banks of the Federal Reserve System. The four or five newly chartered Negro-owned banks (mainly national banks) have expanded rapidly, and one of them is now the third or fourth largest among the group of 17 Negro-owned institutions.

What factors underlie these trends? How does one account for the extremely modest progress of the Negro-owned life insurance companies? Why have the Negro-owned banks registered such a diverse pattern of growth?

First let us look at the life insurance companies. For much of the last decade, the large national institutions have been making a special effort to tap the expanding market for insurance among middle class Negroes. Many of them have adopted special promotional programs directed at this market: They have bid successfully for some of the most promising officials of Negro insurance companies, and a fairly large number have established district offices in the heart of the urban areas populated primarily by Negroes. For example, it is reported that one such office of a national company was recently located in Chicago's Southside, with the expectation of building up to a force of 22 salesmen and underwritings of about $30 million in a few years. But, let me repeat, this type of competition with the Negro-owned companies has been underway for almost a decade. The result is that many Negroes active in the industry believe that any one of the largest five or six life insurance companies in the country is now carrying on its own books more coverage on the lives of Negro citizens than is carried by all of the Negro-owned companies combined. This assertion is not difficult to believe when we note that the 48 Negro-owned companies had $2.2 billion of insurance in force and total assets of $390 million at the end of 1966.

This new interest in the Negro market represents a significant change in itself. Until a few years ago, virtually all of the national companies avoided entirely or were highly selective in the issuance of policies on Negro lives, a practice which they felt was necessitated by excessively high mortality rates in the Negro community. As we know, this practice on the part of the national companies was the main reason that Negro-owned life companies found such promising markets for so many years. With the change in practice, the nation-wide companies are now concentrating on expanding coverage in the Negro community—especially among the members of the growing middle class. While the average Negro policy is undoubtedly smaller than the average for white policyholders, in the aggregate the volume of net premiums (and the net savings component) collected in the Negro community is sizable and growing. The over-all result has been a marked slow-down in the progress of the Negro-owned companies. But, more fundamentally, these developments also have a number of serious implications for the availability of funds for investment in the ghetto. I shall return to this point before closing these remarks.

Turning to Negro-owned banks, the first thing to observe is that—taken as a group—they are not appreciably different from other banks of comparable size. At the end of 1966, the 17 Negro-owned institutions had total assets of $122 million and held total deposits of $108 million. Thus, they represented 0.033 per cent of the total assets of insured commercial banks in the country. But even this small figure reflected modest but steady improvement, because in 1963 their share of such assets was 0.021 per cent, and in 1957 it was 0.018 per cent. As mentioned above, a large proportion of the relative gain recorded by the Negro-owned banks can be traced to the four or five recently chartered national banks, which were able to get underway mainly because of more liberal policies followed by the Comptroller of the Currency during the early 1960's. More recently, a few States have also chartered Negro-owned institutions which will operate in the ghettos of several of our large cities.

Further insight into the characteristics of the Negro-owned banks can be seen by comparing a few key ratios for the banks in 1966 as shown below (per cent):

Ratios	Negro-owned banks	Federal Reserve members with assets of $5,000,000 to $10,000,000	All insured commercial banks
Cash and U.S. Government/total assets	35.9	36.0	28.1
Cash/total assets	11.8	14.2	15.1
U.S. Government/total assets	24.1	21.8	13.1
Loans/total deposits	58.2	53.8	64.7
Time deposits/total deposits	51.3	49.2	52.8
Capital/risk assets	14.7	13.4	11.0

The Negro-owned banks are compared with all insured commercial banks as well as with Federal Reserve member banks of approximately the same size as the Negro-owned institutions. (The mean asset holding of the Negro-owned banks was $7.2 million against $29.8 million for all insured commercial banks). In relation to total assets, the Negro banks tend to hold a smaller proportion of cash and loans and a larger proportion of U.S. Government securities than do other banks—except that their loan-deposit ratio is higher than for smaller member banks of the Federal Reserve System. They also seem to rely on time deposits as a source of funds to about the same extent as do other banks.

However, as a group, the Negro-owned banks seem to be somewhat more heavily capitalized.

But this global review does not tell us very much of what we need to know about the performance of the Negro-owned institutions. During the last few months, with the assistance of a number of people in several of the Federal Reserve Banks, I have spent a considerable amount of time studying the experiences of the Negro-owned banks. Without going into details concerning particular banks, the findings can be summarized briefly in the following observations on asset quality and the problems faced by their managements.

Over-all the asset quality of the banks seems to be fair. However, the banks chartered prior to 1960 appear to follow somewhat less venturesome policies than do the newly-chartered institutions, and this shows up in a number of differences among them. For example, among these older institutions, there is a heavy reliance on savings accounts of individuals and less reliance on demand deposits—especially of partnerships and corporations. They rarely make unsecured loans, with the bulk of their lending activity centering in loans secured by real estate. Their loan loss record is good. The ratio of loans to deposits in these banks is somewhat low, averaging 53 per cent, compared with an average of 58 per cent and a range of 42 per cent to 75 per cent for all Negro-owned institutions. This lower average ratio probably reflects primarily the policy of making basically only secured loans. As a group, the asset quality of these older banks was generally satisfactory.

Among the banks chartered since 1960, the asset quality is generally not quite as satisfactory as that found in the older institutions—even of comparable size. These newer banks have gone readily into areas of unsecured loans and discounting of consumer installment contracts, principally dealer generated automobile paper. Because these fields were generally unexplored by the banks, some of them have encountered a number of difficulties. Some of the newer banks have not been able to press their collection policies as vigorously as they would have liked, and past due loans have averaged somewhat higher than for other banks. This may be due in part to the fact that the newer banks have moved—sometimes aggressively—to extend loans to lower income groups which find it very difficult to make up payments on amortized loans once they become delinquent.

Probably the most serious problem faced by all of the Negro-owned banks is that of obtaining, training—and retraining personnel. This seems to be true of clerical personnel as well as of senior management and younger individuals with management potential. The older, well established banks have managements which are generally rated satisfactory, and most of them have provided adequately for management succession. However, they do seem to encounter considerable difficulty in maintaining experienced operating staffs. Since these banks (like those newly-chartered) are serving primarily a low-income community, they are faced with a heavy volume of lobby traffic and an equally heavy volume of paper work. Such conditions are one of the causes of a high turnover rate of clerical staff which compounds the training problem. Of course, this situation—and its effect—is common to all banks where it exists.

For some of the newly chartered institutions, the task of obtaining and keeping a senior management cadre has been difficult. To some extent, this may have reflected the pressure of competition for bank management personnel faced by all institutions—especially by the smaller ones. Some of the banks have attempted to meet their difficulties by employing white persons (particularly retirees) with bank management experience. Others have brought in officers from the established Negro-owned banks. Nevertheless, some of these new banks are still facing an uphill struggle.

But, taken as a whole—and despite the problems which some of them face—the Negro-owned banks are filling a vital need in their respective communities. With few exceptions, each of these banks is located in a part of an urban area which the large, white-owned banks have not sought aggressively to serve—even when State branch banking laws would have permitted them to do so. In fact, it seems that several of the newly-chartered national banks were able to obtain charters primarily because they proposed to concentrate on the needs of communities where the number of banking offices per capita was particularly low. A few of the State bank charters recently obtained by Negroes seem to have been granted for similar reasons. Although the community support for some of the new institutions may not have developed as rapidly as had been anticipated, the Negro-owned banks as a group do seem to be meeting a definite need which has gone unmet for many years.

On the other hand, as mentioned above, the tasks of mobilizing the financial resources necessary to rehabilitate the urban ghetto will place a gigantic burden on all of our institutions. This clearly calls for a genuinely cooperative effort in which Negro-owned institutions can—and should—share.

AVENUES OF COOPERATION

Let us look, then, at some of the specific ways in which this needed cooperation can be facilitated. Initially, let us return to the life insurance companies' plan to invest $1 billion in the urban ghetto. At the outset, I want to make certain that everyone understands my own attitude toward this proposal: I applaud it because it is a major step—not simply in the right direction but also because it represents a sizable amount which could increase substantially the availability of funds for urban housing. In saying this, I am not unmindful of the magnitude of the tasks we face. Nor am I unaware of the enormous volume of resources under the command of the life insurance companies. At the end of 1966, total assets of these institutions amounted to $167 billion, having increased by $8 billion during the year. But during 1966, they acquired a total of about $37 billion in new investments, an amount more than four times as large as the net gain in total assets—a fact reflecting the reinvestment of loan repayments, exchanges, replacements and short-term security purchases.

I, personally, do not interpret these large flows of life insurance company funds to mean that the diversion of $1 billion of investments to the urban ghetto (perhaps over a period of several years) is of only minor importance. To the contrary. In the first place, insurance companies are pinched for funds. The cash flow in a typical life insurance corporation is about as fully committed as it has ever been. In my judgment, these corporations would have absolutely no trouble putting the money into investments elsewhere with a higher rate of interest. Of course, insurance companies already have heavy commitments in the city—investments in housing and in industrial and commercial facilities. Therefore, I can see that they would want to share in underwriting the efforts of urban reconstruction.

I think this decision of the life insurance companies is significant in another way. It is my impression, based on a number of conversations with officials of Negro-owned life insurance companies, that the large, nation-wide institutions are collecting substantially more in net premiums in the Negro community than they are re-investing in that community. Of course, one cannot document this statistically, but the indirect evidence seems to support the conclusion. As mentioned above, they have written a considerable amount of coverage on Negro lines, and the total is growing rapidly. At the same time, because of the high risk inherent in investing in ghetto properties, the flow of investments to the Negro community, in the judgment of Negro insurance officials, probably falls considerably short of the outflow.

In reporting these observations, let me say immediately that I am not advocating that there should be a one-to-one ratio between the flow of life insurance savings and the re-investment of funds in a particular locality or community. If such a rule were applied across the board, the efficiency of our machinery for mobilizing and channeling funds would be greatly damaged if not essentially destroyed. On the other hand, if extra risk in the urban ghetto has induced life insurance companies, on balance, to steer investments to other areas, there is much to be said in support of a conscious effort on their part to divert funds into the ghetto.

So, in my judgement, this is a good decision. But, how can Negro-owned financial institutions help to translate these plans into effective action. The possibility of joining in local financing of low-cost housing developments (perhaps through limited dividend cooperation) is an obvious step. Apparently, projects involving properties backed by FHA and built to rent on the basis of Federally-subsidized rents, will be among those initially undertaken by the participating insurance companies.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR MORTGAGE BANKERS

But, at some stage presumably, the companies would plan to branch out into expanded financing of other projects in the ghetto—particularly single-family homes, small apartment buildings, and commercial properties. Here, then, one can see even more promising opportunities for the large national institutions to build not simply physical structures but human bridges as well in the ghetto.

It is my impression, based on considerable checking with industry officials, that so far no major life insurance company has designated any of the Negro mortgage bankers as correspondents. Of course, many of the companies have made a considerable number of loans against Negro homes and business properties in urban areas. However, these were effected primarily through white mortgage bankers, through Negro mortgage brokers, or by the companies directly. Moreover, most insurance companies have long-established relationships with one or two mortgage bankers in their principal lending areas. Nevertheless, there appear to be positive advantages which would probably result from the development of correspondence relationships with some of the Negro mortgage bankers—who could not only originate loans but service them as well.

I am told that there are presently some 1,300 mortgage bankers in the country. Eight of these are Negroes who have met the requirements of FHA approval—e.g., that applicant:

Must be a responsible person.

Must have net worth of $100,000 for office in one State, plus another $50,000 for office in noncontiguous States, and $250,000 for offices in several States.

Must have commercial bank lines of credit against warehousing of mortgages.

Must have outlets with institutional investors (such as life insurance companies and mutual savings banks) other than FNMA.

The typical mortgage banker has a net worth of something over $100,000 and services about $50 million of loans a year, although the largest may do a volume of business in excess of $1 billion. The largest of the Negro mortgage bankers has a net worth of $100,000 and originates and services roughly $12 mil-

lion of loans in a year. One-third to two-fifths of this total amount is on behalf of FNMA rather than for private lenders. The other Negro mortgage bankers are said to have a volume of business in the neighborhood of $2–$4 million.

In conversations with a number of officials in Negro-owned institutions (particularly banks and insurance companies) a great deal of stress was put on the need for Negro mortgage bankers to obtain secure correspondent relationships with leading life insurance companies. They believe that such channels would greatly enhance the flow of funds to the ghetto by making available to these lenders a degree of knowledge about local conditions which they cannot otherwise tap. While no one would want to suggest that a particular company should employ a particular person as a correspondent, it does appear—at least at a distance—that there may be merit in some company's pursuing the idea further.

The continuous access to local people with expertise in ghetto housing problems does seem to be a necessary condition of a successful program of the type which the life insurance companies have undertaken. This seems to be one of the over-riding conclusions which has emerged from the experience of the Philadelphia savings banks which launched a similar program in that city about 18 months ago. Four of these institutions pledged to invest $20 million in private homes to be insured by FHA and purchased by residents of the ghetto. The amount was to be distributed among the participating banks on a pro-rata basis according to their assets, and they made it clear that additional funds could be provided. So far they have been able to disburse or firmly commit about $1½ million, although they originally expected to be much farther along toward their goal by the time 18 months had passed. They have encountered a number of obstacles which are only gradually being overcome. It took quite a bit of time to work out procedures with the regional office of FHA, and it took even more time to devise a system for appraising ghetto homes and establishing criteria of eligibility without compromising on income standards. But above all, it took time to make contact with ghetto residents and to instruct many of the potential buyers about the process—and responsibility—of becoming homeowners. While they worked through a local information center and even employed a young lawyer full-time to help expedite the program, they relied mainly on their own personnel supplemented by local mortgage brokers and others active in real estate.

From the experience of the Philadelphia institutions, it seems clear that Negro bankers, insurance company officials, and others with a specialized knowledge acquired through lending funds against ghetto properties could make a major contribution in helping to translate the recently announced $1 billion life insurance company program into a significant effort of urban reconstruction.

OPPORTUNITIES IN JOB-CREATING ENTERPRISES

Beyond the housing field, opportunities will probably also exist to join in the establishment of job-creating enterprises in the ghetto—although only limited planning in this direction has been undertaken by the life insurance companies so far. One concrete example of how this might be done was called to my attention only a few days ago: Just outside the boundary of one of our large midwest cities is an all-Negro community with a population of about 10,000 and a labor force of roughly 5,000—of whom 20 per cent to 25 per cent are unemployed. The reasons for the high unemployment rates are the usual ones, of which a lack of skills is the most important.

The municipal officials have drawn up a development plan and are actively trying to attract industry. A moderate-size machinery manufacturing firm has responded with an offer to establish a plant in the community which would have approximately 300 employees when it reached full strength in about two years. The capital outlay would be about $300 thousand, and the company is prepared to supply $150 thousand. It has asked the city to find the remaining $150 thousand. It appears that about $300 thousand would be required to underwrite the on-the-job training program necessary to fit most of the local potential employees for the semi-skilled assignments which the plant would provide. It also appears that training funds may be available through existing Federal Government programs. Thus, the net requirement is for $150 thousand for plant facilities. Here, then, is a natural opportunity for Negro businessmen and bankers in that midwest community to join with a life insurance company participating in the newly-announced investment program to translate a plan into a going enterprise offering jobs to ghetto residents. I am confident that simliar opportunities exist in every one of our major cities.

I urge the National Bankers Association to share in the identification and development of these opportunities. Our citizens in the ghetto—and particularly their children—will be eternally grateful to all of you.

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, in the past few months there has been much controversy concerning the Office of Economic Opportunity. During all of the controversy the supporters of OEO have maintained that this organization, while it has some shortcomings, has striven valiantly to do a very difficult task. Truly, in some areas the OEO has expended a lot of energy and has achieved some results. Project Headstart is one example of this.

However, in all too many instances, this simply has not been the case. In fact, it often has been virtually impossible for Members of Congress to find cut what is going on even in the OEO Washington headquarters. Once I wrote personally to the Director of the OEO concerning a most urgent matter; some 5 weeks later, I had still not received a reply. In the most recent case, which prompts my brief remarks today, I received a letter from a constituent asking some questions about OEO operations. So that he may have their explanation of the matter, I forwarded this letter to the OEO on July 25 for comment.

I received a reply to this inquiry on October 12, some 11 weeks later. I can only conclude that OEO's bureaucratic confusion is so massive that it takes 80 to 90 days even for the most routine letter to be answered.

This fact points out one of the most outstanding problems that not only Congress, but citizens as well, face in trying to deal with the OEO.

Again I suggest that with a little more efficiency in that office, perhaps some of their programs could be better consummated, waste identified, and problems solved.

NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, on October 11, 1967, the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] delivered a most interesting address entitled "National Security: Basic Tasks." This address was to the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace Conference on 50 Years of Communism in Russia. I highly recommend this to the Senate and ask unanimous consent that a copy of this address be inserted in the RECORD.

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

NATIONAL SECURITY: BASIC TASKS

(Address to the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace Conference on 50 Years of Communism in Russia, by Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, Stanford University Memorial Auditorium, October 11, 1967)

I am delighted to be with you this evening. I am honored to share in this truly significant conference. It is also very good to be back at Stanford University.

I guess you would classify me as a Stanford drop-out. I attended school here during the summer of 1931 and took two courses under Dr. Graham Stuart, one on the League of Nations and the other on international relations. On his advice, due to the deepening depression and the manpower ceiling in the Department of State, I undertook the study of law rather than my previous plan to prepare for the Foreign Service. Your Dr. Stuart was and is a great inspiration to me.

I

Unlike Paul Bunyan's Flu-flu bird—that didn't care where it was going, it only wanted to see where it had been—we are looking at the past in these meetings in order to find clues to the future. By gaining a better understanding of the last half-century we hope to be able to use our wits and wisdom to help shape events of the next half-century.

That comment reveals, I suppose, a political perspective. Some of you write history; the politician reads history to discover its operational significance to him in his work. What does it tell him that will help him to distinguish the wise from the less wise choices he faces from day to day?

II

In 1967, as throughout the postwar period, the conflict of purposes and policies between the United States and the Soviet Union is the conflict that must be successfully managed if our children are to inherit a nation and a world whose future possibilities have not been foreclosed.

There is a belief in some quarters that the cold war storms are abating and that the worst of our problems with the Soviet Union are behind us. The relative tempering of behavior since Stalin has encouraged many people to believe that the Kremlin, if not yet content with the *status quo,* is not acutely dissatisfied with it. Other people assure us that Moscow will not attempt to adjust by force existing spheres of influence. Some people even see Communist China as the one source of disturbance and danger in today's world—and tomorrow's—and the Sino-Soviet rift as the doorway through which the Soviet Union may step to rejoin Western society.

Experience *has* produced some leavening of world revolutionary dogmatism. The shaping forces of the modern world have not bypassed the Soviet Union. Moscow, like Washington, now is aware of the risks of nuclear war to Soviet society, and Soviet leaders seem to have some understanding of the need to prevent the accidents, miscalculations, or failures of communication that could lead to catastrophe. The vigorous development and application of science and technology have not only multiplied the capacity to wage war but also the capacity to

produce consumer goods and services. The demand by Soviet citizens for improvements in living standards have thus been encouraged. These same advances in science and technology have brought about a somewhat wider diffusion of power internally. A restoration of Stalinism would today be difficult, if not impossible. The worldwide appeal of democratic ideas has touched Soviet society also—and where lip-service is paid to these ideas, in time mere lip-service may not be enough. The events of the century reveal no weakening of the political force of nationalism, as the Kremlin has learned in its relations with many communist regimes, and particularly with China.

Although everyone now says "polycentric" where some used to say "monolithic," it does not follow that Moscow is about to make common cause with the West. There is a hopeful side to the picture, but it is not the only side.

I do not know how to assess Soviet foreign policy in recent years except as an effort to extend the frontiers of Soviet influence whenever the risks seemed to be acceptable. How else should we read the several Berlin crises or the Cuban missile crisis? Khrushchev has not been criticized in Kremlin circles, by the way, for what he was trying to accomplish by installing missiles in Cuba, but for failing—by biting off more than he could chew.

Moscow's heavy responsibility for the situation in Vietnam also illustrates my point: it has given Hanoi steady and substantial military and diplomatic support. Moscow has helped to train and equip Hanoi's forces and is now the North's principal source of supply. Hanoi is one of the two or three best-defended cities in the world, thanks to Soviet anti-aircraft installations. Late-model Soviet rockets are being used against our bases and our forces on land and sea. In light of the evidence one must ask whether the Soviet Union desires a compromise settlement. Its behavior suggests that it would welcome our humiliation but that it will be careful to keep itself insulated against excessive risks.

On the other side of the world, Moscow is deeply involved in a political campaign, backed by all the elements of Soviet power, to reduce the influence of the United States in Western Europe to the point where NATO will disintegrate. Just this year, at the Karlovy Vary Conference of Communist and Workers Parties of Europe, Brezhnev took the lead in issuing a call to European communist parties and to West European socialist and social democratic parties to try to disrupt the NATO Alliance by 1969, in the expectation that Moscow could deal thereafter with a fragmented Europe of small and medium-sized states, with obvious implications for the ability of these states, including the German Federal Republic, to pursue policies not meeting with Soviet approval.

Moscow's large political, economic, and military investments in the Middle East underlie the events of last May and June, and dramatically support my point, even though, in the Kremlin's view, its efforts miscarried. It was not until events threatened to embroil the Soviet Union in an excessively hazardous enterprise that the Kremlin opted for a policy of caution.

My own reading of events, therefore, suggests that where we find the Kremlin acting with circumspection, it is because, to use their phrase, "objective conditions" impose this requirement. Where the "objective conditions" are propitious, however, the Kremlin is encouraged to act boldly to expand the frontiers of its influence. The circumstances are thus created for the most dangerous confrontation—a showdown between nuclear powers.

It is difficult, if not impossible, for anyone on the outside to know whether the Soviet leadership, at any given moment, is in a cautious or risk-taking mood. Nothing is more guarded than the discussions that take place within the Kremlin. Perhaps Kosygin, Brezhnev and company will avoid daring adventures—at least in Europe; I would be less sure, about, say, the Middle East. For even a sense of caution about a direct US–USSR confrontation still leaves open a large arena for so-called "wars of national liberation" and political conflicts waged through proxies and mercenaries needled into action by Moscow. The constant danger is that any one such lesser war or conflict-by-proxy may lead to a nuclear showdown.

And how long will the present Soviet leaders lead? Few, if any, students of Soviet affairs anticipated Khrushchev's ouster, and few are likely to anticipate the next shift, or the policy changes it may precipitate.

In any event, as I look back upon our experience, I find a strong correlation between Soviet prudence and restraint and the firmness and capabilities of the West.

Also, as the record shows, Soviet leaders can be reasonable in one field and unreasonable in another—blunt and ready to do business on some issues, crafty and unpredictable on others. Indeed, on any given matter they can twist and turn, thaw and freeze, agree and disagree, and, with no embarrassment whatsoever, trot out on alternate days a black-hatted Fedorenko and a white-hatted Dobrynin.

We should have learned by now that the way to encourage a reasonable response from Moscow is not through weakness but through strength. The way to negotiate successfully with Soviet leaders is to maintain the strength to make negotiated agreements more attractive to them than continued disagreements—as in the case of the Austrian Peace Treaty and the limited nuclear test-ban treaty.

III

In relations with the Soviet Union the free world must pursue two consonant courses of action: to work with them where interests converge, and at the same time to maintain the strength and the resolve to discourage peace-upsetting moves by them.

It was with this point of view on East-West relations that I voted for the limited nuclear test-ban treaty—and also worked to obtain the Administration's pledges to continue actively with the nuclear testing permitted under the treaty and to maintain in a state of readiness a program for atmospheric tests in the event of abrogation of the treaty or other circumstances placing the supreme interests of the nation in jeopardy.

It is with this point of view that I have favored efforts to limit the spread of nuclear weapons—and at the same time have opposed major concessions in the treaty negotiations without any compensating changes of policy on the Soviet side.

For similar reasons I have favored discussions with Moscow about freezing the development of strategic defensive weapons—and at the same time voted to appropriate funds to begin the production and deployment of a "thin" ABM system, and argued against indefinitely delaying such a deployment. I have sought a high priority for a research and development program to develop, if we can, the tools for an effective defense against the kind of missile attack that, as of today, only the Soviet Union could launch.

For similar reasons I have supported West German efforts to move toward normal relations with Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, including expanded cultural, scientific, trade, and diplomatic contact. At the same time, I have opposed substantial unilateral reductions of American forces in Western Europe and I have argued the still fresh and compelling need for the Atlantic Alliance and its international commands.

It is with this point of view that I have urged the importance of frequent and frank discussions between the United States and the Soviet Union, in order that each side might gain a clearer understanding of the range and limits of the other's intentions and actions and that we and they might work toward an identification of areas of common or parallel interest, in Vietnam and elsewhere. At the same time, I have tried to counteract the siren song that goes: "If we trust the communists, they will trust us." A favorite quotation of mine is one from Reinhold Niebuhr:

"If the democratic nations fail, their failure must be partly attributed to the faulty strategy of idealists who have too many illusions when they face realists who have too little conscience."

IV

Frankly, I am deeply concerned at a tendency I discern in some current thinking about American military policy. Some scientists and civilian officials have a mirror image interpretation of Moscow's decisions relating to its military establishment, seeing them as reflex actions—a tit-for-tat, action-reaction view of the Soviet arms buildup. Implicit (and sometimes explicit) in this view is the belief that if the U.S. did not act the Soviet Union would not act. Sometimes the argument is taken even farther: if the U.S. acted to reduce its military programs, the Soviet Union would reciprocate, in what could be called *a policy of minus-tit for minus-tat.*

That is one possible model of Soviet behavior, but the policy-maker cannot rely on it until and unless it is supported by convincing evidence that the model describes not how the Soviet Union *might* act, but how it *does* act. There is, of course, a relationship between the U.S. strategic posture and that of the Soviet Union. I am sure the Russians have a real fear of our awesome military might. Yet as I read the evidence, the Russian aspiration to possess a first-rate military establishment stems from other factors as well, from a perspective that goes beyond the theories of deterrence that have gained popularity over the last twenty years.

One factor is the long-implanted belief that Russia is threatened at various points along its tremendously long land borders. The Soviets have lost tens of millions in the wars of this century and it is not surprising that they display a passionate, at times paranoid, concern for the security of their frontiers. Another factor is the propensity of Soviet leaders, given their interpretation of history, to impute to the "capitalist-imperialist" West, the worst of intentions. Over and beyond this, of course, the thinking of Soviet leaders is conditioned by their own conception of the Soviet Union's historic role, which is still defined in the familiar vocabulary of world revolution.

We cannot ignore the fact that it was the Soviet Union which acted first to develop long-range intercontinental surface to surface missiles, and the U.S. which followed. It is the Soviet Union which has acted first to deploy an ABM set-up, and the U.S. is following.

Some American scientists and civilian officials have done the nation a poor service by propagandizing a notion contrary to all the evidence namely, the idea that military technology has arrived at a "plateau," that the "scientific military revolution" has been "stabilized," and that no new technological upsets which could affect military relationships are likely. Ordinary economic technology is always finding better ways to do things and there is no reason to suppose that military technology will cease in this effort. Missile technology, for example, is advancing in almost all fields of offense and defense—payload, accuracy, guidance, maneuverability, and multiple warheads.

What is the evidence that if we unilaterally reduce our own military programs, the Soviet Union will reciprocate? We do have

some experience to go on. It may not be conclusive, but we should face up to it.

Some time ago our government announced a top limit on the number of our strategic missiles for deployment—both land and sea based. But Moscow, according to its own statements, has been working hard to narrow the missile gap that limited its range of options in the Cuban crisis of 1962. Moscow has just increased by 50 percent in one year the number of its operational intercontinental ballistic missiles. A year ago the ratio of American to Russian ICBMs and submarine-launched ballistic missiles was 3 to 1; the present ratio is less than that.

The argument is made that this declining ratio in offensive strategic capability can be offset by the U.S. move to multiple warheads. If past experience in the development of critical weapons is any guide, however, we must assume that the Soviets are also on the multiple warhead course. We need to remember that the larger missile payload the Soviets can mount on their bigger missiles gives them the capability to deploy more nuclear warheads per missile than we can.

Sometime ago our government phased out our land-based intermediate-range ballistic missiles and we have reason to believe the Soviet Union understood that we were trying to eliminate a possible source of misunderstanding about our intentions. Yet the Russians have maintained 700 to 800 medium-range and intermediate-range ballistic missile launchers, most of which are targeted on Western Europe.

Consider also our experience with the anti-ballistic missile. Our government put off a decision to start deploying a "thin" ABM system in the hope that the Soviet Union would see the mutual advantages in mutually foregoing further developments in defenses against missiles, thus releasing Soviet and American resources for urgent and constructive purposes in the world.

Moscow, however, is going about *its* business, not *ours*. An ABM system in Soviet hands lends itself superbly to the bluffing and blackmail that have all too often been hallmarks of Soviet policy. Would a U.S. without ABMs maintain its firm resolve if a USSR with ABMs began a series of step-by-step moves against Berlin? As Soviet planners "cold-war game" with the forces of the 1970s, they are surely asking themselves questions of this kind. So should we.

Obviously the Soviet rulers do not accept the notion that military technology stands on a "plateau." Perhaps no single breakthrough would be as significant as the developments leading to the H-bomb or the ICBM, although I would not want to bet on that. In any case an accumulation of less dramatic inventions could have major significance, and could critically affect the present balance of forces.

V

I must also say, I am profoundly concerned at another tendency I note in the current discussion of American military policy. Top Defense officials are telling us that "nuclear superiority has only limited relevance today" and that "today, in the nuclear age, nuclear superiority is of limited significance." What do statements like that mean? While continuing to describe our policy as one of maintaining nuclear superiority over the Soviet Union, are we in fact embarked on a different course? Have top Defense officials accepted the hypothesis that nuclear superiority constitutes a provocation to the other side to build up its strength? Is nuclear parity now our goal? Have top Defense officials come to think that missile defense against the Soviets is a destabilizing influence in world affairs, and that an effective missile defense should not be one of our objectives?

These are not rhetorical questions. I do not know the answers. I do suggest that if such assumptions are entering into the making of American military policy, they should be ventilated and debated thoroughly—and not quietly substituted for the assumptions on which we have been acting. The questions involve what would be a radical change in American policy. I believe it could be the road to catastrophe.

If, for example, the Soviet Union comes out ahead in the search for an effective anti-missile system, the relationship on which our defense planners have counted to maintain political stability by discouraging a diplomacy of blackmail will be reversed. The consequences for the West could be calamitous.

As I see things, international peace and security depend not on a parity of power but on a preponderance of power in the peace-keepers over the peace-upsetters.

Our aim is not, of course, an unlimited accumulation of weapons. Our policy has been—and I believe it should continue to be—to create and maintain, in cooperation with our allies, a relationship of forces favorable to the deterrence of adventurism and aggression. The road to disaster would be to permit an unfavorable relationship of forces to arise.

VI

In all this the productive power of the American economy is a factor of great importance. Last year our gross national product exceeded $740 billion. By the end of this year it will approach an $800 billion rate. Total current output of our NATO allies is more than $500 billion, so that together the fifteen allies have a productive capacity well over $1 trillion. Although GNP comparisons must be used with care and do not necessarily indicate what societies can or will allocate to military purposes, it is worth noting that Soviet productive capacity is estimated at less than $350 billion, and that the figure for all communist countries combined is estimated at less than $600 billion.

The USSR with a large command economy can afford to build a fairly complete arsenal of sophisticated weapons. But in terms of outlays of money, materials, and manpower for military and foreign programs, there is no doubt that the Soviet Union is operating under more severe economic constraints than the West. We have the economic power to help build a healthier world economy and to give prudent support to the efforts of developing countries to raise their productivity. The superior industrial and agricultural power of the West might yet be a trump card in the long effort to arrive at mutually advantageous arrangements and agreements on the control and limitations of arms and in other fields. If this card is to remain in our hand, however, the Executive Branch and Congress must be ready to make the hard decisions needed to assure continued, steady, non-inflationary growth.

We want to walk the road of cooperation with any who will accompany us. We want a world in which reconciliation and peace prevail. It is a noble cause. But a cause must have its champions, and we may take pride in being counted among them.

DISCONTINUANCE OF RAILROAD POST OFFICES

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, when the Post Office Department began discontinuing railroad post offices throughout our Nation, I cosponsored, with a number of other Senators, Senate Concurrent Resolution 25. This resolution proposed a moratorium upon all future discontinuances at least until a complete and comprehensive study could be made of RPO's by the Department of Transportation. It was advanced in hopes of determining the most economically advantageous program for the long as well as the short run.

Yet, despite the pleas of a number of Senators from both sides of the aisle, despite the protestations of several State Governors, the Post Office Department continued its policy of abolishing RPO's. This policy was undertaken without adequate planning, without adequate investigation, and without a long-range look at the needs that had to be met. The effects of this shortsighted policy are now coming to the fore.

One such effect has been the slowing down of mail deliveries. At this point, I ask unanimous consent that two letters from Mr. Quentin Ackels, a resident of Cheyenne, Wyo., be inserted in the RECORD, along with my remarks to reveal the inefficiency which seems to have become Post Office Department policy since the abolition of RPO's.

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

CHEYENNE, WYO.,
September 29, 1967.

Senator CLIFFORD HANSEN,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HANSEN: I suppose you are sick and tired of hearing about the Post Office Department but if their policies prevail over the objections of thousands of railmen, business leaders and labor unions my 31 years seniority is going down the drain and unlike the RPO clerks, when I'm out, the UP isn't going to transfer me or retire me.

My comments follow—

The Postal Department is shipping mail in freight service that was previously handled on our Streamliners and Mail and Express trains 5 and 6 between Omaha and the West Coast and on UP trains 27 and 28 which operated only between Omaha and Cheyenne. I understand its 20% cheaper rates handled in freight service. The loss of these cars on train 27–28 has allowed the UP to consolidate these trains with trains 105–106. This move alone cut off 3 engineers, 3 firemen, 2 brakemen, 1 conductor, 5 baggagemen and 3 mail pilers.

Now, trains 5 and 6 are headed for the same fate that has overtaken trains 27–28. Train 5 is down to about 6 cars from its usual 35 to 40 and there is strong talk of it being cut off entirely because they are handling 5's mail cars on freight trains. If this set of trains are abolished it will result in the loss of at least 200 rail jobs thru the area the trains serve. (Omaha to Los Angeles with part of the train splitting at Ogden, Utah, for San Francisco.)

The Post Office has started shipping all the Wyoming mail captured at Omaha for Laramie, Rawlins, Rock Springs, Green River and Evanston into Cheyenne in freight service and then they give it to a truck for delivery from here. All this mail was previously handled on train 5 and was put off this train by a team of 4 mail pilers who reside in Cheyenne. They expect to be laid off in October.

The first Wyoming mail received at Cheyenne under this new freight service arrived Sunday, September 24, about midnite. I went out on train 103 the 25th at 10:45 AM. I noticed they had about 200 sacks of Wyoming shorts on the trucks and told the boys what car I wanted it loaded into and they laughed and said the Postal Service wouldn't let them load it on a train, that a truck was to come at midnite, September 25th, to pick up and deliver.

I just learned from friends today that this mail was picked up about 1 AM, September 26, and was taken as far as Laramie by truck. For some unknown reason this mail was taken to the Laramie depot and loaded back on our passenger trains on September

26. Again, mail received here in freight service the morning of September 28, was allowed to stand on the platform trucks while three crack streamliners passed it up so it could be dispatched on a truck about 1 AM the 29th. The bulk of this shipment was taken only as far as Laramie. I was at the depot today (29) when the Agent called and alerted the baggagemen on our streamliners to be prepared to pick up 135 sacks left there by this truck.

Now, if you study my letter closely you will note it takes days to get this mail from Omaha to Laramie. Isn't this a dirty shame when all of Southern Wyoming can get one day service from Omaha on our trains?

The railroad grapevine has it that trains 17–18 Kansas City to Portland are to be abolished. People tend to scoff at these rumors but in my 30 years with the railroad most of the big rumors have materialized.

In closing, thank you for your time and consideration.

Yours truly,

QUENTIN ACKELS.

P.S.—We want and need this mail back to the trains. I forgot to mention the loss of this local mail will cost in addition to the mail pilers, at least one man at each station across Wyoming.

CHEYENNE, WYO.,
October 2, 1967.

Senator CLIFFORD HANSEN,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HANSEN: I don't want to make a nuisance of myself but if you don't object, I'd like to keep you informed of instances where the mail is being mishandled by the trucks.

The boys at Cheyenne advise me they unloaded an undetermined amount of South Dakota mail from train 6, at 7 a.m. September 29, and sent it to the Post Office to be trucked to destination. Apparently, it was too big a load and fifty seven pieces of this mail was returned to our trains the evening of 9–29–67 for handling thru to Omaha.

The exorbitant delay is at once apparent.

To continue the thoughts I've presented you in my first letter. This continued expansion of the truck service plus changing the storage mails from our mail trains to freight trains can't help but kill our passenger trains. The average person doesn't realize that every one of our fast passenger trains have mail and baggage cars and they have to have something in them for the UP to meet expenses.

Can't the Post Office figure out some way to keep everyone alive, railroads and trucks alike, without forcing a bunch of us old fellows into the Job Corps.

Respectfully,

QUENTIN ACKELS.

IT'S TIME FOR DISSENT AGAINST THE DISSENTERS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, on Wednesday evening, October 11, 1967, Joseph A. Scerra, of Gardner, Mass., commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, spoke in Redfield, S. Dak., at a great testimonial program for the new junior vice commander in chief, Ray Gallagher, of Redfield. It was a thrilling and memorable occasion for the overflow audience assembling in Redfield from all over South Dakota and from our neighboring States. Joe Scerra's address was enthusiastically received.

Ray Gallagher, able attorney and community leader, is a typical South Dakota product. Born in Sioux Falls, S. Dak., on July 29, 1921, Ray graduated from the University of South Dakota with his LL.B. degree awarded by our nationally recognized College of Law, which is a proud part of our university complex.

I know from my personal talks with Ray that he abundantly shares the points of view expressed by the commander in chief of the VFW in his South Dakota address which was accorded National news coverage.

Mr. President, before concluding this presentation, I want to pay my personal tribute to Ray Gallagher and his charming wife, Trixie, and to join in the congratulations so amply due him for his achievements to date and for the new VFW office to which he was recently elected in which I am sure he will perform effectively, impartially, and with customary candor and courage.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Joe Scerra, and also a complete biographical sketch of Ray Gallagher, of whom the Nation is destined to hear much more in years to come.

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

IT'S TIME TO DISSENT AGAINST THE DISSENTERS

(Remarks by Joseph A. Scerra, Gardner, Mass., commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, at Redfield, S. Dak., October 11, 1967)

It is high time some of the amateur diplomats, professional politicians, armchair generals and would-be Presidents in our nation be reminded that their continuing harsh and distorted criticism of America's continuing stand against aggression in Vietnam is harmful to the success of our mission and to the security of our nation.

It may not be their intention, but these self-appointed experts of international military and political strategy are providing false hope and misleading comfort to the enemy. They—no less, and perhaps even more, than the so-called anti-war demonstrators—are actually helping to prolong the war rather than to shorten it, as they so zealously claim is their objective. Their expressions of dissent and protest provide the North Vietnamese with a reason to believe they can achieve the victory our men in uniform are denying them on the battlefront through a split in our ranks on the home front.

The devisive antics of the peaceniks, beatniks and draft card burners can perhaps be blamed on ignorance or immaturity. It is difficult, however, to find any excuse for the increasing tendency of certain members of Congress and other elected officials to assume they somehow have acquired a special insight and wisdom which qualifies them to render better judgments on policies and actions than the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State or the Commander-in-Chief.

Never in the history of our nation has there been a greater need for national unity and support of our constituted leaders. The withholding of traditional bi-partisan Congressional support from the President in the conduct of foreign policy can only serve to undercut his bargaining strength with our enemies and diminish his stature among our friends.

Our military leaders report that our military position in Vietnam has improved considerably in recent months. We have gained the offensive and the enemy has sustained crippling losses in men and materials that have destroyed his ability to effectively continue his course of aggression. However, although the North Vietnamese can find little comfort in the trend of the war itself, they have only to read the statements of some of our Senators and Representatives to find reason to believe they can outlast our will even if they cannot outgun our fighting men. Almost daily, a Member of Congress furnishes the enemy with fresh signs of what he can easily misinterpret as a weakening of our staying power.

It is difficult for our enemies to understand that America's freedom to debate and dissent does not mean a lack of resolve to honor our commitments. We Americans respect the right of the individual to dissent. But too often the enemy quotes the words of our debaters and dissenters in their newspapers and on their broadcasts as a means of bolstering the sagging morale of their own fighting men.

It is indeed unfortunate that the pressure that our guns and bombs bring to bear on the enemy in an effort to lead him to the negotiating table in response to the President's repeated requests for peace talks is continually negated by the words of the dissenters in the U.S. Congress.

Some of the dissenters say we should halt our bombing of North Vietnam. Yet they do not ask that the enemy provide any assurances that he will respond with a comparable deescalation in military activity, or that he will not use the occasion to build up his weaponry and manpower so that he can launch new offensives and kill more of our American troops.

Some of the dissenters want to restrict our military activities to the defense of isolated enclaves. Yet they do not explain how this will help the South Vietnamese achieve freedom for the people outside these limited areas or how this will help resolve the conflict.

Some of the dissenters even call for a complete withdrawal of our troops. Yet they do not say how we can explain this abrogation of our commitment to the other small nations of the free world who look to us as a bulwark against Communist aggression.

The dissenters do not have a monopoly on a desire for peace.

What the dissenters in Congress and elsewhere seem to forget is that the Administration has tried halting the bombing of North Vietnam a number of times, but they have all gone unheeded by Hanoi.

The Administration has repeatedly offered to hold unconditional negotiations with the North Vietnamese and the Viet Cong but all overtures have been rejected.

The Administration has honored cease fire agreements during certain holiday observances, but the enemy has used them to infiltrate our lines and reinforce his positions.

The Administration has conferred with every interested nation and used every available channel, including the United Nations, in its efforts to find some method for bringing about a meaningful cessation of hostilities.

Peace, unfortunately, can not be achieved merely by making speeches on the floors of Congress or by holding demonstrations in the streets of our cities. And peace cannot be brought about by one side alone.

The enemy must be made to realize that he cannot achieve his goals of expansion and domination by military aggression. He must understand that this nation is committed to the defense of freedom in South Vietnam and that this nation honors its commitments. He must not be permitted the luxury of drawing succor, no matter how unjustified, from the misleading statements of the dissenters within our midst.

We do not need another pause in the bombing of North Vietnam to convince Hanoi of our desire for peace. We tried that, and it didn't work.

What we need to try now is a pause in irresponsible dissent to demonstrate our strength of purpose and unity of spirit.

President Kennedy said "The cost of freedom is always high but Americans have always paid it. And one path we shall never choose, and that is the path of surrender or submission."

The path to a just peace is the one where we present a united front to the enemy, so that he will not fail to recognize the futility of his aggressive course of action.

I, therefore, personally call upon our Senators and Representatives to support the Administration in fulfilling its pledge to support our fighting men in Vietnam and to work for a just and honorable peace in Vietnam.

At the same time, I urge every member of the V.F.W. and every American citizen to embark on the most massive letter writing campaign in the history of this nation. I urge that he write his own Senators and Congressman to adhere to our traditional Constitutional procedures for the conduct of war and foreign affairs and to support—not hamper—our Secretaries of State and Defense and the President of the United States in the conduct of their awesome tasks. You should also send copies of your letters to the White House, so that our President will know his countrymen stand behind him in this hour of trial.

I have never asked the members of the V.F.W. to write their Congressmen for any specific purpose before, but I do so now because I feel the need is critical. Let your Senators and Congressman know how the veterans of this nation feel about our commitment in Vietnam.

If he supports the Administration's stand in Vietnam, let him know how much you appreciate it. But if he has been among the dissenters, let him know that now is time for our nation to stand together in its defense of freedom and its quest for peace.

RAYMOND A. GALLAGHER, JUNIOR VICE COMMANDER IN CHIEF, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES

Raymond A. Gallagher, Redfield, South Dakota where he is a Life Member of V.F.W. Post 2755, was elected Junior Vice Commander-in-Chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States at the organization's 68th Annual National Convention August 25, 1967 in New Orleans, Louisiana. On August 26, 1966 he was elected Judge Advocate General at the 67th Annual National Convention held in New York City. At that time he was a member of the National Council of Administration, representing the Departments of North Dakota, South Dakota and Nebraska.

Born in Sioux Falls, South Dakota, July 29, 1921, he attended Millsaps College, Jackson, Miss. and the University of South Dakota, where he received his LLB Degree. He presently practices law in Redfield with the firm of Gallagher and Battey.

From September 1942 to May 1946 the Junior Vice Commander-in-Chief served with the U.S. Navy, as an enlisted man. After training at Asbury Park, New Jersey and at Midshipmen School, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York, he served on LST duty in the Asiatic-Pacific theatre. His decorations include the Philippine Liberation Medal.

In 1946 Gallagher joined V.F.W. Post 4674 at Winner, South Dakota, later transferring to Post 2755 at Redfield, where he served through the various posts to Post Commander. He went on to become District Commander in 1962. On a Department level he progressed to Commander during 1964–65. While serving as Department membership chairman, he produced the highest percentage of increase in membership in the history of the Department of South Dakota. Among innovations adopted during his year as Commander of the Department was the annual Legislative Conference which has been adopted as a permanent program.

Gallagher has served as President of the Redfield Chamber of Commerce, as Chairman of the Redfield Community Fund (which he founded), past president of the Spink County Mental Health Division and as Chairman of the Sioux Falls Diocesan Aid Program. He is a former member of the South Dakota Veterans Commission and is a member of the American Legion, the Disabled American Veterans, Military Order of Cooties, Redfield Baseball Board, Knights of Columbus, Elks, the State Bar Association of South Dakota and the American Bar Association.

He is married to the former Theresa Meyers. The Gallaghers have four children—Patrick, Thomas, Mary Ann and Edward.

CONCLUSION OF THE WORLD SERIES

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, although I do this with a somewhat heavy heart, nevertheless I warmly and sincerely congratulate the distinguished Senators from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON and Mr. LONG] upon the great victory the St. Louis Cardinals achieved last Thursday in Boston's Fenway Park.

It is certainly never a disgrace to lose to real champions, and there can be no doubt that Manager Red Schoendienst's extraordinary team deserves the title of World Champions. They have lived up to their reputation as skillful competitors and fine sportsmen. I wish them success in next year's pennant race and look forward to a return series next October in Fenway Park and Busch Memorial Stadium.

But, Mr. President, once again I want to salute the Boston Red Sox and to commend Manager Dick Williams, owner Tom Yawkey, and each and every member of our stout-hearted team. Massachusetts is proud of them. Coming into the World Series after their electrifying capture of the American League pennant, the fine showing by the Red Sox throughout the seven-game series has given people all over the world the thrill of a lifetime and has filled us all with nothing but respect and admiration.

I fear that this is an instance when I cannot truthfully say that it just "wasn't in the cards." For anybody watching the final game will have to concede that it was "in the Cards!"

Mr. President, I had hoped not to revert to this subject again, but alas, I am compelled to say, "Wait 'til next year!"

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there any further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

AMENDMENT OF THE SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL ACT OF 1950

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 498, S. 2171.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2171) to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, so as to accord with certain decisions of the courts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from West Virginia.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

DESIGNATION OF SAN RAFAEL WILDERNESS, LOS PADRES NATIONAL FOREST IN THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to S. 889.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 889) to designate the San Rafael Wilderness, Los Padres National Forest, in the State of California which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, in accordance with section 3, subsection (b), of the Wilderness Act (78 Stat. 891), the area shown on the map entitled "Los Padres National Forest, San Rafael Wilderness, proposed", revised July 1967, is hereby designated the San Rafael Wilderness. Said map is and shall continue to be kept on file and available for public inspection in the office of the Chief of the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, and the area thereon shown, comprising approximately one hundred and forty-five thousand acres, is within and shall continue to be a part of Los Padres National Forest.

SEC. 2. As soon as practicable after this Act takes effect, the Secretary of Agriculture shall file a map and a legal description of the San Rafael Wilderness with the Interior and Insular Affairs Committees of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives and such description shall have the same force and effect as if included in this Act: *Provided, however,* That correction of clerical and typographical errors in such legal description and map may be made.

SEC. 3. The San Rafael Wilderness shall be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture in accordance with the provisions of the Wilderness Act governing areas designated by that Act as wilderness areas, except that any reference in such provisions to the effective date of the Wilderness Act shall be deemed to be a reference to the effective date of this Act.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House of Representatives, 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 appointed Mr. JACKSON, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. KUCHEL, and Mr. ALLOTT conferees on the part of the Senate.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

AUTHORIZATION OF FEASIBILITY INVESTIGATIONS FOR WATER RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on the bill S. 1788, with the amendments of the House of Representatives thereto.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1788) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to engage in feasibility investigations of certain water resource developments, which were, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to engage in feasibility studies of the following proposals:

1. Missouri River Basin project, Garrison division, Garrison diversion unit, Minot extension, in the vicinity of Minot, North Dakota.

2. Mogollon Mesa project, Winslow-Holbrook division in the Little Colorado River Basin in the vicinity of Winslow and Holbrook, Arizona.

3. Mountain Park project in the vicinity of Altus, Oklahoma.

4. Retrop project on the North Fork of the Red River in the vicinity of the W. C. Austin project, Oklahoma.

5. Washita River Basin project, Foss Dam and Reservoir water quality investigation, on the Washita River near Clinton, Oklahoma.

6. Rogue River Basin project, Evans Valley division, on Evans Creek, a tributary of the Rogue River, in southwestern Oregon.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to undertake investigations and prepare a reconnaissance report on the California coastal diversion project, consisting of subsurface offshore conveyance of water from the Eel-Klamath River areas to an appropriate terminal point in Southern California.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to engage in feasibility investigations of certain water resource developments, and for other purposes."

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] who is necessarily absent, has prepared a statement which he has asked me to read for him.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JACKSON—READ BY SENATOR BYRD OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, section 8 of the Federal Water Project Recreation Act—Public Law 89–72, 79 Stat. 213—requires that the preparation of any feasibility report on water resource developments under reclamation law must be specifically authorized by law. The purpose of S. 1788 is to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to undertake investigations and prepare feasibility reports on specified water resource development proposals.

The House of Representatives amended section 1 of S. 1788 to authorize feasibility investigations of two additional projects: the Foss Dam and Reservoir water quality investigation and the Evans Valley division of the Rogue River project. I propose that the Senate accept these amendments.

Section 2 of the House-passed bill, however, purports to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to undertake investigations and to prepare a "reconnaissance report" on a specific water development proposal. The House Interior Committee's report—Report No. 635—states that this amendment was adopted "to indicate the committee's desire that this particular reconnaissance study be made at the earliest possible date."

Under existing law the Secretary does not need specific legislative authority to undertake and prepare reconnaissance reports. The Secretary has authority to request funds for reconnaissance investigations and, as a result, this section of the bill is not necessary.

The views of the Department on section 2 were requested and are stated in their letter of September 25, 1967. In brief, the Department's views are that, first, the Department has adequate authority to engage in reconnaissance studies; second, they are currently engaged in feasibility studies in the area proposed for study by section 2; third, until water supply studies of this area are completed a reconnaissance study would be premature. I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. JACKSON. The Senate Interior Committee made a policy determination during the 89th Congress that feasibility authorization bills should not include either directives or authorizations to undertake reconnaissance investigations—see committee report on S. 3034, 89th Congress, report No. 1368, pages 8, 9. During the executive session on June 28, 1966, when this matter was considered, it was determined that projects upon which reconnaissance studies have not yet been made "should be listed in the report with a request by the committee that the Bureau of Reclamation should undertake reconnaissance studies"—see minutes, June 28, 1966, page 4. This policy was followed in the Senate and projects upon which the committee wished to have reconnaissance studies made were listed in the committee's report on the bill—see pages 8, 9, and 10 of report No. 1368.

I do not believe that an exception should be made to this policy of the Senate Interior Committee in the absence of a compelling reason to do so. To make exceptions is to create a situation where every Senator and Congressman will wish to have proposed reconnaissance investigations in his State authorized in the periodic feasibility authorization bills. This is impractical and may have the effect of advancing studies on economically unsound project studies ahead of sound project studies.

Mr. President, the amendment to strike section 2 of S. 1788 as amended by the House, does not represent a negative judgment on the merits of the proposed reconnaissance study. The Interior Department should give expeditious consideration to this proposal. The proposed study may have considerable merit but it should be initiated in the same manner in which other reconnaissance studies are undertaken.

EXHIBIT 1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D.C., September 25, 1967.

Hon. HENRY M. JACKSON,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your oral request for our views on section 2 of S. 1788 (a bill, "To authorize the Secretary of the Interior To Engage in Feasibility Investigations of Certain Water Resources Developments), as passed by the House of Representatives on September 18. Section 2 of S. 1788, as amended, reads as follows:

"SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to undertake investigations and prepare a reconnaissance report on the California Coastal Diversion Project, consisting of subsurface offshore conveyance of water from the Eel-Klamath River areas to an appropriate terminal point in Southern California."

As authorized by the Act of September 7, 1966 (P.L. 89–561, 80 Stat. 707), we presently have authority to engage in feasibility investigations of the water and related land resources on the potential North Coast Project in California. This study area includes those streams, including the Eel and Klamath Rivers, entering the Pacific Ocean between San Francisco Bay and the California-Oregon boundary. The purpose of the investigation is to develop plans for the conservation and use of the water that now flows unused into the Pacific Ocean for the diversion into other California areas.

The investigation of several units and divisions of this project is under way by the Bureau of Reclamation in cooperation with the California Department of Water Resources and the Corps of Engineers. As soon as sufficient progress has been made in the water supply studies for the potential project to indicate the extent of availability of surplus waters in those coastal streams, consideration logically will be given to the alternative means for conveyance of such surpluses to water-deficient areas in California. One of the means which will warrant study will be the subsurface offshore conveyance such as contemplated by the amendment of the House of Representatives of section 2 of S. 1788.

With respect to the above-quoted section 2, we presently have general authority to engage in reconnaissance investigations. Although the subsurface offshore conveyance proposal appears to have sufficient merit to warrant further consideration, to our knowledge very little work is being done in this field by Federal agencies at the present time. Before considering the application of this technique to specific projects, a substantial research effort to develop and test materials suitable for that purpose, and to develop methods of manufacturing, installing and maintaining underwater conduits of the size being contemplated, should be conducted.

Sincerely yours,

KENNETH HOLUM,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House of Representatives, with an amendment, as follows:

Strike all of section 2.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from West Virginia.

The motion was agreed to.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

HAROLD P. FABIAN APPRECIATION DAY

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, on the 6th of October, the Governor of the State of Utah declared a Harold P. Fabian Appreciation Day, and Mr. Fabian was honored at a dinner held in Salt Lake City, Utah, which was attended by the Governor, officials of the State of Utah, the National Parks Advisory Board, the Director of the National Park Service, several of the superintendents of the national parks, high officials of the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, and leading citizens of the State of Utah. It was a very impressive affair, and one that I shall long remember. In the course of the dinner, much was said about the work that has been done by Mr. Fabian, who is noted throughout the West, and in fact throughout the Nation, as one of the architects of national parks, restoration of historic sites, development of outdoor recreational facilities for all of the people. Mr. Fabian richly deserves every accolade which has been paid to him.

The Deseret News, published in Salt Lake City, wrote an editorial at the time of the Fabian dinner. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be included in the RECORD.

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

MISTER STATE PARKS

If there is a man in Utah who can be called Mr. State Parks, he is certainly Harold P. Fabian, honored this day by the citizens of Utah.

An attorney by profession, Mr. Fabian has spent much of his life promoting the conservation of choice areas of both the state and the nation for recreation purposes. Certainly no one in Utah has worked harder to set aside a part of the state's scenic and geological wonders that they might become a heritage for our posterity.

Mr. Fabian was the father of the Utah Park and Recreation Commission, serving as its chairman on two different occasions. Under his guidance, the basic policies of the state's developing state park system were set, and many fine areas have been incorporated into the system—Wasatch State Park, Dixie State Park, Stage Coach Inn, and Monument State Park, to name just a few.

Mr. Fabian is a man who loves the beauties of the out-of-doors. He is one who wants to share that love with all Americans. For this, Utah owes him a large appreciative vote. The tribute today—Harold Fabian Day, so proclaimed by the governor—to be climaxed tonight with a special dinner in his honor at Hotel Utah, is a well-deserved tribute to this fine gentleman.

THE GROWING PROBLEM OF ALCOHOLISM

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, earlier this year I joined with many colleagues in introducing a bill (S. 1508) which would provide a strong public health approach to the growing problem of alcoholism. Alcoholism is now identified as the Nation's third most serious health problem.

As a result of the efforts of many individuals and organizations operating in both private and official circles, there is greater public awareness of the serious health and economic aspects of alcoholism.

Recent court decisions, notably the Easter and Driver decisions, have illustrated the need for greater involvement by Government at all levels in programs to combat and treat alcoholism. The court cases have reaffirmed what many of us have said for years, that alcoholism is a disease and not a crime. No longer, in some jurisdictions, can a person be arrested merely because he is drunk in public. But, where does this individual go if he is not sent to jail? The answer should be that he goes to publicly supported detoxification and rehabilitation centers. These centers, however, are not available. The demand for them, however, will mushroom as the court decisions spread to States and communities which are totally unprepared to handle alcoholics as ill persons.

Greater public awareness was recently given a boost by the publication of a book by Thomas F. A. Plaut on alcohol problems. I ask unanimous consent that a review of the book by Donald Newlove which appeared in Sunday's Washington Post be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

THE PICKLED SKELETON IN OUR CLOSET

(By Donald Newlove)

The purpose of this important book is nothing less than a total revolution in the way Americans think, feel and act about alcohol. In sober, judicious words the book manages to shock by bringing Giant Staggerjuice out into the open, naked and shameless, just like those once embarrassing but now tired subjects called sex education and birth control. Old Staggerjuice is actually everywhere—but no one sees him. Young Pot (or marijuana) is much less ubiquitous—but everyone sees him even where he isn't. As for cigarette smoking—we are all quite willing to admit that it may be harmful to health; that in fact a lot of people may die of lung cancer (though it won't happen to us, of course). But the dangers of alcohol—even greater than those of smoking—are stubbornly masked by lies and jokes.

The fact is that the American Medical Association now rates alcoholism as our third greatest health problem, led only by heart disease and mental illness. And this year, for the first time, alcoholism knocked cancer into fourth place. In reality, drink may well be the most serious of all our illnesses, for when a middle-class alcoholic dies the death certificate is often falsified by the insertion of such euphemisms as hepatitis, gastric bleeding, pneumonia, tuberculosis, diabetes, over-enlarged heart, heart disease, mental disease (28 per cent of all male mental patients are alcoholics) and auto fatality. Drunkard though the deceased may have been, no family wants it in writing.

America's guilty attitudes about alcohol consistently lead the drinker to minimize and disguise his illness and to exaggerate his will power. The problem drinker is supersonically alert to any sanction that will allow him to keep his bottle. A brief encounter with psychoanalysis may bring insight and freedom from guilt—but these new clarities rarely shut off the intake. As for will power, by the time he wants to make use of it, the alcoholic discovers that it is too late: he is the permanent victim of a progressive disease, one that bears as little relation to will power as malaria. Neither guilt nor will power nor insight can help him.

To come to grips with these unpleasant realities, the Cooperative Commission on the Study of Alcoholism was founded in 1961 under a grant from the National Institute of Mental Health. A score of eminent authorities including psychiatrists, anthropologists, biochemists and administrative experts, with headquarters at Stanford University, make up the Commission. Their findings, published here as the first part of a continuing study, culminate in a controversial proposal for a federally sponsored "total alcohol program." It will require an open-mindedness on the part of the nation no less heroic than that needed to implement welfare and civil-rights legislation.

The Commission specifically urges the creation of a Committee for National Alcohol Policy which would operate under the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Neither pro- nor anti-alcohol, such a committee would create objectives and co-ordinate programs for the national attack on the disease. At the pyramid's base would be an army of "alcohol workers" analogous to social workers. The army would be divided into teachers, group leaders, medical aides, welfare helpers. Eventually, the policy committee would create a network within the already existing government bureaus that deal with agriculture, finance, liquor control, penology, education, highways, public health and public welfare. It would also work closely with the Department of Defense, for the armed services are plagued with problem drinkers—as is the U.S. Senate, if one is to believe a recent Drew Pearson column. But such cross-stitching of one group throughout the entire fabric of the government has never before been attempted, nor is it likely to happen without an uproar. No similar proposals in the range of "personal freedom," not even the 18th Amendment, have had the range or the authority of those set forth in this report.

Educating the public and the legislators is the core of the campaign, for the problem is one of inbred attitudes or, just as pertinently, the lack of them. Our unsureness about alcohol is due to the absence of a set of standards. Legislation makes alcohol mysterious and exciting by placing age restrictions upon it. Advertising represents drinking as a masculine pursuit; indeed, at many levels getting drunk is regarded as proof of virility. Most important, as yet, "no satisfactory means have been developed for influencing the ways in which youngsters are introduced to drinking. For some, their first drinking experience is an act of rebellion; it may occur outside the family circle and is likely to be associated with guilt and hostility." Since "drinking patterns (and associated attitudes) can influence problem drinking in a cultural group," it is the *introduction* to alcohol that determines later responses. Among many American cultural groups, drinking "is not usually associated with another activity; rather its specific purpose is often 'having fun' or 'escape.' Far from being positively

connected with deep-seated cultural and moral values, it is associated with the residual uneasiness about the enjoyment of pleasure, an attitude still widespread in America."

Thus the Dean Martin syndrome and much of the basis of our national humor. As *Alcohol Problems* observes, "expressions such as 'sneak a quick one' or 'have a blast' reveal uncertainty and mild guilty feelings which rarely accompany socially approved behavior." So the problem is covered up by nervous laughter and, as a result, little is done to alleviate it.

No drunk could have hallucinated the crazy-quilt of prejudice about the use of beverage alcohol that now prevails. Perhaps as a reaction to the years of Prohibition and Repeal few people, even non-alcoholic sociologists, recognize the effect of alcohol on life in America. "Heart disease, cancer, schizophrenia and delinquency are not completely understood either," the Commission says, "yet a community which responded to these conditions as it responds to problem drinking would be considered medieval and a national disgrace."

Part of the enormity of the problem is illustrated by the fact that the most frequently imposed sentence of the entire criminal code is the one for public drunkenness. As this book points out, of the total reported arrests for all offenses in the United States during 1965, about one-third or 1,535,000 were for public intoxication. "However several hundred thousand additional arrests listed in police records as disorderly conduct, disturbing the peace, vagrancy, and other charges are commonly known to refer largely and sometimes almost entirely, to public drunkenness." One man may be rearrested for public intoxication more than a hundred times a year. (Significantly, the incidence of rearrest is lowest in St. Louis, the city with the best rehabilitation program.) But police records can give no more than an indication of the adverse influences of alcohol; the number of problem drinkers and alcoholics who will never come under police scrutiny is staggering even by the most conservative estimates.

The report sweeps aside much that even old hands in the field accept as gospel. For example, the Commission found no real difference between heavy drinkers and alcoholics. What keeps a heavy drinker from acquiring the disease of alcoholism is probably a greater supply of social and psychological independence, more mobility, more active responsibilities and the metabolism of an ox. But even the heavy drinker probably has a bolo of difficulties, and for that reason many government agencies will have to be involved if the drinking problem is to be dealt with meaningfully.

Public misinformation about alcoholism is phenomenal, despite the growing number of recovered alcoholics. (This number is balanced by the growing incidence of youthful problem drinkers. A few weeks ago, a 23-year-old Cornell student addressed a Manhattan Alcoholics Anonymous chapter and told of his ruined past. It was no joke. No one is too young to be an alcoholic.) Present treatment services are in a disarray that almost defies definition. Even A.A., for all its merits, manages to reach but a handful of the problem drinkers in any community. And, to make matters worse, the treatment of problem drinkers, according to this report, is now taught to medical students under conditions which perpetuate an attitude of therapeutic pessimism. As for the police and the courts, they pursue inhuman policies that doom the problem drinker to the revolving door of a drunk tank or the "flight decks" of city hospitals. Furthermore, only a few of the workers at the clinics for alcoholism are inclined to give any time to poorly motivated, less verbal drinkers of the lower classes. The report remarks that "A basic belief of our civilization is that suffering should be relieved, regardless of the person, his contribution to society, or the manner in which the suffering was brought about." But even in an egalitarian society, some people are more and some less equal. The man who has five martinis before dinner at home is a lot more equal than the one who drinks sherry from a pint bottle on a sidewalk.

The pride of the egghead alcoholic is too great to be humbled by a recovery program or by the (to his mind) inspirational naiveté of A.A. (Manhattan, however, has four or five A.A. chapters attended by highly professional members whose outright spiritual courage could bring daylight to the most benighted intellectual.) A true national program must include the Skid Row castoff with the alienated Harvard graduate. As in the army, everyone is the same age and maturity in alcoholism, for the disease is baffling, cunning and insidious to each according to his resistance.

The Commission hopes to be able to take the emotionalism out of the treatment of alcoholism much as it has been taken out of the public discussion of birth control (though *that* took 40 years). The "kicks" aspect of drinking must be punctured at the earliest age. The Commission also suggests doing away with age restrictions on drinking, or, less precipitously, establishing a national minimum age of 18. The report cites the fact that Jews and Italians, who are indoctrinated into a pattern of truly social drinking at an early age, have the lowest rate of problem drinking. When alcohol is unrelated to family or group activities that have certain guidelines about how much consumption is acceptable, drinking becomes unmanageable. The Commission feels that alcohol might be made available to the young under certain supervised conditions—". . . at youth functions such as those organized by church, recreational, or athletic groups. Prohibitions against excessive or inappropriate drinking would then be unambiguous, clearly understood, and effectively enforced. Since these are learning situations, adult supervision would be stressed."

Alcohol Problems is a model of exposition and clear writing. It is provocative and well aware of the antagonisms it will arouse. Giant Staggerjuice will howl that he is being exposed, abused, picked on, deprived, that the rights of private citizens are being invaded. But the Commission's sensible purpose is to meet an endemic national disease head-on by effecting major changes in our drinking patterns. And to lend a therapeutic hand to those millions of forlorn drunks alone with their anxieties, conflicts, guilts and griefs. The question is, is it better to let them drift unmanageably toward death, or to help steer them back to life? Unless you've been there, perhaps you'll never know, because an alcoholic is a man for whom one drink is too many and a thousand deaths not enough.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with further proceedings under the order for a quorum call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF THE SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL ACT OF 1950

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2171) to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, so as to accord with certain decisions of the courts.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the pending bill is one of the most controversial bills we have had before us this year. One of the best indications of that is a press conference that was held this morning and a wire that was sent to the Attorney General of the United States yesterday by some of the outstanding constitutional experts in the Nation.

I shall read a copy of the wire that was sent to the Attorney General in connection with the bill that is before the Senate at this time for a vote. The wire reads:

> We believe Senate bill 2171, to revive the McCarran Act, contains serious constitutional defects, is wholly unnecessary, and threatens basic freedoms of thought and expression. No hearings have been held in the Senate. We urge you to make public the views of the Department of Justice on this legislation and hope you will vigorously oppose enactment.

Mr. President, it seems to me that Members of the Senate, under these circumstances, would want to have in detail the views of experts in the field—certainly of the Attorney General—on this measure. We would also want to know the opinions of other constitutional experts in connection with this matter. I do not say that we should have extensive hearings; but there should be 1 or 2 days of hearings and an opportunity for at least two or three witnesses who are critical of the measure, as well as supporters of the measure, to appear, so that we would have some record and know what we are doing.

I might say in this connection that the pending measure is designed to amend the McCarran Act of 1950. The Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, as we know, had a very serious constitutional defect. It was enacted in 1950 for the purpose of exposing Communist fronts and Communists—people who were associated with the Communist fronts. But it did nothing. It has been law for 17 years, and the heart of that bill is to require such organizations to register.

As was brought out in the colloquy yesterday between the distinguished Senator from Nebraska and myself, not a single Communist, not a single Communist-front organization, not one subversive organization of any kind, not one subversive individual has been registered under the 1950 Subversive Activities Control Act. Why? Well, because the act was in direct conflict with the Constitution, in the light of the Smith Act, which made it unlawful for anyone to advocate violent overthrow of our Government or to belong to an organization that did.

Under those circumstances, it would seem to us—and with hindsight it is easy to see—that it is transparently in conflict with the fifth amendment of the Constitution on self-incrimination to require a Communist to register or a Communist front to register; if once he is registered, you can use this as evidence to prosecute him under the Smith Act.

This is not the opinion of somebody who is just a Senator or somebody who is sympathetic to the act. This was the

unanimous opinion of the Supreme Court, the entire conservative wing—Justice Harlan, Justice White. The entire Supreme Court voted unanimously.

Mr. President, I mentioned Justice White. I meant Justice Stewart and Justice Harlan. Justice White did not participate. It was an 8-to-0 decision, and Justice White did not take part. But the Supreme Court unanimously declared it unconstitutional.

It seems to me that if Congress had had competent constitutional advice it could have designed a bill at that time that would have stood the test of constitutionality.

All we are asking now is that we have at least some hearings. We have not had a day or an hour of hearings. We have not had a single witness. We have not had a minute of hearings. We are working in the dark on this bill. If the bill were noncontroversial, perhaps that would be all right; but, as I have said, the bill is opposed by some of the leading constitutional authorities in the Nation.

Let me name the people who signed the telegram I have just read, and who oppose the bill and say it contains serious constitutional defects: Prof. Paul Bator, Harvard Law School. Prof. Clark Byse, Harvard Law School.

I might say that Professor Byse is the head of the American Association of University Professors, a professor of administrative law, and he has written one of the most important case books in the entire area of administrative law. He says this bill has serious administrative defects. I say that by failing to hold hearings the Senate is showing it does not care enough to secure competent opinion on this legislation.

I shall continue to read the names of the signers of the telegram opposing the bill:

Prof. David Cavers, Harvard Law School;
Prof. Vern Countryman, Harvard Law School;
Prof. John Dawson, Harvard Law School;
Prof. Norman Dorsen, New York University School of Law.

Mr. President, I should have said in the beginning and I ask unanimous consent that at the beginning of this listing the name of Prof. Thomas I. Emerson, Yale Law School, be placed because he is an eminent lawyer, a constitutional expert, and he is the man who organized this group and held the press conference this morning.

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. In addition to the names I have mentioned, there are the following persons:

Dean Robert F. Drinan, Society of Jesuits, Boston College Law School, who is dean of the Boston College Law School, and a very eminent constitutional expert; Prof. Richard B. Dyson, Boston University School of Law; Prof. Morris Forkosch, Brooklyn Law School; Prof. Walter Callhorn, Columbia Law School, who is another expert in the field of administrative law, and along with Professor Byse has written the case book on administrative law used in outstanding law schools throughout this country; Prof. Louis Jaffe, Harvard Law School, a well-known, outstanding expert in the field; Prof. Benjamin Kaplan, Harvard Law School, who is a key figure in the copyright field; Prof. William J. Kenealy, Society of Jesuits, Boston College Law School; Prof. Robert B. Kent, Boston University School of Law; Prof. Louis Loss, Harvard Law School, who teaches a course in this security field and who is an outstanding nationally recognized expert; Prof. Banks McDowell, Jr., Boston University School of Law; Prof. Saul Mendlovits, Rutgers Law School; Prof. Frank Michelman, Harvard Law School; Prof. Henry P. Monaghan, Boston University School of Law; Prof. Nathaniel L. Nathanson, Northwestern University School of Law; Prof. Daniel C. Partan, Boston University School of Law; Prof. Daniel R. Pollitt, University of North Carolina Law School; Prof. Frank E. A. Sander, Harvard Law School; Prof. George Schatzki, University of Texas School of Law; Prof. Thomas L. Shaffer, Notre Dame Law School; Prof. Malcolm P. Sharp, University of New Mexico School of Law—I am sure we all recognize the University of New Mexico School of Law, which is in the great State of the Presiding Officer (Mr. MONTOYA in the chair)—Prof. Morgan Shipman, Harvard Law School; Prof. Leonard P. Strickman, Boston University School of Law; Dean David H. Vernon, University of Iowa College of Law; and Prof. Henry Weihefen, University of New Mexico School of Law.

Mr. President, once again, these are eminent authorities, and I am sure that many, many other outstanding experts in this field would have signed this telegram and expressed sentiments of vigorous opposition to the pending bill, had there been time. Professor Emerson was able to organize this much opposition in the matter of a very few days, with very little notice. As I think we all know, while this has been an issue before the Senate for a few days, it has not been an issue that has been widely publicized throughout the country. Yet an impressive number of outstanding experts in the country were willing to make clear their view that the proposed bill contains serious constitutional defects.

As I have said, we do not have a line of testimony on the bill before the Senate. Mr. President, it would seem clear to me that we should have some real opinion from the Attorney General. I am waiting with bated breath to see the copy of the letter which presumably has been written by the Attorney General to the distinguished minority leader. It was announced by the Senator from Nebraska yesterday that the minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], received a letter but none of us has been informed as to what was in the letter. It seems to me that this letter, if it is going to be of any value to us, should have an analysis of this particular bill which would indicate that the Attorney General is well aware of the bill and is prepared to tell us whether or not this bill will be effective.

The last thing any Senator wants to do, whether he is conservative, liberal, whether he believes strongly in the Subversive Activities Control Act or not, is to pass a law that will not work. To do so would mean there will be another period of years for this Board to remain idle and for taxpayers to have to pay $26,000 a year to each of the five members of the Board and high salaries to a number of other employees on the staff for absolutely nothing.

All of us want to know whether or not this Board is going to do anything. Until we get word from the Attorney General as to whether or not he intends to use this legislation, it is impossible for us to know whether or not it is going to be effective.

BILINGUAL EDUCATION CALLED NECESSARY FOR 2 MILLION DROPOUTS WITH LINGUISTIC DIFFICULTY BY THE NEW REPUBLIC

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, in the most recent issue of the New Republic, it is stated:

> There are almost two million children who will drop out of school and end up on the economic slag heap because of an almost insurmountable language barrier.

It is because of this language problem that I have introduced and held hearings on S. 428, the bilingual education bill, which the article discusses.

Because of the insight into the bilingual problem shown by the article, I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "Bilingual Education," published in the October 21, 1967, issue of the New Republic, and appearing on page 9, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

BILINGUAL EDUCATION

Last summer, Senator Ralph Yarborough (D, Texas) held hearings in the Southwest on the educational afflictions of Spanish-speaking, Mexican-Americans. As the author of a bill to funnel federal funds into bilingual educational systems in certain sections of the country, Yarborough was interested in getting the opinions of the Spanish-speaking themselves, and of the professional educators who have been studying this situation for years. He brought back to Washington a wealth of evidence, showing that it is largely the language barrier that blocks the 6–7 million Spanish-speaking from climbing up the economic ladder.

The average number of school years completed by the "Anglo" child in the Southwest is 12.1 years; for the Negro it is nine years; for the Mexican-American, 7.1 years. Relatively poor educational achievement is reflected in an extremely high unemployment rate among the Spanish-speaking. It is seen also in the fact that the Southwest's badly paid migratory labor force, once made up of the Deep South's dispossessed sharecroppers, is now largely composed of Spanish-speaking workers.

According to a study by Dr. Faye Bumpass of Texas Technological Institute, there are at least 1,750,000 schoolchildren with Spanish surnames in the five-state area of Texas, New Mexico, Colorado, Arizona and California. These children, she told Senator Yarborough's subcommittee on bilingual education "are suffering from linguistic, cultural and psychological handicaps that cause them to experience academic failure in our schools." Senator Robert Kennedy has made a similar observation about Spanish-speaking youngsters in New York City. At hearings in East Harlem, recently, he noted that of 250,000 Puerto Ricans in the New York

public school system, only 37 went on to college last year.

A report of the Texas Education Agency revealed that in 1957—the only year such a survey was made—about 80 percent of the non-English-speaking children in that state had to spend two years in the first grade. Forty percent of the Southwest's Spanish-speaking pupils are in Texas. But during the last session of the state legislature, a bill to provide English-Spanish instruction in most subjects in certain public schools became so embroiled in controversy to the consternation of educators, that it was dropped. Its opponents contended that Texans of German ancestry and those living near the French-speaking areas of Louisiana were against making Spanish a second language. By the time the bill was rewritten to provide a sort of local option on the language issue, interest had waned and the proposal was quietly shelved.

In California, where it is estimated there are 461,000 schoolchildren from Spanish-speaking homes, bilingual legislation has fared somewhat better. School districts may teach children in their native language if they do not have a working knowledge of English. The drawback here is that the legislation is merely permissive, and that local school districts must finance the bilingual training. As might be expected, school districts with the largest proportion of Spanish-speaking students are the worst off, and unless more aid is provided by the state—a dim prospect under the cost-conscious Reagan administration—the program is not likely to be carried out where it is needed most.

This may explain the interest of many Californians in a bill Senator Yarborough and others (including Robert Kennedy) are drawing up. It calls for appropriating in the neighborhood of $50 million over a three-year period to assist local school districts set up bilingual instruction, with Spanish taught as a native language and English as a mandatory second language. It also would help underwrite the training of Spanish-speaking teachers. Two Los Angeles congressmen, Edward Roybal and George Brown, have introduced similar legislation in the House, and they have been joined by Rep. James Scheuer of New York.

At a hearing in Los Angeles, Senator George Murphy brought out that 50 percent of Spanish-speaking students in California drop out of school by the time they reach the eighth grade, which he found "shocking" and in part the result of "the language problem." Senator Thomas Kuchel suggested treating "the ability to speak Spanish and other languages as an asset. The United States can no longer pretend that it can communicate with other people with but one tongue—no matter how widely the English language is spread over the earth." Both California senators are on Mr. Yarborough's subcommittee.

Representatives of all organized Mexican-American groups were at the Los Angeles hearing and were unanimous in support of a federal subsidy for bilingual education. One of the spokesmen pointed out that according to the population ratio in California at least 20,000 Mexican-Americans should be enrolled in the state's colleges, whereas the figure is around 2,000.

In the past, Americanism has been equated with ability to speak English, and nothing but. Undoubtedly there are many congressmen who feel that the "melting pot" principle is sacrosanct. But in the simpler society of the past—when the "melting pot" was going full boil—the great need was for manual, not educated, labor; brawn or dexterity often were prized as much as formal schooling. (Even then, however, in the 1890's, there were towns and cities where public school instruction was conducted for part of the day in a language other than English.) Today, machines have shrunk the market for manual labor. In a complicated, computerized world the need has shifted to workers who can quickly master new concepts and techniques—and a prerequisite for such workers is a high degree of comprehension—and that means schooling.

There are almost two million children who will drop out of school and end up on the economic slag heap because of an almost insurmountable language barrier. Professional educators are aware of it. It remains to be seen whether Congress is.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the article refers to hearings held in the Southwest during the past summer by the Special Subcommittee on Bilingual Education, of which I have the privilege to be chairman, on the educational afflictions of Spanish-speaking Mexican-Americans.

It states that the bill seeks to funnel funds to assist local school districts to set up bilingual instruction in certain sections of the country. The hearings were held to get the opinions of the Spanish-speaking people themselves.

The article points out that our subcommittee brought back to Washington a wealth of evidence showing that it is largely a language barrier which blocks from 6 to 7 million of the Spanish speaking from climbing up the economic ladder.

The hearings were held in my State at Corpus Christi, San Antonio, and Edinburg. We also held hearings in Los Angeles and New York City.

While we often think of the Spanish speaking as people of Spanish-American extraction, in our hearings we found many people of Latin American descent who have settled in New York City. We learned that 22 percent of the school people in New York City are from Spanish-speaking homes and that most do not speak English. So this is also a problem of persons of Puerto Rican extraction who live in New York City.

The Senator from Florida has told us that this need is also felt in Miami and other areas of the United States to which refugees from Communist Cuba—hundreds of thousands of them—fled to liberty.

Reading from the article, in part, it states:

> The average number of school years completed by the "Anglo" child in the Southwest is 12.1 years; for the Negro it is nine years; for the Mexican-American, 7.1 years. Relatively poor educational achievement is reflected in an extremely high unemployment rate among the Spanish-speaking. It is seen also in the fact that the Southwest's badly paid migratory labor force, once made up of the Deep South's dispossessed sharecroppers, is now largely composed of Spanish-speaking workers.
>
> According to a study by Dr. Faye Bumpass of Texas Technological Institute—

Incidentally, she spent 9 years teaching in Peru and is one of the outstanding and completely bilingual teachers in America—

> there are at least 1,750,000 schoolchildren with Spanish surnames in the five-state area of Texas, New Mexico, Colorado, Arizona and California. These children, she told Senator Yarborough's subcommittee on bilingual education "are suffering from linguistic, cultural and psychological handicaps that cause them to experience academic failure in our schools." Senator Robert Kennedy has made a similar observation about Spanish-speaking youngsters in New York City. At hearings in East Harlem, recently, he noted that of 250,000 Puerto Ricans in the New York public school system, only 37 went on to college last year.

Just think, 37 out of 250,000.

> At a hearing in Los Angeles, Senator George Murphy brought out that 50 percent of Spanish-speaking students in California drop out of school by the time they reach the eighth grade, which he found "shocking" and in part the result of "the language problem." Senator Thomas Kuchel suggested treating "the ability to speak Spanish and other languages as an asset. The United States can no longer pretend that it can communicate with other people with but one tongue—no matter how widely the English language is spread over the earth." Both California Senators are on Mr. Yarborough's subcommittee.

Mr. President, a vast body of evidence accumulated by the subcommittee in the report has been printed. The bill (S. 428) was the first bilingual education bill ever introduced in either House of Congress. Again, I thank the distinguished chairman for being one of the original cosponsors. The hearings held in the Senate were the first hearings on bilingual education ever held by either House of Congress. They were printed in two volumes.

I was in San Antonio yesterday. While I was there, a member who has served in the State legislature for 6 years asked for additional copies. We had already sent him some. He said they were the most popular publication to come from Congress, based on a study of the statements made by some of the finest educators in America on this problem. The bill has been reported unanimously by the special subcommittee on bilingual education to the Subcommittee on Education and is now under consideration by that subcommittee.

Mr. President, I think it is vital that the bill be incorporated into the Elementary and Secondary School Act and be written into law this year. In my own State of Texas, four of the so-called Rio Grande counties—that is, the citrus belt of Texas where oranges and grapefruit are grown—Cameron, Hidalgo, Starr, and Willacy—contain more than 600,000 people, and of the children of school age in that population, 70 percent come from Spanish-speaking homes. In the first grade, in September of this year, 90 percent came from Spanish-speaking homes. That is in the entire citrus area of Texas. The need is urgent. It is vital. So say the fine educational psychologists and fine educators who deal with bilingual education. It simply means teaching children whose mother tongue is Spanish, both Spanish and English. They presently go to a school where it is illegal to speak Spanish, even in the playgrounds. They try to speak their own language but read and write in another. They can speak only Spanish. We can try to teach them to read and write English, but that creates in the children an intellectual barrier, to say nothing of a psychological inferiority, so most of them drop out of school very soon.

The plan for bilingual education has

been discussed by educators. They want the children to become literate in both languages, whereas, under present circumstances, they are illiterate in both. This is one of the greatest wastes of America's greatest natural resource—its citizens. Millions of Mexican-Americans, when given an intelligence test in Spanish, in words they can understand, make grades as high as those of anyone else.

In addition to depriving these people of the chance to obtain equal opportunity, we are losing a valuable national asset—the most valuable national asset we have.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Texas on his statement. A serious problem is created for children who speak a foreign language.

It is particularly interesting to me, because Wisconsin, 50 or 60 years ago, had a somewhat similar situation to the one which now exists in Texas. In that day, the basic language in Wisconsin was German. In fact, many of the children did not speak English at all because their parents had come from Germany as little children. Wisconsin saw to it that those children gradually learned English. But the fact is that their education was obtained in a language which they understood.

The Senator's bill will be a helpful accommodation to the children of Texas. He is absolutely right in pointing out that this valuable, precious, natural resource—indeed, the most valuable resource we have—is the minds of our children.

I am so glad that the Senator from Texas brought this to the attention of the Senate.

A psychological impact is made on a little child when he is forced to speak a language with which he is not familiar, and he is told that he is not intelligent. No matter how his IQ rating is concealed, that child knows, from the basis on which he is treated that he is considered to be inferior. That can have a damaging and destructive effect upon his whole life.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin for his contribution on that point. In my State of Texas it is not widely known, but there was a very large German migration to my State which began when Texas was a Republic, because one could be naturalized in the Republic of Texas after only 6 months' residence with no requirement to learn English. Texas wanted to settle Germans, so as to act as a buffer between the Texans and the Comanches, and gave the Germans free land as an inducement to come to Texas. The failure of the liberal revolution in central Europe in 1848 caused German-speaking settlers to pour into Texas by the thousands.

Ten thousand came through the Port of Galveston alone in 1 year; and they were coming into other ports, too. Because they had lived in Germany during that liberal revolution, which failed, most of them were teachers or writers or other well educated people, and they made great contributions in my State.

The first tax-supported public high school in Texas was established in the 1850's by those German-speaking settlers, and they maintained their German-speaking schools up until World War I. The best known person to come out of them was Admiral Nimitz. He settled in Fredericksburg. Up until World War I, German was the language spoken there.

However, we have never before had in Texas so many millions of people who speak a language other than English. The problem becomes more serious now. Psychologists have testified that permanent damage is done when a psychological barrier is created in which children are forced to speak one language in school and another language at home. We hope that that barrier will be removed, so that those children will have a fair chance in our economy, and that we will have a chance to benefit from that resource by enabling them to get the benefits of a fair chance in our economy.

The Senator from Wisconsin brings a perceptive knowledge to this subject. I mention this because the bill will have active consideration this week before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I thank the Senator for his contribution.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

LABELING OF POTATOES

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, pending before the Commerce Committee is a bill known as the potato labeling bill. Its purpose is to require the various States in which potatoes are grown to label the potatoes indicating the State from which they came. An Ohio potato would have to be labeled "Ohio Potato." A Wisconsin potato would have to be labeled "Wisconsin Potato." Minnesota, which grows a great number of potatoes, likewise would have to label them "Minnesota Potatoes."

I am somewhat puzzled over who conceived the idea that potatoes offered in the market should be labeled on the basis of the States where they were grown. My belief is that the thought had its origin in the growers of potatoes in Maine and Idaho.

I mention this fact for the purpose of showing to what extent Congress is attempting to go in restricting the operations of the citizens of the country. We have now what is known as the Fair Trade Act and thhe Pure Food and Drug Act. Both of those acts contain provisions prohibiting fraudulent marking of packages. The provisions of those two acts are very distinct and precise. Whatever markings are made on packages must be in accordance with the truth. Thus, under those two acts, West Virginia, for example, could not label potatoes—if potatoes were grown there to any extent—as Idaho potatoes or Maine potatoes. Yet it is argued that a Federal law should be passed requiring the labeling of packages to show in which State a potato is grown.

I now pose this question: If we pass a law of that type with respect to potatoes, what about peaches, cherries, tomatoes, pears, electronic equipment, and any other type of agricultural product or manufactured product?

Will the Senator from Florida come before the Senate and urge that all oranges shall have to be identified as to whether they come from Florida or California?

We are entering into a dangerous field, Mr. President. We are imposing upon industry a burden that it ought not to have to bear.

I concur with the argument and the principle that there should not be any false advertising, but why should Ohio be compelled, by law of the U.S. Government, to write on a package "Ohio potatoes"? What difference does it make whether the potatoes are grown in Ohio or Pennsylvania or Wisconsin or Minnesota?

What will happen to the bill in the Commerce Committee, I do not know; but the great, dignified body of the Congress of the United States, believing that by law all things shall be achieved, has undertaken to deal with potatoes. It is going to require how packages shall be identified and labeled. One would think Congress has nothing of importance to do; that the important issue is to show how potatoes shall be labeled.

I contemplate fighting that proposal, and I will do so because I believe that Congress cannot begin passing laws that purposely will serve one or two States to the disadvantage of the other States in the Nation.

I yield the floor, Mr. President.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

AMENDMENT OF THE SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL ACT OF 1950

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2171) to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, so as to accord with certain decisions of the courts.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I rise in support of the bill introduced by the distinguished minority leader, the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. I feel that I should say something on the pending legislation inasmuch as I was one of the coauthors of the original act that created, among other things, the Subversive Activities Control Board at the time we had the long and rather exciting debate setting it into operation by an overwhelming vote over the veto of a President.

The legislation originated under the imprimatur of the so-called Nixon bill and became incorporated as part of the McCarran, Ferguson, Mundt, Johnson Act known as the Internal Security Act of 1950. I think it has served the country well.

Since then, as the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin has pointed out, and as we are all aware, the legislation has been subjected to a number of attacks in the courts and outside the courts—many of them motivated openly by the Communist Party in this country, some of them motivated by front organizations dominated by the Communist Party, and some of them motivated by misguided citizens who are not Communists but who somehow or other feel that our society is incompetent of creating the appropriate machinery required to protect the freedoms which we all enjoy.

So, I want to raise and answer four or five basic questions which I think are involved in the decision we are about to make today or tomorrow or the next day, or whenever the Senator from Wisconsin feels that the matter has been debated adequately.

I listened to most of the address of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] yesterday and read the rest of it this morning. As the Senator is well aware, most of what he had to say dealt with the past—how the act had been attacked, how the Supreme Court had ruled, and certain authorities that the Subversive Activities Control Board had in the original legislation.

I want to direct my remarks to the future, and hope that I can induce my friend, the active and enterprising Senator from the great, progressive State of Wisconsin, to look ahead instead of backward, quite prepared to accept the fact that as the situation presently prevails in view of the Supreme Court interpretation, the Subversive Activities Control Board would not be meaningful.

I am not one of those who wants to array myself against the board simply because the President of the United States selected a young man to be a board member who happened to have married his private secretary.

I know nothing about the young man. I am quite prepared to believe that President Johnson—who voted for the Internal Security Act of 1950, by the way, when he was a Member of the U.S. Senate—feels that this young man has good judgment, that he is loyal, that he is desirous of protecting this country against communism. And I see no reason to attack the Board because some people are unhappy about the President's choice or the personality of a new Board member. Nor do I see any reason to attack the Board because certain of its functions have been eliminated by a decision of the U.S. Supreme Court.

There are, however, some realistic questions that we ought to ask each other and answer to our individual satisfaction before we vote.

The first question is: Is communism a menace to our way of life and our constitutional concepts of our individual freedoms and representative democracy?

I think I recall that the Senator from Wisconsin agreed in the course of colloquy yesterday that communism is a menace to our way of life and to our constitutional concepts. I am sure that that must be the case. I think I read him correctly. But if I am wrong, I stand now to be corrected on that particular interrogatory. Seeing only an affirmative nod from my congenial friend, the Senator from Wisconsin, I assume that, like the rest of us, he recognizes communism to be a very serious problem on the home front.

The second question is: Is it important that our free society find effective means for preventing world communism from achieving its goals?

Certainly communism has not changed its goals or objectives. Nor has it changed its methods insofar as its domestic attacks against us are concerned as well as its international objectives. So, it becomes today not only a creed against which we are arrayed in a costly war, but it also continues to be a serious menace to our way of life because of its internal activities in our country which emphasize the importance that we establish and maintain methods of meeting the menace of communism on the home front.

I think that question also has to be answered by Senators unanimously in the affirmative.

It was considered important 17 years ago. It should be considered even more important today, at a time when we are arrayed, for the fifth year, in a costly war against communism and at a time when our enemy, Vietnam, is able to continue its war efforts only because of the outside assistance it receives from the fountainhead of communism in Moscow, Russia. So, if it is that important on our foreign front, it must not be unimportant on the home front.

I submit it is therefore vitally important that we try to establish and maintain methods for meeting that challenge here. J. Edgar Hoover said not long ago—and he is our best authority on the whole program and problems of subversion—that he believes there are about 150 communistic front organizations in the United States, not publicly identified as Communist, not quickly discernible to the average citizen as being under the control of communism, but actually being under that control and enjoying Communist direction in the carrying forward the subversive programs of the Communist Party.

Hence, it seems to me that it becomes very clear that we must find some way to curtail and curb, as best we constitutionally can, the danger of Communist activities and intrigues at home, their programs of subversive activities, their capacity on occasion to infiltrate not only our Government but also a lot of other fine, reputable organizations, their current program—which is paying them big dividends—to send out undercover agents of the Communist Party as lecturers on the college campuses, to provoke and promote a Communist line without ever being forced to identify themselves, as members of the organization which they represent and which are actually very often Communist-front organizations. I, therefore, think we must accept the fact that it is important that we try to do something to curtail communism.

My third question for your consideration is whether it is appropriate that a free society such as ours find a means to protect its constitutional freedoms against the subversive attacks of the Communists?

It seems to me that we must accept as an axiomatic fact, in this wicked world, the concept that a free society must find ways to protect its freedoms against those who would undermine them, and that if there is any doubt about matters of relative priority and importance, it is more important that a free society find the necessary means to protect its institutions and the freedoms of its people, even, than to protect those who would undermine them from unfair and unjust prosecution in the courts of law. Fundamentally, unless we can find a way to protect our society from those who would destroy it, the destroyers are certain to succeed. I doubt whether anybody will argue against that point.

So that brings us to the fourth point: Will the Dirksen proposal, now before the Senate, move the United States in the direction of being better able to protect the United States on the home front against the attacks and strategies of international, aggressive, atheistic communism? Does it have any protective value?

If it has any value at all, if we accept the conclusions I have made to the first three questions and propositions, there should be a unanimous vote for the continuance, the maintenance, and the redefinition of the duties of the Subversive Activities Control Board as they are set forth in the Dirksen proposal.

I might say, as an original author of this proposal, which was first heard before a committee chaired in the House Committee on Un-American Activities by then-Representative Richard Nixon, and hence became known as the Mundt-Nixon bill, that Dick Nixon and I, as a couple of young, enthusiastic Congressmen, who felt that communism was a strong and growing menace, thought that the easy way would be to outlaw the Communist Party. We originally planned our legislation with that in mind.

Then, and I think for at least once in our lives, we acted wisely and with foresight, because we decided there must be people in Washington who knew more about the machinations of communism than we did. So we had a conference with J. Edgar Hoover and the people in the FBI, and proudly presented there our cure-all for communism. The FBI pointed out to us that they felt there was a better approach than to try to outlaw the Communist Party. They told us how our neighboring country of Canada had twice outlawed the Communist Party but had later twice rescinded the law, because Canada discovered quickly that to outlaw a movement by name was merely to give a false sense of security to the people, because the Communist Party dissolved, and a new party, operated, controlled, and directed by the same forces under a new and pleasant-

sounding title, began its continuing program of subverting the freedoms of Canada under the covert direction of the Communist overlords in Moscow. So the Canadian Government found that to outlaw the Communist Party would not work.

The wise men of the FBI then told us there were other ways in which to proceed. They said, in effect, "Why not refine your legislation and follow other approaches?" We did precisely that in response to their counsel. The first and foremost is by exposure. Let our fellow Americans know who the Communists are. Let our fellow Americans know who the officers are. Let our fellow Americans know the identity of publications issued by the Communist Party. Above all, let our fellow Americans know the identity of the front organizations which the Communists control, to protect well-meaning Americans from being dragged into a Communist-front organization because its title sounds good and its announced purposes sound good.

Too many Americans contribute their funds and lend the use of their names as officers and directors and associates and members of Communist-front organizations, although they would not, for the life of them, actually join the Communist Party. But, to all intents and purposes, acting out of an abundance of ignorance, they join the crypto-Communist Party, they join the front organization, and their money and their funds and their names and their efforts are used to promote the infamous designs and the programs of international communism.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yeld?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. MURPHY. I wonder whether the Senator has any idea of the value that Government information would have had for the people in Hollywood in the 1940's, and how many people of that town became involved in organizations and became branded as members of subversive groups, when they were not and had not the slightest idea about the nature of the organizations they were joining. Many of them still suffer from such an unfortunate stigma.

The only way we have of avoiding this situation is through Government listings which provide a warning. They need not arrest anybody or close any offices, but merely post a warning sign to let the individual, the labor unions, the businessmen and the businesses know exactly where the problem is. Then if the individual chooses to associate himself with a doubtful group, he does so at his own risk. But at least he has a chance to know exactly where the pitfalls are and where these funds are going. This is the purpose, as I understand it, of the Subversive Activities Control Board.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is correct, and the experience of Hollywood and its actors and actresses of the motion picture industry is no whit different from what happens everywhere else.

In the hearings which preceded the House passage of the Mundt-Nixon bill, one of the witnesses who appeared before us was a very prominent woman jurist of this country, who had identified herself with 22 different Communist-front organizations. Her testimony under oath was that she had no idea that these pleasant-sounding organizations had any remote connection with communism.

Yet, the Communists were trafficking with her fine name to bring in and recruit new members and to get youth interested in Communist youth movements. Because this prominent woman judge had her name associated with so many of the Communist organizations, she was rendering a direct and significant service to godless communism.

May I bring in as a witness another gentleman from the past, Eric Johnston, of the American Motion Picture Association. We had had the cases of the "Hollywood 10," as the Senator from California will recall before our House Committee on Un-American Activities. Eventually, they were all publicized as members of the Communist Party, and most of them lost their contracts with Hollywood, and some of them went off to the Federal penitentiary.

So we called in Eric Johnston and said:

> What in the world is wrong with Hollywood? Why do you hire people like this? Why do you use this great American industry to pervert the minds of the American people and to spread the doctrines of Communism? We think you are guilty of a gross failure to maintain your public trust.

He said, and rightfully so:

> We have no mechanism in Hollywood to know who the Communist is. We have no way of telling, when we hire a man who belongs to a particular front organization, that he is actually a member of the Communist Party. If you would write a law which would give us a way to determine who they are, we would put in our motion picture contracts a clause of abrogation, whereby if it was discovered that somebody who had concealed a Communist connection from us was found to be a member of the organization or its sister organizations or its creature organizations, he would automatically violate his contract, and we would get rid of him.

Eric Johnston contributed greatly to the writing of the Mundt-Nixon Act, because we put in that clause, we put in that mechanism. So the first thing was to expose the identity of the organizations and, as much as we could, to expose the identity of the membership.

Next, we received a suggestion from the FBI that when those organizations are exposed, they should be publicized. Let the buyer beware. Let the joiner beware. Let the contributor beware. Let the good citizen beware that he was actually aiding and abetting the downfall of this Republic by joining an organization controlled and dominated by the Communists and dedicated to the success of communism.

So we provided for the publication of the Attorney General's list. After the Subversive Activities Control Board had held its hearings and had gone through its procedures, it was provided that a public list be made available so that any cautious and prudent citizen could write to the Attorney General's office and get a list of the Communist-front organizations.

A man gets a nice letter through the mail or a neighbor calls him on the telephone and says, "Will you join the Association for Good Will, Motherhood, Brotherhood, and Fatherhood?" We would have no reason to suspect it would be a Communist-front organization. But he could write in and find out because of the exposure provisions of the law.

So it was a question of identifying, a question of disclosing, a question of publicizing. And we cranked into the Mundt-Nixon bill only two items for curtailment of Communist actions.

We said that once you have ascertained that a man is a Communist in this country, he shall not be entitled to have a Federal job, and both he and his employer shall be subject to prosecution if through concealment or careless employment tactics he gets such a job.

The other prohibition was that he shall not be entitled to get a passport to travel abroad. Bad enough to have him spewing out the poisons of communism at home, but he could not get a passport to carry that noxious message to people overseas.

Beyond that, there were no prohibitions and no curtailments. It was legal for him to be a Communist.

Now, we are aware of the fact that this particular aspect of the matter ran into conflict with the Smith Act, as the Senator from Wisconsin has properly pointed out; because the Smith Act and Supreme Court decisions had held that to be a member of the Communist Party was in itself a crime, was in itself an indication that you were moving in a traitorous direction.

So Senator DIRKSEN very wisely has eliminated that problem by limiting the authority of the Subversive Activities Control Board to making investigations, to hold hearings, to arriving at findings whereby it says that such an organization, on the record, is Communist controlled.

There is no self-incrimination left in the bill—not in the slightest. This is a finding on the part of the Government, acting through its investigative agencies and with appropriate hearings, a finding that the organization is controlled by Communists. Then, it is up to Congress to decide if we want Communists in Federal jobs, and enjoying the privilege of a passport, which is not an inalienable right of an American citizen; it is a privilege accorded a good citizen who believes in our concept of freedom.

The Dirksen proposal will work and will meet constitutional objectives. In its finding the Supreme Court said it is true that a free society should have a right to move against communism but that was not the way because of the conflict between registration and disclosure and the provisions of the Smith Act.

Mr. President, that brings me to my final question. Do the people of the United States generally support and approve the idea that Congress should take legislative steps to protect our country against Communist activities on the home front?

I emphatically state that they do and I believe my good friend from Wisconsin is completely out of step with the times if he and those persons associated with

him believe they do not. I think the people generally are demanding action. I get letters every day, as most other Senators do, saying that all are concerned about the Vietnam war; they say they recognize we are there because we have to do something about keeping communism from being victorious, but if so why do we not do something about it at home; and they ask if we sacrifice our treasure and lives in Vietnam, why not do something to curtail the activities of communism in the United States?

This is our chance on the homefront to back up the boys in Vietnam by doing something effective to set back the programs of communism here in the United States.

Let me point out that the Internal Security Act of 1950 was not easy to enact, because there were Senators and Representatives then raising the kind of nebulous criticisms we hear today and asking the old question: Is this the right way? Who knows? Who knows what is the right way or the optimum way? This is a way. This is an effective device; this is a tool that will work. It will not do the whole job, but this method has been tested and tried; it has been proved successful and effective.

The Internal Security Act of 1950 was made the pending business of the Senate on September 1, 1950. Debate began on the bill on September 5, 1950, and occupied the time of the Senate almost exclusively until it was passed a week later on September 12. This included 6 working days and nights of September 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, and 12. The debate alone took 349 pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at that time.

Mr. President, I ask uanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a table showing when the Senate met and adjourned in this debate.

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

The table ordered to be printed in the RECORD is as follows:

Sept. 5, 40 pages of debate, Senate went out at 8:51 p.m.

Sept. 6, 32 pages of debate, Senate went out at 5:40 p.m.

Sept. 7, 107 pages of debate, Senate went out at 7:41 p.m.

Sept. 8, 45 pages of debate, Senate went out at 8:14 p.m.

Sept. 11, 74 pages of debate, Senate went out at 11:29 p.m.

Sept. 12, 51 pages of debate, Senate passed the bill.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the bill finally was passed overwhelmingly on September 12, by a rollcall vote of 70 yeas and seven nays.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the rollcall of that vote, because many of our present Senators voted on the bill at that time.

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

VOTE NO. 431

Subject: Internal Security Act of 1950—(H.R. 9490). (Language of S. 4037 substituted for text of House bill.)

Synopsis: Vote on passage of the McCarran-Mundt-Ferguson bill to protect the United States against certain un-American and subversive activities by requiring the registration of Communist organizations and the confinement within constitutional limitations of disloyal and dangerous individuals. It strengthened the existing espionage and subversive laws, forbade Communists to hold Federal jobs, denied them passports and forced them to label their propaganda. Also, it tightened security checks on immigrants and permitted the jailing of deportable aliens. Included also was a provision relating to the picketing of Federal Courts.

Action: Passed.

The result was announced—yeas 70, nays 7, as follows:

Yeas, 70: Anderson, Benton, Bricker, Butler, Byrd, Cain, Capehart, Chapman, Chavez, Connally, Cordon, Darby, Douglas, Dworshak, Ecton, Ellender, Ferguson, Frear, Fulbright, George, Gillette, Gurney, Hendrickson, Hickenlooper, Hill, Hoey, Holland, Humphrey, Hunt, Ives, Jenner, Johnson of Colorado, Johnson of Texas, Kem, Kerr, Kilgore, Knowland, Langer, Lodge, Long, Lucas, McCarran, McCarthy, McClellan, McFarland, McKellar, McMahon, Magnuson, Malone, Martin, Millikin, Morse, Mundt, Myers, Neely, O'Conor, O'Mahoney, Robertson, Russell, Schoeppel, Smith of Maine, Sparkman, Thomas of Oklahoma, Thye, Tydings, Watkins, Wherry, Wiley, Williams, Young.

Nays, 7: Graham, Green, Kefauver, Leahy, Lehman, Murray, Taylor.

Not voting, 19: Aiken, Brewster, Bridges, Donnell, Downey, Eastland, Flanders, Hayden, Johnston of South Carolina, Maybank, Pepper, Saltonstall, Smith of New Jersey, Stennis, Taft, Thomas of Utah, Tobey, Vandenberg, Withers.

So the bill (H.R. 9490) was passed.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I call to the attention of the Senator from Wisconsin, since he has some skepticism about where President Johnson stands on this issue, that he was among those Senators voting "aye." His name will be found on the rollcall vote. Whether it is meaningful I do not know, but none of the seven Senators who voted "nay" are any longer Members of the Senate. Many of those who voted "aye" are still among us.

That proposal was a much more comprehensive measure than the one before us because it included elements that the Supreme Court has ruled out. The Dirksen proposal does not contain them, since it complies with the constitutional restrictions of the Supreme Court.

That was not the end of the fight because at 5 o'clock on September 22, 1950, the Senate took up H.R. 9490 once again because the President had vetoed the bill and the question was on overriding the President's veto. This time the debate was continuous.

Some of our colleagues mistakenly had decided to launch a filibuster against this right of the people to protect their freedom and themselves against communism. They organized a filibuster. I was one of the team of three Senators whose job it was to break the filibuster. Those were more rugged times. We did not delay and dillydally, with sessions, coming in and out, and trying to get a petition on cloture; we said, "Go ahead, if you want, and filibuster. We will stay here all night and all day and we can argue throughout the country what is the best course of action for the country in protecting itself and fighting against communism."

This debate occupied 113 pages of the RECORD. Attempts were made at about 6 a.m., 11:45 a.m., and later, to try to get unanimous consent to recess, meet the next day, send the matter to committee, and bring it back at another time. Objections were raised. We said, "This is a vital issue. Let us face it. Let us meet it and let us decide." We said, "Despite the President's veto, should we have this protection for ourselves, our families, and our country; or should we not have it?"

We were meeting then in the old Supreme Court Chamber, as many Senators will recall, because the ceiling of this Chamber was being refurbished. Debate had gone on continuously for 23 or 24 hours or longer. Senator Langer had the floor and he was filibustering against our bill. We used to talk in the well in that Chamber. Those of us sitting in the Chamber noticed that Senator Langer was weaving as though he were perhaps tired, ill, or sleepy, and suddenly he collapsed on the floor. It was about 5 a.m.

It looked as though he had passed away. Somebody with the presence of mind when that type thing occurs, or an emergency develops, called a quorum. We called colleagues who were perhaps having breakfast or who were sleeping in the cloak rooms, and they rushed up. Dr. George Calver was the Senate physician at that time and he came rushing in. He looked at the man on the floor. He pumped something into him which is good for a man who has diabetes and it was discovered later that the Senator had had a diabetic shock. They carried him out on a stretcher and the debate went on, but the hard core of the filibuster was broken by that collapse. Those of us who were trying to break the filibuster said it was a travesty on freedom that a good colleague of ours who did not want the act passed should engage in debate; to the point it brought him close to death.

We voted at 2 o'clock that afternoon. It was my privilege as the author of the bill to give the concluding speech. I found myself in the unhappy position of holding up the vote which we had been seeking to get by day and by night because Senator Cabot Lodge, of Massachusetts, was enroute to Washington by plane and was having difficulty getting into the airport. My job was to talk until he came in. When he came in the debate ended and we had a vote. We overrode the veto of President Harry Truman by a rollcall vote of 57 to 10 following that long filibuster. None of the 10 Senators who voted against the protection of America are any longer Members of the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that the rollcall vote be printed at this point in the RECORD. The President's veto and the long filibuster had changed only three votes.

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

VOTE NO. 444

Subject: Internal Security Act of 1950—(H.R. 9490).

Synopsis: Vote on the passage of the bill over the objections of the President. This was the McCarran-Mundt-Ferguson bill which protected the United States against

certain un-American and subversive activities by requiring registration of Communist organizations. The bill also contained authority under which the executive branch in time of internal-security emergency may cause the apprehension and detention of persons as to whom there is reasonable ground for belief that they probably will engage in espionage or sabotage activities. See veto message of President attached hereto which also contains copy of the bill as passed.

Action: Passed over veto.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 57, nays 10, as follows:

Yeas, 57: Bricker, Butler, Byrd, Cain, Capehart, Chapman, Connally, Cordon, Darby, Donnell, Dworshak, Ecton, Ellender, Ferguson, Frear, Fulbright, George, Gurney, Hendrickson, Hickenlooper, Hill, Hoey, Holland, Ives, Jenner, Johnson of Colorado, Johnson of Texas, Johnston of South Carolina, Knowland, Lodge, Long, Lucas McCarran McCarthy, McClellan, McFarland, McKellar, McMahon, Magnuson, Malone, Martin, Mundt, O'Conor, Robertson, Russell, Saltonstall, Schoeppel, Smith of Maine, Stennis, Taft, Thye, Tydings, Watkins, Wherry, Wiley, Williams, Young.

Nays, 10: Chavez, Douglas, Graham, Green, Humphrey, Kefauver, Kilgore, Leahy, Lehman, Murray.

Not voting, 29: Aiken, Anderson, Benton, Brewster, Bridges, Downey, Eastland, Flanders, Gillette, Hayden, Hunt, Kem, Kerr, Langer, Maybank, Milliken, Morse, Myers, Neely, O'Mahoney, Pepper, Smith of New Jersey, Sparkman, Taylor, Thomas of Oklahoma, Thomas of Utah, Tobey, Vandenberg, Withers.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On this question the yeas are 57, and the nays are 10. Two-thirds of the Senate, a quorum being present, having voted in favor of its passage, on reconsideration the bill is passed, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I mention this solely because if there are those in this generation of Senators who are determined to filibuster this legislation, I, for one, propose to the majority leader that we do it all over again, that we have meetings around the clock, because the future of freedom is at stake. Let those who protest, those who dispute the desirability of the legislation, talk as long as they want to. We will be here. The formula that gave this legislation birth is good enough to give it an opportunity now to function in a constitutional manner. I seriously hope that it is not necessary at this time, but it has no appeal at all to me when I hear people say, "Well, let us delay the decision."

We can no more afford to delay a decision on this kind of contest on the homefront than we can delay an imperative decision to be made on the battlefield overseas.

When the time is here to decide, let us decide. Let us count noses. Let us have a rollcall. Let us stay in session around the clock and break the filibuster, if they want to filibuster it.

I certainly am not persuaded by the argument that because the Attorney General has not yet said he wants us to act, or because the President of the United States, has not made a speech in which he said he wants the act, we should delay our vote. I do not believe many Senators of this generation will be influenced by that, when they were not influenced by the veto message of another President 17 years ago. There were more Democrats who voted to override the veto than Republicans simply because of the unhappy circumstances that there were more Democrats in the Senate. But, this is not a party issue. This is not a question of having to wait until we get a message from Mount Olympus as to how we can vote.

My dear friend from Wisconsin is following a unique formula in this regard. I have served with him too long, and have admired him too much, not to know that he has never gotten up before and indicated he wanted to be a rubberstamp. I have seen the way he fights in the committee room and on the Senate floor for issues which he opposes, particularly on spending programs in which he is so much interested. I have never before heard him say, "I am not ready to vote. I have not heard from the White House." That is not in the tradition of progressive Wisconsinism which he represents so well in the Senate.

They are independent people in the Badger State. Our friend from Wisconsin here is an independent fellow. I think that we should undertake to convince him by consultation here, and not delay the Senate waiting for a telephone call from the White House which may never come.

I should add that on the rollcall to override the veto of President Truman 17 years ago, Senator Lyndon Johnson of Texas voted "aye." Thus, twice he has expressed himself in favor of this type of legislation.

The minority leader stated that he has it from President Johnson himself that he supports it. But, I submit to my colleagues—and with this I close—that these are dangerous and perilous times. We should come to our decision on this matter on the basis of the record of 17 years. We should make it up in terms of whether, in any way at all, the Dirksen proposal will help curtail the menace of communism at home.

Let me say to my good friend from Wisconsin that we can be sure whatever we do, however long we wait, however hard we solicit the counsel of the Attorney General, we can be quite sure that the Communists of America are going to take this into court, as they have taken every syllable, every sentence, and every paragraph of the International Security Act of 1950 into court. It will have to be adjudicated by the judges.

The Communists are determined people. I can recall when I lived at the Capitol Towers on Massachusetts Avenue, for 3 weeks I had to walk through picket lines that went all around the entrance to that apartment house simply because MUNDT lived there, and the legislation happened to bear my name, in part.

Communists are determined individuals. They will test it out in the courts. Our responsibility, it seems to me, in this tragic hour, is to do whatever we can to make whatever effort we can to provide some additional security against communism at home which, overseas, has compelled us to send 500,000 of the flower of American youth to fight and die to destroy the communism some are reluctant to move against today.

I know that their reluctance stems not from a love of communism but from some mistaken notion. I hope that this legislation does not leave the floor of the Senate until we can convince the vast majority of our colleagues that the notion of taking steps to protect ourselves internally against communism is a good, a useful, and a salutary notion.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. First, I want to congratulate the Senator from South Dakota on his usual very forceful and extremely persuasive speech. In my view, in the 10 years since I came to the Senate, I do not know of anyone, Republican or Democrat, who is as effective a debater, or as effective a speaker as the Senator from South Dakota. He always does a superlative job. Of course, in this area where he is certainly one of the outstanding authorities in the Nation, because he is the author of the Mundt-Nixon bill, he commands our respect and our attention.

Certainly, with a great deal of what the Senator himself has said, I think almost all of us will agree. I would agree, as I have indicated, that there is a Communist menace. I would say it is appropriate for a free society to find a way to protect itself.

The one question which bothers me most is the Senator's fourth question, and I think it is the real question before the Senate today; namely, will the Dirksen proposal better arm us to combat communism?

Mr. MUNDT. That is right.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from South Dakota may well be right, that it will better arm us. Maybe it will. Frankly, I do not say it will not. I say that I do not know. We are informed today of vigorous opposition to the bill by some of the outstanding constitutional authorities in this country, including three deans of great law schools, and including many of the distinguished constitutional experts from outstanding law schools in the Nation, telling us that the bill has serious constitutional defects—I just placed in the RECORD a telegram from this group of experts. Under these circumstances does it not seem fair that we should hold hearings on the bill, to have experts come in and testify and tell us why they think it has constitutional defects, and how we can correct those constitutional defects, in order to achieve an effective law which both the Senator from South Dakota and I want to achieve.

I say that, without having hearings, without having something like this on the record, we cannot possibly know whether this particular bill, which has not had a day, an hour, a minute of hearings. No witnesses, not one has appeared on this bill. If this bill still does not make the law conform to the Constitution, it will not do the job. If it is not constitutional it will not help us fight communism.

Mr. MUNDT. Let me say that the concept of the bill, in fact the language of the bill, had long and elaborate hearings 17 years ago by both Houses, and

sustained debate in both Houses. We have the record of history to show that its mechanism worked effectively as long as it was permitted to work until the Supreme Court found a conflict of interest.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Let me interrupt there to say——

Mr. MUNDT. Between the Smith Act and the original act.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Let me interrupt at that point to say that despite the hearings held at that time, despite the debate that was conducted on the floor of the Senate, a mistake was made in not recognizing the clear conflict with the Constitution on the fact that the 1950 act and the 1940 act were in contradiction—that is, if we required a Communist to register, having already made it illegal for him to belong to a Communist organization, we would require him, in effect, to testify against himself.

Mr. MUNDT. But that is a misinterpretation of the——

Mr. PROXMIRE. I know——

Mr. MUNDT. We had not made it illegal——

Mr. PROXMIRE. It was illegal for him to advocate the violent overthrow of this country, or to belong to an organization which so advocated.

Mr. MUNDT. Illegal only insofar as the penalties were concerned, which were written into it, as well as the registration provisions. That was all. It was not a crime he registered that was how we built our constitutional case so far as his right concerning self-incrimination was concerned. But as to certain privileges enjoyed by the Senator and me, and millions of others, seeking to hold public office and get a passport, I suspect the Supreme Court pitched its case on that aspect. This was debated at great length by many constitutional lawyers, 17 years ago.

Suppose hearings were held for a week, a month, or a year. We would still have no way of predicting what kind of decision the Supreme Court of the United States is going to make on this or any other bill curbing the freedom of Communists, because they will take it into court and have it tested—as they have a right to do, and as they will do—because they are adequately financed and have available to them many brilliant lawyers in this country.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The hearings would not guarantee the bill emerging would be foolproof against a finding by the Supreme Court, but this would give us information which we do not have now on this particular bill. This bill represents a new departure from the 1950 act. It does not require registration, which was held by the Supreme Court as being unconstitutional. It requires identification. If we had the views of constitutional lawyers in 1 or 2 days of hearings, then I would be perfectly agreeable to having the bill reported back on a final date, with a vote on a day certain. I am anxious to have our eyes opened on this bill. Hearings can do that. I am sure the Senator from South Dakota will agree that this bill was rapidly drafted, and it did have errors, as the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] indicated, which have been corrected since then. My staff and I have found errors, which could be corrected by amendment, but they are errors.

This procedure of no hearings is not in keeping either with good legislative practices or with the traditions of the Senate. The bill may be declared unconstitutional, anyway, but, at any rate, we will be in a much better position to have a bill which will stand up in court if we have a record of some kind of hearings so we will have the most expert information we can get.

When some of the best constitutional authorities in the country say this bill has constitutional defects, it seems to me it is arrogant for the Senate to say, "We will not have any hearings. We will push it through." Not only is it arrogant, but it will not accomplish its purpose.

Mr. MUNDT. Would the Senator estimate what he would consider would be a long enough period of time to hear constitutional lawyers, who would be able to agree on any bill we wrote?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I would say if we could have two or three or four witnesses on one side and two or three or four witnesses on the other side, that would be agreeable. I earnestly hope the Attorney General will appear. He may not, but I think he should be asked to appear. I think he owes it to the Senate to tell us where he stands—not that he will enforce the law; of course he will; that is his job; but whether or not he has had a chance to read the legislation and have an opinion on it. When Mr. Yeagley appeared before the Appropriations Committee and was asked whether such a law as the Dirksen bill would revive the Subversive Activities Control Act, he said, "Let us take a look at the particular bill. We would have to analyze the law before we can say whether the bill will result in bringing any more cases before the board." That is what I am asking for, and all I am asking.

Mr. MUNDT. The mere fact that the Attorney General said to the minority leader that he would enforce the law and move under the law obviously answers the question whether there would be more cases brought before the board. Of course, there would be, because this law would enable them to be brought there. Now we have a sterile board because of the decisions of the Supreme Court. This law will give the agency an opportunity once again to move forward in presenting cases before the board.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I think there is serious question whether or not he will move forward, depending on the interpretation of the letter; but, at any rate, he ought to have an opportunity to interpret the bill.

Mr. MUNDT. I interpret the letter as meaning that he would move forward.

One of the great advantages of a bicameral legislative system is that the type of concern which the Senator has expressed can be alleviated by the fact that this is not a final act. The bill will go before the House. The Senator can be certain that the House will hold hearings, because of the characterization and membership of the House Judiciary Committee. If there are any defects in the bill, they will be corrected. The Senator knows that even after hearings have been held, very frequently a bill comes to the Senate floor and a sharp-eyed critic like the Senator from Wisconsin or someone else says, "It looks like this is an error in construction." We do not get perfection here merely because there have been long hearings.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Let me say, on that score, that if the Dirksen motion to suspend the rules and put its bill on the appropriations bill had been effective, there would have been no hearings in the House. One of the principal reasons why I opposed that motion was that under the procedures followed there, there would be no hearings. Upon inquiry of the Parliamentarian, I learned that the bill would be referred to the House Un-American Activities Committee, and not the House Judiciary Committee. The Un-American Activities Committee might or might not have hearings.

Mr. MUNDT. How does the Senator know that?

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is the opinion of the Assistant Parliamentarian in the House. He may be wrong, but it is the best opinion we can get.

Mr. MUNDT. Did he make a public statement to that effect?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I asked him on the phone where the bill would go. He said it would be referred to the House Un-American Activities Committee. Of course, they may change their minds, but that was his opinion as of that time.

Mr. MUNDT. Normally, bills that we have here go to sister committees in the other body. I admit that the Parliamentarian is the Supreme Court over there. If he is committed to that, of course that is the final decision; but that does not alter my opinion that hearings will be held and they will be given a chance to change any language which they believe to be unconstitutional. We get these lawyers and judges, and they will not agree. I do not know that we will be any wiser. We will be a little older. We will be paying salaries for members of an agency which cannot work until we pass this bill. But that is the advantage of a bicameral system. I am for it. The Senator from Wisconsin is for it. Our favorable action will put the bill over there for consideration by the House.

Mr. PROXMIRE. This is a board which has done nothing for 20 months. I am not asking that the bill go over for a week of hearings. As a matter of fact, the hearings may last a day or two. But I am asking that the bill be reported back at a certain time, 10 or 20 days, or on a certain date. Then we will have no obligations at all other than to pass or not pass the bill. It is not my intention to filibuster the bill, but to call attention to some of the problems the bill raises. If we can have hearings on it, then we will have it in the proper tribunal, and outstanding authorities in the Nation can tell their views of it.

Mr. MUNDT. Is the Senator proposing that the bill go back to the Judiciary Committee for 3 or 4 days, to be reported back to the Senate on a day certain, with a time certain included for a vote?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes, with a final date

as to reporting it, and with a time certain for a vote after that. I would be agreeable to that. This does not bind any of those on this side, but I have talked with Senators who are of the same general view, and they would be amenable to that. The point is we want to be sure there will be hearings; that the bill will not merely go back to the committee and then come back. Then we would have some information.

Mr. MUNDT. That is a unique procedure. I would have to check with our Parliamentarian as to whether or not we can freeze the schedule of the Senate that far in advance, so that the Senate could bring the bill back Thursday, for example, and on Friday at 3 o'clock we would agree to vote. I am not sure that can be done by unanimous consent, but assuming it can be, that is a reasonable position—much more reasonable than trying to filibuster. Certainly, if we got the bill back without such an agreement, we would be in the same position as now, the Senator could filibuster, and nothing will have been accomplished.

I have spoken to rescue my friend from what I think is an untenable position. I like him. He is an effective Senator. I did not think he should be allowed to remain in that position.

I thank the Senator for his contribution.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator.

CALIFORNIA REAPPORTIONMENT RULING THREATENS SEPARATION OF POWERS

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, the October 16 edition of the Los Angeles Times contains an excellent article concerning the implications of a recent decision by the California Supreme Court. It was written by the Honorable Caspar W. Weinberger, a former California assemblyman, Republican State chairman and a distinguished practicing attorney in San Francisco.

Mr. Weinberger points out the threat to the traditional separation of powers between the executive, judicial, and legislative branches of our government posed by the California decision ordering our State legislature to reapportion California's congressional districts by December 7, 1967, or to accept a reapportionment plan to be imposed by the court.

I believe that Mr. Weinberger's excellent analysis will be helpful and applicable in broader areas, and I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Redistricting Ruling Was Bad," written by Caspar W. Weinberger and published in the Los Angeles Times of October 16, 1967, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

REDISTRICTING RULING WAS BAD

(By Casper W. Weinberger)

The State Supreme Court's decision—ordering the legislature to reapportion our 38 congressional districts, backed up by the court's threat to write its own reapportionment law if the Legislature fails to act to the court's satisfaction by Dec. 7—seems to me to be a clear and flagrant violation of our historic doctrine of separation of powers.

It is of course far too late to argue with the U.S. Supreme Court's "one man, one vote" rule upon which our supreme court's rulings are based, and no one should criticize our court for following that U.S. Supreme Court decision.

But the vice of last week's rulings that it completely neglects the historic limitations that have been placed on the judicial branch of our government since its foundation. The courts are supposed to decide actual controversies brought before them by litigants, public or private. Courts may also "declare the rights" of parties in advance of completed transactions.

Thus, in the reapportionment controversy, no one could challenge a court ruling that a particular act passed by a legislature, or a Congress, apportioned in violation of the "one man, one vote" rule, was unconstitutional and void. Nor could anyone challenge a declaratory judgment by the court that any act by an unreapportioned legislature or Congress would be held void.

But that is a far cry from what our supreme court did in 1965 and last week, when in effect they said to the Legislature, "If you do not pass an act we find to be constitutional by the day we fix, we will order the statute we ourselves have written into effect."

The judicial function specifically, and for very good reason, does not and never has embraced the writing of statutes. By the same token, neither our governor nor our Legislature can decide lawsuits or write legal opinions.

The difference between a court holding unconstitutional a statute passed by an unapportioned legislature, and a court writing its own law and ordering it into effect, is vast.

Courts are supposed to interpret and pass on the validity and application of laws enacted by the elected-legislative branch. How can courts fairly or honestly interpret laws they write themselves? Who can then protect us against an unconstitutional court-written statute?

The Legislature is properly hedged about with numerous constitutional and other restrictions on lawmaking to ensure that there will be public notice, open hearings, three readings, majority recorded votes by the peoples' elected representatives, and many other safeguards which have come down to us from more than 600 years of parliamentary experience.

And the executive branch, as a further check and safeguard, has the additional duty to examine each passed bill and decide whether it is to be signed into law or vetoed, with a further right in the legislature to override the veto.

All of those carefully worked out safeguards and the collective policy decision only two months ago of 120 elected members of the Legislature not to reapportion on the basis of 8-year-old census figures, are now swept into discard by a court decision.

Court decisions quite properly should be above the ordinary criticisms to which policy decisions of our elected officials must be subject. Courts are, or should be, removed from the arena of policy making, and this, and their needed independence, are powerful safeguards which should always be preserved.

But when the courts themselves neglect to transgress the boundaries of judicial action, and start writing statutes, or threatening to do so, they not only subject these rulings to the same harsh criticism which is the fate of any policy decision, but they also endanger their proper role as protectors of the liberties of each of us.

The same special session which will shortly consider congressional reapportionment under the shadow and threat of a court-written statute, should also consider a constitutional amendment making it crystal-clear that the separation of powers doctrine, written into our federal and state constitutions from the beginning forbids a court from writing, or threatening to write statutes—just as it forbids a legislature from deciding, or threatening to decide, lawsuits.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR FILING REPORT OF COMMISSION ON URBAN PROBLEMS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on Senate Joint Resolution 112.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 112) extending the time for filing report of Commission on Urban Problems which was, on page 1, line 3, after "Housing", insert "and Urban Development".

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

PROTECTION OF FEDERAL FACILITIES SHOULD NOT BE LEFT TO LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, last Thursday, I informed the Senate, the Attorney General of the United States, and the Secretary of Defense that an attempt would be made this week to close the Oakland Induction Center in Oakland, Calif., as part of a nationwide protest movement against the draft. I asked the Attorney General, in a letter, whether the protesters were in violation of Federal law by the mere threat to shut down the Oakland Center, and I requested that Federal authorities take steps to prosecute violators of the Selective Service Act.

As you all know from press accounts, demonstrations did indeed begin yesterday in Oakland and in San Francisco, Los Angeles, Boston, Chicago, and other cities. In Oakland, 119 persons were arrested Monday by local and State authorities on a variety of charges ranging from trespass to blocking sidewalks. I am proud to say that the target of the demonstrations, the Oakland Induction Center, remained open for business and the same situation prevails today thanks to the vigilance and careful planning of the Oakland Police Department, the Alameda County Sheriff's Department, and the California Highway Patrol.

Mr. President, I remain puzzled by the apparent failure of Federal authorities to act in this matter. I have received no reply from the Attorney General, and I am informed by Oakland authorities that only a scattering of arrests have occurred under Federal charges. This has created a situation in which the sole protection of a Federal building has been left to local law enforcement agencies. I pointed out some time ago in a statement to the Senate that, if a similar situation should occur in a Federal building in Los Angeles, there are 22 Federal employees—U.S. marshals and deputy marshals—legally empowered to defend that building and the people working therein. The Armed Forces entrance and examining station in Oakland—the induction center—is deeded Federal property and houses other Federal agencies along with Selective Service.

It is not my place, nor my purpose, to question the operations of the Attorney General or his representative, the U.S. attorney for the northern district, and I certainly am not presuming to tell them their business. It does seem strange, however, that the burden of protecting a Federal installation in Oakland again has fallen upon local and State authorities. My judgment is that a more certain way of halting these shameful and deliberate efforts to disrupt the lawful activities of a Federal agency would be prompt—and I emphasize the word "prompt"—arrest and prosecution by Federal authorities.

I think that to permit this type of unlawful disturbance is shameful and, apparently, I am not alone in this view. I hold in my hand a piece of literature distributed by the San Francisco Committee for Draft Resistance. It is headed "End the War," and it calls upon readers to join resisting the draft. One paragraph of the message is particularly pertinent:

> We do not undertake this action lightly. We are keenly aware of the penalties which may be exacted for this action. Universal Military Training and Service Act, Section 12, Penalties: "Any person who . . . knowingly counsels, aids or abets another to refuse . . . registration or service in the armed forces . . . shall upon conviction in any district court of the United States . . . be punished by imprisonment for not more than five years or a fine of not more than $10,000 or by both."

My point is that even the draft protesters themselves evidently realized they are violating the Selective Service Act by their actions, and are prepared to suffer the consequences. I would hope that the Federal officials concerned in the Oakland case take these people up on their dare.

I think it is unbelievable that these peoples' acts should be allowed to fly in the face of the law of this great country without the slightest concern being shown by the proper Federal authorities. It is a bad precedent to permit this to be done. It has happened already too often.

We cannot continue to condone deliberate disobedience to the law in this country. I will be most interested to see whether the U.S. attorney in the northern district seeks prosecution of the individuals trying to close the Oakland Induction Center. I know that I speak for many concerned citizens in Alameda County and elsewhere in California who are as puzzled as I am over the apparent disinterest of Federal attorneys to follow through in these cases, leaving the burden of prosecution to local and State law enforcement officials. There is some feeling that prompt arrests and Federal prosecution of those who sought last year to close operations at the Oakland Army Materiel Center perhaps could have influenced the demonstrators today to obey the law. As the Oakland Tribune stated in a front-page editorial last Thursday:

> Any effort to occupy Federal buildings and to trespass for the purpose of preventing the functioning of the Selective Service System would be a violation of Federal and local law. The Attorney General of the United States and the United States Attorney for the Northern District of California should forthwith make plain that those who violate Federal laws will be prosecuted to the full extent of the law.

I wonder, Mr. President, whether Attorney General Ramsey Clark has issued guidelines for Federal district attorneys in the current wave of demonstrations against the draft. Do these guidelines include instructions for full prosecution of agitators and demonstrators? Has the Attorney General ascertained whether there is centralized leadership of these nationwide demonstrations against the draft? If so, does he plan prosecution under conspiracy laws?

The law-abiding citizens of California—who are forced to pay the costs of the police, the sheriff's deputies, the highway patrolmen, and other local and State law enforcement officers protecting Federal property—are curious over the position of the Attorney General and his representatives in these cases. So am I.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a copy of the front page editorial from the Oakland Tribune of last Thursday, together with a copy of the handbill to which I have referred.

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

[From the Oakland (Calif.) Tribune, Oct. 12, 1967]

THE OAKLAND INVASION

Our community is the target of various groups proposing illegal acts against Federal and local law on Monday, October 16.

The illegal action is not aimed at anything over which the City Council of Oakland or the Board of Supervisors of Alameda County has any control.

It has been proposed that the campus of the University of California be used as a rallying point and staging area for such action.

The target in this case is the Government of the United States. The appeal of the actionist groups is for those registered under the draft laws to "burn their draft cards" and to refuse induction into the armed services of the United States. This comes at a time when more than half a million American combat men are engaged in preventing Communist forces from taking over South Vietnam.

A mass failure of our induction system would mean the combat veterans already overseas would have to remain longer and could be denied essential reinforcements because of the lack of replacements.

Any effort to occupy Federal buildings and to trespass for the purpose of preventing the functioning of the Selective Service System would be a violation of Federal and local law.

The Attorney General of the United States and the United States Attorney for the Northern District of California should forthwith make plain that those who violate Federal laws will be prosecuted to the full extent of the law.

Any effort to block our city streets and sidewalks and prevent their use by citizens or vehicles carrying on their normal and lawful activities is a violation of local ordinances.

All such efforts should be prevented by the local law enforcement officials. Behind the city police in maintaining law and order stands the full power of the government of Alameda County, the State of California and if need be, the United States of America.

The overwhelming majority of our citizens will support the Constitutional authorities in maintaining law and order.

The advocates of the illegal action have stated their plans in the following language: "During the week of October 16–21, men and women from all over Northern California will converge on the Oakland Induction Center to physically shut it down. They will also spend much time organizing young people against the war and the draft."

Another publication urged men of draft age to "hand in your draft cards. Turn them back to the government."

This is what the proposed invasion of Oakland is all about.

No government, no free people, can permit these direct actionists to obstruct the due process of law nor to bring disorder to our streets.

The issue is law and order or anarchy.

[Handbill by San Francisco Committee for Draft Resistance]

TO END THE WAR

An ever growing number of young American men are finding that the American War in Vietnam so outrages their deepest moral and religious sense that they cannot contribute to it in any way.

We and others throughout the country, like the majority of Americans not among those called upon to offer our lives in Vietnam, share this moral outrage. We believe that any American citizen is morally bound and legally justified in exerting every effort to end this war, to avoid collusion with it, and to encourage others to do the same.

Therefore, we call upon all men of good will to join with us in the following statement, if they believe as we do that we must step forward at this time with those young men who are openly resisting an unjust military draft serving a disastrous military policy.

A CALL TO RESIST

The fundamental immorality and increasing brutality of our nation's course in Vietnam compels us to commit our lives to changing that course. No man's conscience belongs to the state. Responsibility lies with each of us. We who give consent by our own silence and inaction declare that the killing must be stopped. We stand with those young men who in the American tradition of civil disobedience refuse to submit to an unconscionable military draft. We ourselves are not eligible for the draft, but we publicly announce our individual and joint complicity in disobeying this law, along with the young men who are refusing the draft.

We do not undertake this action lightly. We are keenly aware of the penalties which may be exacted for this action:

Universal Military Training and Service Act, Section 12, Penalties: "Any person who . . . knowingly counsels, aids or abets another to refuse . . . registration or service in the armed forces . . . shall upon convic-

tion in any district court of the United States . . . be punished by imprisonment for not more than five years or a fine of not more than $10,000 or both."

We explicitly encourage, aid and abet this civil disobedience and thus place ourselves in equal legal jeopardy with draft refusers. We cannot leave them to take the risks alone for what is the basic act of conscience in our time.

PARTIAL LIST OF INITIATING SIGNERS

Ben Seaver, George Leppert, Roy C. Kepler, Russell Jorgensen, Gordon Zahn, Philip Drath, Charles M. Stein, Julian A. Ripley, Jr., Jay Neugeboren, Gerald Wilsnack, E. John Lewis, Robert W. Brown, Theodore W. Keller, Paul Turgis, Clarence Rainwater.

William Sloan Coffin, Samuel R. Tyson, Alan Strain, George Reeves, Roland Finston, Paul Dickert, Alfred Williams, Paul Brink, Roger S. Lorenz, Mitchell Goodman, Jackie Stroud, John McClesny, Frances Zainello, Barbara Sinton, Wayne Richards.

Milton Mayer, Adrian Wilson, Robert H. Weir, Richard C. Strohman, David Newman, Ronald U. Landau, Laurence Moore, Barbara Howden, Virginia Brink, Dorothy J. Malasky, Elinor H. Stillman, Darel Baylor, Winnett Hagens, Isobel M. Cerney, Pat Garford.

Louis Sloss, Jr., Herbert Foster, Jr., Paul S. Seaver, John L. Levy, Archie Van Wyk, Steve Smith, Irene Baratoff, Elaine W. Schwartz, A. D. Schwartz, James M. Swan, Jo Anne Wallace, Ann Wood, Dan Due, Judith Ann White, Hollis A. Chenery.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

AMENDMENT OF THE SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL ACT OF 1950

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2171) to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, so as to accord with certain decisions of the courts.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I believe that S. 2171 should be recommitted to the Judiciary Committee for full hearings and for a full inquiry on its relation to the statutory framework which it amends.

I seriously question the continued relevance of the Subversive Activities Control Board to the struggle against communism. The course of constitutional decision over the past 17 years has revealed the invalidity of some of the statutory provisions the Board is supposed to administer and has thrown others into serious question. In its 17 years of existence, the Board has not successfully registered a single individual or organization. It has not even met formally in over 20 months. The Board, in simple terms, does nothing, because it no longer has anything to do.

It was charged by the Internal Security Act of 1950 with the duty of requiring Communist-action organizations and Communist-infiltrated organizations to register as such. Certain sanctions could be applied. It was also charged with the duty of requiring members of Communist-action organizations to register when their organizations failed to do so after having been the subject of an order by the Board. After 17 years of testing, it is clear that key elements in this scheme are not permitted by the Constitution of the United States. As a result, the Board, which tried actively in earlier years to enforce the statutes that it was charged to administer, now does nothing.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] now proposes to revive this moribund agency. He would do so by turning it into a solely investigatory body. He tells us nothing, and there have been no public hearings to tell us anything, about how those investigatory functions would relate to the effective institutional framework we already have for investigating communism, which centers around the Federal Bureau of Investigation. He would revive the agency without answering or resolving any fundamental constitutional questions which have been raised by court decisions over the past 17 years. And there is substantial question about whether the SACB would in fact be solely an investigatory body if S. 2171 were enacted. The Internal Security Act contains a number of sanctions which the SACB would still be apparently free to impose on those whom it investigates.

These are all substantial questions. Senator DIRKSEN gives us the answer to none of them. He asks the Senate to have faith that his solution to the problem is workable and feasible. This is extraordinary. Our legislative system is premised on the idea of holding hearings and listening to the views of those who would be charged with administering the proposed legislation as well as those who would be affected by it. No reason is presented why we should depart from those principles on this occasion.

The present ineffectiveness of the SACB, and the serious question about whether it is worthwhile to save that agency in any form, might be illuminated by a discussion in some detail of the agency's efforts over the years to enforce the Internal Security Act of 1950, and a more detailed understanding of why those efforts proved to be fruitless.

I go into this, Mr. President, in some detail because I think it is important to have an understanding of the kind of legislation we are considering at the present time and because I played a role in the effort to enforce this act myself while I was Attorney General of the United States.

Let us look first at the litigation involving the Communist Party itself. In November 1950, after the Internal Security Act had been enacted over President Truman's veto, the Attorney General of the United States petitioned the SACB to compel the Communist Party to register as a Communist-action organization.

After two suits to enjoin the proceedings, both of which were dismissed, the Board held hearings on the petition. It finished those hearings in July 1952. It had taken 15,000 pages of testimony and had received 507 documentary exhibits. In 1953 it issued an order telling the Communist Party to register.

The issue then found its way into the courts again. In April 1956, 3 years after the Board's original decision, the Supreme Court reversed the Board's action on the ground that the Board had based its decision in part on the testimony of three witnesses who had allegedly perjured themselves in the proceedings, an allegation which the Government did not deny.

In December 1956 the SACB issued a modified order, basing its decision on an expurgated record which did not include the testimony of the three witnesses whose credibility had been questioned.

In 1958, the Board's order was reversed again, this time by the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia Circuit. The court said that the respondents were entitled to inspect the reports which four witnesses had submitted to the FBI. This ruling was the result of a 1957 decision of the Supreme Court in Jencks against United States.

As a result, the Board held further administrative proceedings, in which the FBI reports were made available. In February 1959, the Board issued a new order compelling the Communist Party to register, and after further litigation, the Supreme Court, in June 1961, finally upheld the Board's order.

Thus, after 10½ years of exhaustive examination and litigation, it was finally held that the Communist Party could be compelled to register. However, the Court held that the question of whether there was any constitutional problem in the registration process itself was premature. Attorneys for the Communist Party had argued that when individual officers of the organization came forth to register, they would be subjecting themselves to possible prosecution under a variety of laws including the Smith Act and the Internal Security Act, and that their coming forward would violate their privilege against self-incrimination as guaranteed by the fifth amendment to the Constitution of the United States. The Supreme Court said this question would be litigated and decided when the individuals acted in response to the order to come forth and register in behalf of the Party.

After 10½ years, then, a substantial question still remained about the validity of the process set out in the Internal Security Act of 1950.

At this point, I was Attorney General of the United States. During the years that followed, we made a conscientious effort to follow up on the Supreme Court's 1961 decision and to enforce the law enacted by Congress. As the years passed, it became more clear that this law raised fundamental questions of individual liberty which rendered it ineffective as a method of fighting communism.

In December 1961, for example, a grand jury indicted the Communist Party for failure to register, as it had finally been ordered to do under the Supreme Court's decision of the previous June. The party was convicted and fined $120,000. In 1963, the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit reversed this conviction, holding that it

did in fact violate the constitutionally guaranteed privilege against self-incrimination for a natural person to have to come in and register the Communist Party as a Communist-action organization. I might add that Judge Bazelon had dissented to all the previous rulings of the Court of Appeals in the case on each occasion when it had upheld the Board's original order against the Communist Party—saying each time that the privilege of self-incrimination would be violated when individual officers of the party came in to register. Judge Bazelon's view, was, therefore, ultimately vindicated. In 1964, the Supreme Court denied certiorari in the case.

In 1965 a new trial was held, the Government contending that it had two FBI agents who were members of the party who were willing to register the party. The party was again convicted, and that conviction was reversed only this year by the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.

Thus, after 17 years of litigation, the Communist Party still has not been compelled to register and there is serious doubt about whether it can ever constitutionally be compelled to do so.

We made other efforts to enforce the Internal Security Act as well. In March of 1962 two national officers of the Communist Party were indicted for failing to register the party when the party itself did not register. These indictments, however, were not pressed since the basic question of the Communist Party's obligation to register was still at issue. One of the defendants subsequently died, and in 1966 the indictment against the other was dismissed on the ground that a trial at that late date would not serve the sound administration of justice.

In 1962, we also petitioned the SACB to require 44 individuals to register as members of the Communist Party. This proceeding was brought under section 8 of the Internal Security Act, which provides that any person who is a member of a Communist-action organization ordered to register but failing to do so shall himself register with the Attorney General. All 44 of the individuals were ordered by the Board to register, and two of them appealed in test cases. In 1965, in the case of Albertson against Subversive Activities Control Board, the Supreme Court reversed, holding, as had been held in the Communist Party case earlier, that it would be a violation of these individuals' constitutional privilege against self-incrimination to be forced to register, since registering might possibly subject them to a variety of criminal penalties.

Thus, by the end of 1965, the whole registration process as it affected both the Communist Party and its members had been shown to be extremely doubtful according to established American constitutional principles.

Nor is this all. Between 1953 and 1956, the Attorney General petitioned the SACB to require the registration of 23 other organizations, 21 of them as Communist-action organizations, and the other two labor unions which the Attorney General alleged were Communist infiltrated. Another petition was filed in 1963, and another in 1966. Not one of these organizations has ever registered. Some are no longer in existence. In other cases, the courts ordered the petitions dismissed for a variety of reasons. One proceeding is still pending, and two or three other orders to register are apparently still outstanding, but nothing is being done to enforce them, apparently because there is so much doubt as to their constitutionality.

Mr. President, I have recited this history because I think it makes clear that the passage of time has explicitly demonstrated the irrelevance of the SACB to the fight against communism. What the Senator from Illinois is seeking to do, really, is to turn back the clock and ignore the constitutional history of the United States over the past 17 years. We must not countenance that, particularly when the way in which he proposes to do it is without any hearings or any inquiry by the standing committees of the Senate.

The privilege against self-incrimination has been the constitutional right relied upon in the court decisions up to now which have invalidated major portions of the Internal Security Act. However, other constitutional developments in the last 17 years have made it clear that the right of association under the first amendment is also relevant to the issue before us. That right is a far more explicit and better understood protection than it was 17 years ago.

Thus, in Bates against City of Little Rock, in a number of cases involving the NAACP, and in a number of decisions involving loyalty oath provisions in various States, it has become more and more clear that Government must be extremely careful when it seeks to investigate the associations which individuals choose to have. The first amendment protects the right of association as a facet of the right of free expression, and the courts have made it clear that any governmental activity which discourages individuals from free choice in their associations and in their choice or organizations will be looked at with great care. Thus, State governments have been held not to have the power to compel membership lists of organizations to be disclosed. And individual members of organizations have been protected in refusing to tell legislative investigating committees about the membership list of their organizations. If the SACB were to be given the power to investigate Communist-action organizations and Communist-infiltrated organizations, there would no doubt be serious questions under the first amendment about the procedure and substance of that power. Yet we have had no inquiry whatsoever about these questions.

Then, Mr. President, there are at least three other major constitutional questions about this legislation which I raised last week in discussing this problem on the Senate floor, and which after reviewing the debate, I find have still not been handled adequately by the proponents of the bill.

First. The definitions of "Communist-action" and "Communist-infiltrated" groups are the same as they were in 1950—these definitions raise serious questions about vagueness, about what groups are included and what groups are not. The Supreme Court's loyalty oath decisions have strongly suggested that vague definitions of "subversive" groups are not constitutionally permissible, because such lack of clarity discourages people from associating with legitimate groups. Yet section 782 of the act—which would not be affected by S. 2171—uses language of the most general sort.

Second. Although the Board's activities would be investigatory, there are a number of severe restrictions on members of tainted organizations which would apply once the Board made its determination of "Communist-action" or "Communist-infiltration." The groups themselves are denied tax deductions—their mail must be stamped—their activities are subject to heavy supervision. Thus, the Board still has functions which are inherently punitive—and which may well be a violation of the privilege against self-incrimination. In addition, the increased protection given political associations by the Supreme Court in recent years makes this kind of government supervision open to serious doubt under the first amendment.

Finally, the self-incrimination problem may be greater under this bill than under the existing act. What happens if an individual refused to answer political questions before the Board? Can he be punished for contempt? Is failure to testify evidence of subversive activity? If the Board's final determination results in severe restrictions on groups, is this not a use of investigatory power to punish?

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

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. As I understand the Senator from New York, who is the former U.S. Attorney General and who had, I understand, the responsibility for enforcing the act that was on the books, the act that the proposed legislation would amend, he is contending that the definition still in the law, untouched by the Dirksen proposal, the definition of Communist front is so vague that there are serious constitutional problems in connection with it. Is that correct?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Yes, I might say to the Senator that the two definitions of "Communist action" and "Communist infiltrated," the vagueness of which undoubtedly had some effect on the court in throwing out the sections of the act which it has passed upon—and also accounted in part for our lack of success in the executive branch of the Government in administering the 1950 act—those same terms are left in the law by the Dirksen bill, and they still raise serious constitutional questions.

The matter will go back to the Supreme Court and in my judgment it will receive the same treatment that the act has received over the last 17 years.

I think we are going through a charade here. Everybody can come in and vote for the act and go back to his constituents and say, "We scored a major victory against communism." But we will not have done anything like that; we will not have advanced one step against commu-

nism, or subversion, or espionage. We would be deceiving the people and we would be deceiving ourselves when we say we have taken the step.

We know the act will be challenged and we know that the Supreme Court will very likely throw it out, as it has done in the case of sections of the law now on the books. This law has not helped us to advance in the last 17 years in connection with subversive activities, and if this legislation is passed, we will still not have taken a step forward. We will be standing still.

It seems to me that it makes much more sense to follow the procedure suggested by the Senator from Wisconsin: Let us see what the problem is and then establish a board that can do something worthwhile. This proposed legislation is not going to get us anywhere. We will not go one step forward but we will perhaps deceive ourselves that we have done something.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The contention by the proponent of the bill and other Senators that this legislation would simply bring the Internal Security Act of 1950 into conformity with the Albertson decision is not true, at least not in the judgment of the Senator from New York, the former Attorney General, who has had great experience under the law which is now on the books; and this would not achieve that objective because the definition of at least two terms——

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. "Communist action" and "Communist infiltrated."

Mr. PROXMIRE. The terms "Communist action" and "Communist infiltrated" are the same and these would still raise serious constitutional questions of vagueness.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Absolutely.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The second point, I understand, is that the act still permits heavy Government supervision of organizations found to be "tainted," and the Senator indicates that this very likely violates the first amendment freedom of association which the Supreme Court has spelled out in recent years.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. That is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The third point is that we may have, under the Dirksen proposal, a law, if this is enacted, which raises even more serious problems under the fifth amendment self-incrimination protection of the Constitution than the present law that was declared unconstitutional.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. That is correct. It seems to me that that is true, and as I have said, I had a good deal to do with this matter. This was a critical matter in 1961. We had studied it carefully in the Department of Justice and we wanted to move ahead on it because we thought that after the lengthy hearings and debates that had taken place in Congress we should follow up on it. The matter was pursued vigorously and energetically. But the legislation was thrown out, and all of our efforts to get the Communist Party and the heads of the Communist Party to register were dissolved.

It seems to me that if we enact this bill, we will be starting to go through all of that all over again after 17 years. It does not make sense to do the same thing over and over again when it does not get us anywhere.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from New York is building a devastating case. As the former Attorney General, he is the only man in the Senate who has had experience enforcing the act, and he is telling us that the bill before the Senate has serious constitutional defects.

We have a telegram which I placed in the RECORD earlier wherein 37 law professors, including three deans of great law schools, state that the bill, S. 2171, contains serious constitutional defects. No hearings have been held on the bill. We have not had a single constitutional expert testify on the record who can tell us whether or not this legislation may conform with the Constitution. We do not have any argument pro or con. We have no committee report that is really a committee report. We have a one-page declaration of what the bill would purport to do, but we have no analysis whatsoever.

On this basis it seems to me that the analysis of the former Attorney General, the Senator from New York, would compel any Senator, whether he is for or against the legislation, whether he is for the same objectives as the Senator from Illinois and others, to say, "Let us get to work on it to see what we want to do."

As the Senator said, it may be another 17 years in which nothing is accomplished.

We have an idle Subversive Activities Control Board which has done nothing for 20 months, has held no hearings for 20 months, and it may be idle at the taxpayers' expense indefinitely. Is that correct?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. That is correct.

I might say it is my strong feeling—and this is my judgment based on my experience—that this bill raises serious problems. It seems elementary it would also be the judgment of the present Attorney General. My feeling is that he would agree with me. It seems to me at least worthwhile, even if it were only for a couple of hours, to call him and see what he thinks. Would he, in fact, be able to operate with this bill? What steps would he contemplate taking under this legislation? Can he take any steps?

Mr. PROXMIRE. This is the heart of the whole matter, because if he cannot take any steps, the bill accomplishes nothing at all.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Not only that, but we deceive ourselves to think that we have done something about the problem and cause our constituents to think we have taken a step with respect to what many Senators and Representatives think is a problem in this country. We would go to the American people and say that we have dealt with the problem, but we have not.

I think we should examine this and make a judgment as to whether or not this legislation would advance the struggle against internal communism and deal with this problem, or whether it in fact accomplishes nothing at all.

My judgment is that it would not accomplish anything at all and that it is a step backward because we think we have done something and we have not.

Mr. President, on the point that the Senator from Wisconsin made, in view of all of these difficulties it is not surprising that a distinguished group of law professors has publicly announced its opposition to S. 2171. As I understand the statement of the Senator from Wisconsin, the telegram that this group of professors sent to Attorney General Clark has been placed in the RECORD. Is that correct?

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is correct. I also identified some of these gentlemen who are distinguished constitutional authorities.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I know many of these faculty members personally. I can tell the Senator, from personal experience, they are not only a distinguished group, but, in fact, a rather conservative group.

Prof. Louis Loss of the Harvard Law School, for example, is one of the leading experts in the country on securities laws, on the SEC and the question of registration of securities.

Father Drinan, the dean of the Boston College Law School, is both a respected and conservative figure whom I have known personally for many years. Benjamin Kaplan of the Harvard Law School is one of the leading experts in the Nation on our Federal courts and on copyright law. Louis Jaffe of the Harvard Law School, Walter Gellhorn of Columbia Law School, and Nathaniel Nathanson of Northwestern University Law School are three of the leading experts on Federal administrative agencies. Paul Bator and Clark Byse of the Harvard Law School are also experts in that field. All of these men could testify about whether the SACB contributes significantly to the administrative process. Norman Dorsen of New York University Law School is the director of the Arthur Garfield Hays civil liberties program. Indeed, Mr. President, every member of this distinguished list of 31 law professors is nationally known in some field of law or another.

I urge the Senate to take the advice of these distinguished men and recommit S. 2171 for further examination and inquiry. We should not enact legislation on a matter so vital and so intimately related to individual liberties and our internal security without the most careful kind of scrutiny.

This is felt by the Senator from Illinois to be a major piece of legislation, that it is extremely important. However, it does not seem to me to make any sense to rush this through when we have gone 17 years without having any kind of decent Board. Should we pass this legislation, we might go another 17 years before we decided other legislation should be enacted. Therefore, why not have hearings for a couple of weeks, make a careful judgment as to whether we are moving in the right direction, make a determination whether the legislation we might enact is constitutional, and make a determination whether the Attorney General feels that this would be helpful, looking to what the Federal

Bureau of Investigation is doing and what it will continue to do.

All of these things could be examined in a relatively short period of time. We could get some legislation passed if it was felt to be necessary and move in the right direction, but we should not pass legislation which will mean in the last analysis, that we are standing still. In fact, I might say to the Senator from Wisconsin that, in my judgment, this would be a step backward because it will be so obvious that there will not be anything that can possibly be done under the legislation that is being proposed by the Senator from Illinois that will not be done or cannot be done otherwise. It would be, really, deceitful for the Senate to pass this legislation.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is it not true that there was specific information which would have been required under the old Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, which is no longer required because of the Supreme Court decision, and would not be required under the Dirksen bill? I am going to indicate here and will ask the Senator from New York, as a former Attorney General, whether in the absence of this information it is not true that the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Justice Department would be in as strong a position to cope with the internal Communist menace without the Dirksen bill as it would be if the Dirksen bill were to be passed.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Without any question. When I was Attorney General, we did not receive, to my knowledge, one piece of information from the Subversive Activities Control Board in connection with communism in the United States that we had not uncovered in other ways. Not one piece of information while I was Attorney General.

Mr. PROXMIRE. While the Senator was Attorney General, there was not a single piece of information that came from the Subversive Activities Control Board—not a name, not an identification or a Communist-front group—no information that was of any value in combating communism.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. That we did not have already from other sources, or that was not available to us already from other sources. Not one piece of information.

Mr. PROXMIRE. If registration had worked, it might have had, as I understand it. Of course, it did not work because it was held unconstitutional by the Court—but the law might have produced names and addresses of officers and organizations at the time of filing for 12 months previous to the filing, with the titles of officers and their duties—but none of this would be required under the Dirksen bill; is that not correct? Of course it was not made available under the Subversive Activities Control Act because the registration provisions of that act were in contradiction to the Constitution.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. The Senator is correct. Of course, so far as the Government's having that information is concerned, we already had it. A substantial number of the members of the Communist Party or Communist Party front organizations now are members of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. So far as getting names and addresses, we have that information.

Mr. PROXMIRE. An accounting of all funds——

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Let me interrupt there to put this in perspective. We know that the great problem is espionage and sabotage. That must be continuously watched in the United States. The case which was uncovered in the past couple of weeks, and which appeared in the newspapers in the last several days, came from the defection of an individual or group of individuals from the Soviet Union espionage team. That is the way we receive, basically, our information, as well as the investigative work of the Federal Bureau of Investigation; of course the FBI works on sabotage and espionage in the United States. No one should deceive themselves that important information on that has come from the Subversive Activities Control Board in the executive branch of the Government, because it has not.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Then the Senator is saying that the names and addresses of all organizations, and so forth, were available to the Federal Bureau of Investigation and were available to the Department of Justice. They knew about it. They had the information. There was not one bit of information that came in fact——

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Let me say nothing ever did come.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Ever did come. All right. Cannot come under this law, because the Dirksen bill would not require this information to be made available. In the second place, the accounting of all funds received, including from whom received and how spent, for 12 months prior to filing.

This additional information is important because it is of great value to know where the money is coming from to finance Communist activity and subversive activity in the country. Again, such information would have been required under the 1950 act, but it will not be required under the Dirksen bill, if the Dirksen bill be passed. So we cannot pretend that we are going to get this information under any circumstances.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. That is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The third is a list of all members of Communist action organizations. Once again, we will not get that information.

Fourth, the aliases of those who are required to register.

Finally, a list of the printing presses and machinery for reproduction of materials.

What I am getting at is: to the extent that the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 would purport to provide information, the information required would have been useful—useful, at least, in the eyes of some. But such a requirement has been largely negated by the Supreme Court. The Dirksen bill, however, does not even attempt to restore such a provision. So the notion that we will have all kinds of relevations about domestic Communist-front organizations or about active Communists who are subverting the Government is erroneous, because the Dirksen bill will not even attempt to secure much of this information.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. The Senator is correct. For someone who does not want to do anything, the job of Commissioner is a nice one to fill at Government expense. If the Subversive Activities Control Board had anything to do, the position would be useful. But if extra money is lying around, and the administration desires to furnish jobs, the positions are nice ones to fill at Government expense. But so far as doing anything good under the legislation suggested is concerned, the Board does not do anything.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The remarks of the Senator from New York are most valuable. I am most interested to know that, in the judgment of a former U.S. Attorney General, this legislation will literally accomplish nothing except preserve an unemployed Subversive Activities Control Board—permit it to continue to provide five $26,000-a-year sinecures for literally doing nothing. The bill will not help us in the least to fight communism at home or abroad.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. If I were still Attorney General and were asked to testify in answer to the Senator's question, I might say that I would hope to use such information, but could not use it under the Supreme Court's decisions. If I were to testify before a congressional committee in answer to such a question, I would have to say that to continue the existence of the Board would be a waste of the Government's money.

I cannot speak for the present Attorney General; he is an able man and can speak for himself. But to learn whether he has the same reaction would be valuable information.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The statement of the Senator from New York is most vital to the debate. He, as a former Attorney General, has said he would not be able to bring an action before the Subversive Activities Control Board and, therefore, would not be able to revitalize the Board under the bill. This is important testimony, because the Senator from New York is the only Senator who has had actual, direct, practical experience in this area.

Under the circumstances, it seems to me that it should be mandatory that we have hearings to ascertain from the present Attorney General whether his judgment is similar to that of the Senator from New York. If it is, then the law would have to be changed, and changed rather drastically. If it is not his judgment, we ought to know it.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

COLUMBUS DAY SPEECH BY SENATOR ROBERT C. BYRD TO THE WEIRTONIAN LODGE OF THE ORDER OF ITALIAN SONS AND DAUGHTERS OF AMERICA, WEIRTON, W. VA.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on Saturday, October 14, I delivered a speech by telephone to the Weirtonian Lodge of the Order of Italian Sons and Daughters of America. I ask unanimous consent to insert that address in the RECORD.

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

COLUMBUS DAY SPEECH BY U.S. SENATOR ROBERT C. BYRD TO THE WEIRTONIAN LODGE OF THE ORDER OF THE ITALIAN SONS AND DAUGHTERS OF AMERICA

Mr. Grossi, Judge Pryor, Judge McClure, Mayor Rybka, Mr. Sinicropi, my good friends of the Weirtonian Lodge of the Order Of Italian Sons and Daughters of America, ladies and gentlemen: I deeply regret that I cannot be with you in person tonight, but I want you to know that I am with you in spirit, and I am glad that this telephone link between us makes it possible for me to speak to you.

When I accepted the very kind invitation of Mr. Mike Sinicropi, I did so in the belief that by this date Congress would have reached adjournment. But it has not, and the pressure of my work made it impossible for me to leave Washington today. I shall have to work here tomorrow to catch up.

But I salute you tonight at a distance, sharing your pride in the knowledge that since the first days of our nation—in fact, since the first discovery by white men of our land—the heritage of America has been inseparably entwined with that of Italy.

Columbus Day is an appropriate time for us to remember that our national debt to the Italians began long before there was an America. As the heirs of Western Civilization, we were also the heirs of the Italian culture which has made so great an impact upon that civilization.

Galileo's telescope was the beginning of much of modern scientific progress, and his pendulum is the principle that made possible the clock and the watch. The research and scientific method of Leonardo da Vinci was far beyond his time, and provided the basis for many other scientists in their quest for knowledge of the world about us.

Although centuries of art have followed them, Raphael, da Vinci, Cellini, Donatello, Michaelangelo, della Robbia, and Botticelli are still the unquestioned masters. The history of art since their time has grown from them, but has never replaced or challenged their position.

The shock and horror with which the whole world viewed the danger and damage to the masterpieces of Florence is witness to the place of Italian art in the world of today. People who had never been to Italy, as well as the thousands upon thousands who had stood before these masterpieces, including many West Virginians, were as concerned about the future of the treasures as they would have been had the tragedy occurred in their own city. Money and experts came from all over the world to help preserve and repair them.

The music of Verdi, Rossini, Puccini, and the countless other Italian composers is ours also. The treasure of world literature is richer by far from the contributions of Petrach, Dante, and Bocaccio.

It was Christopher Columbus who provided the tie between the old civilization and the New World. When he returned to Spain and told of this new land, which he believed to be an unexplored part of Asia, the news spread like a prairie fire. The Italians were among the first to follow Columbus.

Amerigo Vespucci explored the coast of South America only seven years after Columbus, and he was among the first to advance the theory that this was not a part of Asia, but a new and unexplored continent. His writings made such a stir in Europe that a German cartographer named the new land after him on a map he was making. The name, of course, has remained with us as a reminder of the explorer.

John Cabot, whose real name was Giovanni Cabota, sailed for the King of England to explore the mainland of the North American continent. Giovanni da Verrazano explored the coast of North America in the early 1500's, from Cape Breton Island to the Carolinas, and in the process discovered New York Bay.

The exploration of the west, although many may not know it, was led by Italians, also. Allessandro Malaspina was the first white man to explore Alaska, Vancouver, and the coast of California. Fra Marco da Nizza led Coronado's expedition through the west and as far east as what is now Kansas.

The concept of liberty, justice and equality brought many Italians to these shores. A number of settlers had arrived long before the first rumblings of independence; there were Italians building a glass factory in Virginia before the Pilgrims landed in Massachusetts, and Italian Colonies were flourishing in Georgia, Florida, Delaware, New York, and elsewhere, before the Revolution.

But when the spunky little colonies defied the greatest empire of the day and declared themselves independent, several hundred Italians, fired by the ideas of liberty and equality, fought and died in the Revolution that made the American dream a reality.

When the fate of our Northwest territories, the land that is now Michigan, Illinois, Wisconsin, Indiana, and Ohio, hung in the balance and was in danger of falling to Canada, an Italian fur trader saved the day. Francesco Vigo provided the money and the information which enabled General George Rogers Clark to emerge victorious at *Vincennes* in 1779.

The Italian Americans, since our beginnings as a nation, have been among the most patriotic of our citizens. They have served with distinction in our wars, and were among the fiercest patriots even when the nation was at war with Italy. In 1941, the Italian-American newspapers were among the first to condemn fascism and give their overwhelming support to America's war effort.

More than 400,000 Italian Americans served in the armed forces during the war. Many of them fought in the bitter Italian campaigns and a large number remained in the land of their parents as war casualties.

In 1944 Sergeant Peter J. Dalessondro, his unit under heavy bombardment, moved to the front, where he covered the withdrawal of his men. Surrounded and armed only with grenades, he maintained his position and called by radio for fire closer and closer to his station. His last words were directing mortar fire on his own position.

Sergeant Dalessondro's story is but one of the many in the military history of World War II involving the bravery and devotion of Italian American soldiers. At least seven of them have received the Congressional Medal of Honor.

Italian Americans have been outstanding in nearly every area of business and in all the professions. Many have entered public life and served their nation, state or city with distinction. Who can ever forget Mayor Fiorello La Guardia of New York?

Since La Guardia's time, Italian Americans have been mayors of a number of our major cities. Several Senators, Governors, and a host of members of the House of Representatives are of Italian parentage. And no Senator is held in greater esteem and respect than is the distinguished and brilliant senior Senator from Rhode Island, John O. Pastore. One, Anthony J. Celebrezze, himself born in Italy, became a member of the President's cabinet as Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The outstanding thing about each of these men and the tremendous number of their countrymen who have chosen the United States as a home, is not that they are Italians, but rather that they are Americans. They are among the finest citizens we have known, bringing with them the best of their heritage and the richness of their traditions and this has been so in Weirton and in every other West Virginia community.

It is the heritage of our proud land that none of us can say "I am English" or "I am Italian". We can only say "I am an American" and know that that makes us a little bit of every land in the world. For our traditions and customs, even our language and our culture, have drawn from the whole world. We have worked together to weave together a nation from all these threads. And we have succeeded.

In the spirit of this day, may I close by quoting the poem titled "Columbus":

"COLUMBUS

"Behind him lay the gray Azores,
Behind the Gates of Hercules;
Before him not the ghost of shores,
Before him only shoreless seas.
The good mate said: 'Now must we pray,
For lo! the very stars are gone.
Brave Admiral, speak, what shall I say?'
'Why, say, "Sail on! sail on! and on".'

" 'My men grow mutinous day by day;
My men grow ghastly wan and weak.'
The stout mate thought of home; a spray
Of salt wave washed his swarthy cheek.
'What shall I say, brave Admiral, say,
If we sight naught but seas at dawn?'
'Why, you shall say at break of day,
"Sail on! sail on! and on!" '

"They sailed and sailed, as winds might blow,
Until at last the blanched mate said:
'Why, now not even God would know
Should I and all my men fall dead.
These very winds forget their way.
For God from these dread seas is gone.
Now speak, brave Admiral, speak and say'—
He sayd, 'Sail on! sail on! and on!'

"They sailed. They sailed. Then spake the mate:
'This mad sea shows his teeth tonight.
He curls his lip, he lies in wait,
With lifted teeth, as if to bite!
Brave Admiral, say but one good word:
What shall we do when hope is gone?'
The words leapt like a leaping sword:
'Sail on! sail on! and on!'

"Then pale and worn, he kept his deck,
And peered through darkness. Ah, that night
Of all dark nights! And then a speck—
A light! a light! at last a light!
It grew, a starlit flag unfurled!
It grew to be Time's burst of dawn.
He gained a world; he gave that world
Its grandest lesson: 'On! sail on!' "

—JOAQUIN MILLER.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

AMENDMENT OF THE SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL ACT OF 1950

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2171) to amend the Sub-

versive Activities Control Act of 1950, so as to accord with certain decisions of the courts.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the only response I have heard, from those who support the proposal before the Senate, to our charge that there have been no hearings on this measure, has been that we do not really need hearings, because there were extensive hearings on the parent legislation, back in 1950, before the Committee on the Judiciary. It is said that we know plenty about what the problem is, and it is simply a matter of making the statute conform to the decisions.

One of the answers to that view, of course, was given by the distinguished former Attorney General of the United States, the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], when he pointed out that there would still be three specific constitutional defects in the law, should the Dirksen bill become law, which defects would make it impossible, in his judgment, for the Attorney General to use the law to take any action against domestic Communists.

I am informed that the Supreme Court has decided more than 100 cases involving subversives since the enactment of the Internal Security Act of 1950. We know that whether one believes that the Constitution is a living document, and changes, or not, certainly those decisions have enormous importance in terms of drafting a law that will conform with the Supreme Court's constitutional interpretation.

Yet we have, as I have said, no record at all. We have not had a single day, not a single hour, of hearings, nor a single witness who has testified on this bill, to indicate whether or not it is in conformity with the law as interpreted by the Supreme Court more than 100 times since the enactment of the Internal Security Act of 1950.

Yesterday, Mr. President, in concluding my remarks, I pointed out that there have been many other changes in the world which could very well have had a profound impact on the threat of communism, and the nature of the Communist threat, since 1950. In 1950 it was recognized that any foreign influence on the Communist Party of the United States would come from Moscow. I think that was probably true then; and that the prevalent conclusion at that time that the world revolution was being directed monolithically from Moscow was sound.

However, as I think all of us recognize, many things have happened in the world since 1950 to change that situation. Communism is no longer monolithic. It is certainly as threatening, in my view; and, with the war in Vietnam, we know how damaging it is to our interests in the Far East. But it is exactly the developments in the Far East that indicate how enormously the world situation has changed since 1950.

As I stated yesterday, Roger Hilsman, the former Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, stated, in testimony before the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on the Pacific and the Far East, in 1966, that the Sino-Soviet split is "one of the most portentous international political developments of our time."

The real threat to world peace now, as Vice President HUMPHREY observed in a speech Sunday in Doylestown, Pa., is "militant, aggressive Asian communism, with its headquarters in Peking, China. The aggression of North Vietnam is but the most current and immediate action of militant Asian communism," the Vice President told his audience.

Vice President HUMPHREY's words were even more emphatic than those of the Secretary of State, whose press conference remarks last week are now being widely discussed. Secretary Rusk warned of the threat of a billion Chinese armed with nuclear weapons.

Communist influences in the underdeveloped nations have been anything but monolithic. On the contrary, the story here is one of fierce and brutal competition between the Chinese and the Soviets.

Che Guevara may be dead, but it is too soon to write off the virile influence in Latin America of the Maoist revolutionary doctrine to which he subscribed and which he practiced. Che and his mentor Mao preached immediate and violent revolution. The Cuban revolutionary influence throughout Latin America, if it looks to any capital outside Havana, looks to Peking, more than Moscow.

Africa—a continent one top ranking Chinese Communist described after a visit there as "ripe for revolution"—is also a battleground between the Moscow and the Peking brand of communism. The record here hardly provides any evidence of a monolith. Rather, the Communist influence where it exists in Africa has, as in Latin America, been indelibly branded by the split in the Communist world. The Asian-African People's Solidarity Organization has been one of the battlegrounds. The aggressive efforts of the Chinese to take control over it has resulted in its decline. And there are countless places where the Chinese Communists have provided a helping hand to revolutionary movements in Africa. They have trained and supplied nationalist revolutionary movements in Portuguese Africa, according to our State Department. They had an influence—albeit a small one—on the revolution in Zanzibar. It was the Chinese Communists to whom the revolutionary African Party for Independence in Senegal owed its allegiance. And again, according to our State Department, the Chinese have made promises to build a $300 million railway between Tanzania and Zambia in effort to establish a beacon that will build confidence among Africans in the efficacy of Chinese Communist aid.

Mr. President, in any event I think that all of my colleagues would be wise to ponder this language about the so-called monolithic worldwide Communist movement which is the basic question, and the Dirksen bill would not change it. It would still paint the picture of a world which does not exist despite the fact that we all know the situation has changed dramatically. After all, the Dirksen bill reiterates the findings expressed in subsections 1 through 15, findings about communism made in 1950, 17 years ago. These findings in section 2 of the act are only modified in the Dirksen bill by adding the following subsection 16:

(16) The findings of fact contained in paragraphs (1) through (15) of this section are reiterated. Recent court decisions involving the registration provisions of this Act make it necessary to enact legislation to accomplish the purposes of such Act without the requirements of registration. Disclosure of Communist organizations and of the members of Communist-action organizations as provided herein is essential to the protection of the national welfare.

What the Dirksen bill attempts to do is really a cut and paste job by taking the 1950 act and deleting every reference to registration and trying to make the correction so that the Supreme Court's ban on registration will still keep the bill alive. But what it does, as the former Attorney General, the present junior Senator from New York, told us this afternoon, is to ignore other provisions in the act which the Supreme Court also found to be unconstitutional and which would still, in his view, render the Subversive Activities Control Board ineffective, inactive, and idle because the Attorney General, in his view, will not be in a position to act.

Has the situation remained so stable, insofar as world communism is concerned, over the past 17 years for Congress to reendorse these findings in toto? I simply raise the question, but I think it is up to each and every one of us to answer it for ourselves. This might well have been a section of the bill that could have been constructively changed after suitable hearings. In the absence of such hearings, and in an attempt to get the bill to the floor of the Senate as soon as possible the feasibility of change was ignored.

The language contained in this addition—section 1 of the Dirksen bill—does help us to understand the Dirksen proposal by telling us that recent court decisions have made it necessary to delete the registration requirements of the 1950 act. It goes on to tell us that registration will be displaced by disclosure "as provided herein."

Section 3 defines several of the terms used in the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950. The section, which is retained despite the Dirksen proposal, reads as follows:

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this title—

(1) The term "person" means an individual or an organization.

(2) The term "organization" means an organization, corporation, company, partnership, association, trust, foundation, or fund; and includes a group of persons, whether or not incorporated, permanently or temporarily associated together for joint action on any subject or subjects.

(3) The term "Communist-action organization" means—

This is interesting to me because this is the language contained in the bill which the distinguished junior Senator from New York said the Supreme Court found to be part of the reason why they declared this act to be unconstitutional.

It concerns the definition of Communist action organization. It is said to be too general and too loose.

Here is the definition:

The term "Communist-action organization" means—

(a) any organization in the United States (other than a diplomatic representative or mission of a foreign government accredited as such by the Department of State) which (i) is substantially directed, dominated, or controlled by the foreign government or foreign organization controlling the world Communist movement referred to in section 2 of this title, and (ii) operates primarily to advance the objectives of such world Communist movement as referred to in section 2 of this title; and

(b) any section, branch, fraction, or cell of any organization defined in subparagraph (a) of this paragraph which has not complied with the registration requirements of this title.

Mr. President, the last point is especially interesting. It says:

Any section, branch, fraction, or cell of any organization defined in subparagraph (a) of this paragraph which has not complied with the registration requirements of this Act.

The registration requirements of the title have been deleted. They are gone. They have been taken out. The Supreme Court found that requiring registration conflicted with the fifth amendment. Yet, the Dirksen measure does not correct this defect.

It specifies:

Any section, branch, fraction, or cell of any organization defined in subparagraph (a) of this paragraph which has not complied with the registration requirement of this title.

Here is another example of why the pending bill badly needs hearings and careful examination to perfect it.

As I say, we may agree wholeheartedly with the objectives of the Senator from Illinois and feel very strongly that we need legislation. But certainly we do not want to pass legislation which is as defective as the pending bill.

With reference to subparagraph (4), once again the distinguished junior Senator from New York raised earlier today the contention that the Supreme Court decisions had found the definition of the Communist-front organizations to be too vague.

This is the definition:

(4) The term "Communist-front organization" means any organization in the United States (other than a Communist-action organization as defined in paragraph (3) of this section) which (A) is substantially directed, dominated, or controlled by a Communist-action organization, and (B) is primarily operated for the purpose of giving aid and support to a Communist-action organization, a Communist foreign government, or the world Communist movement referred to in section 2 of this title.

(4A) The term "Communist-infiltrated organization" means any organization in the United States (other than a Communist-action organization or a Communist-front organization) which (A) is substantially directed, dominated, or controlled by an individual or individuals who are, or who within three years have been actively engaged in, giving aid or support to a Communist-action organization, a Communist foreign government, or the world Communist movement referred to in section 2 of this title, and (B) is serving, or within three years has served, as a means for (i) the giving of aid or support to any such organization, government, or movement, or (ii) the impairment of the military strength of the United States or its industrial capacity to furnish logistical or other material support required by its Armed Forces: *Provided, however,* That any labor organization which is an affiliate in good standing of a national federation or other labor organization whose policies and activities have been directed to opposing Communist organizations, any Communist foreign government, or the world Communist movement, shall be presumed prima facie not to be a "Communist-infiltrated Organization."

(5) The term "Communist organization" means any Communist-action organization, Communist-front organization, or Communist-infiltrated organization.

(6) The term "to contribute funds or services" includes the rendering of any personal service and the making of any gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit, of money or of anything of value, and also the making of any contract, promise, or agreement to contribute funds or services, whether or not legally enforcible.

(7) The term "facility" means any plant, factory or other manufacturing, producing or service establishment, airport, airport facility, vessel, pier, water-front facility, mine, railroad, public utility, laboratory, station, or other establishment or facility, or any part, division, or department of any of the foregoing.

The term "defense facility" means any facility designated by the Secretary of Defense pursuant to section 5(b) of this title and which is in compliance with the provisions of such subsection respecting the posting of notice of such designation."

(8) The term "publication" means any circular, newspaper, periodical, pamphlet, book, letter, post card, leaflet, or other publication.

(9) The term "United States", when used in a geographical sense, includes the several States, Territories, and possessions of the United States, the District of Columbia, and the Canal Zone.

(10) The term "interstate or foreign commerce" means trade, traffic, commerce, transportation, or communication (A) between any State, Territory, or possession of the United States (including the Canal Zone), or the District of Columbia, and any place outside thereof, or (B) within any Territory or possession of the United States (including the Canal Zone), or within the District of Columbia.

(11) The term "Board" means the Subversive Activities Control Board created by section 12 of this title.

(12) The term "final order of the Board" means an order issued by the Board under section 13 of this title, which has become final as provided in section 14 of this title.

(13) The term "advocates" includes advises, recommends, furthers by overt act, and admits belief in; and the giving, loaning, or promising of support or of money or anything of value to be used for advocating any doctrine shall be deemed to constitute the advocating of such doctrine.

(14) The term "world communism" means a revolutionary movement, the purpose of which is to establish eventually a Communist totalitarian dictatorship in any or all the countries of the world through the medium of an internationally coordinated Communist movement.

Once again, Mr. President, it would seem that this definition, which may well have been adequate in 1950, certainly is not adequate in 1967, when world communism should certainly embrace the concept of a split, a competitive situation, between Moscow and Russian communism and Peking and Red Chinese communism.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONDALE in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

PROTECTION OF HOUSEHOLD PETS—HUMANE TREATMENT OF ANIMALS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, in the New York Times this morning there is an editorial entitled "The Care of Animals," which I believe to be most pertinent to a bill which has been introduced in the Senate by the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and in the House of Representatives by Representative ROGERS of Florida.

Last year, as the culmination of the efforts of a dedicated group, composed largely of women who were outraged at the treatment which pets, particularly dogs and cats, had been receiving at the hands of certain unscrupulous dealers in laboratory animals, the Senate, by a vote of 85 to 0, passed a bill which gave some protection against cruelty toward these household pets.

I believe the effort to obtain this legislation was substantially aided by an event in Slatington, Pa., where a group, which has been well described as dognapers, went through the town with their nets, picking up whatever dogs they could find in order to sell them to labora. tories which used them for experimental purposes. A pet, a pedigreed poodle, of a prominent member of the Slatington community was thus stolen.

Naturally, the owner was outraged and endeavored to trace the animal. It was not easy because the dognapers left few clues as to where they had gone. Nevertheless, eventually she traced the pet to a hospital in New York where, by the time she got there, it had been cruelly destroyed as part of a research experiment.

Her cause was taken up by the press and many friends in Pennsylvania, and resulted in the passage of a State law against dognaping, which is one of the best in the country.

A group of her friends and others who were outraged by this incident pressed for the passage of legislation in Congress because, in the particular instance, the dog had been transported across a State line and it was necessary to invoke the interstate commerce powers of the Federal Government.

Although the bill we passed, which was subsequently passed by the House, incurred no open opposition on the floor of either body, it was subjected to strenuous and adverse lobbying activities while the bill was in committee. Those activities involved charges to the effect that it would make impossible the research nec-

essary to protect the health of the American people.

A certain Dr. Bisscher, purporting to represent the medical profession and others, was particularly active in arguing that the progress of research in medicine would grind to a halt if the bill were to be passed. Fortunately, those efforts were of no avail, and I believe the case made in opposition to the bill was entirely untenable. The bill was jointly sponsored by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and myself, and was referred to the Commerce Committee where, after hearings and some amendment, it was favorably reported.

Great credit for passage of this legislation is due to the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], chairman of the committee, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the ranking minority member, and to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

Parenthetically, let me say that the wives of these three gentlemen exercised a salutary effect on their respective senses of compassion for animals.

The legislation included provisions which, in my judgment, were vitally necessary, for the licensing and inspecting of the laboratories which use live animals for experimental purposes.

The legislation deals primarily with the humane care of these animals during the period before they are used for experimentation and after the experiment is completed. There is no requirement in the legislation which would prevent any kind of cruelty to animals required by the nature of the experiment, during the course of the experiment. This, of course, I deplore but, on the other hand, there comes a time when research for the alleviation of human ailments must take precedence over the requirements of the humane treatment of an animal.

But the legislation did require that the animal should be properly housed, and properly fed, and properly cared for before the experiment. If, as a result of the experiment, the animal was in great pain and in danger of a long and painful death, the legislation required that it be disposed of as promptly as possible without further cruelty.

This legislation has stood on the books for only about a year. It has not really had an opportunity to be tested from the administrative point of view.

The requirement for inspection and for licensing is vested, for administrative purposes, in the Department of Agriculture, which has a highly skilled corps of veterinarians and health officials well qualified to conduct this important work.

I have seen no evidence to indicate that the legislation is not working well. Neither has there come to me any serious complaint about its administration.

I was, therefore, startled to learn that Representative ROGERS, of Florida, a longtime dear friend of the veterinarian and medical professions, had introduced a bill in the House and had persuaded my very dear friend the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] to introduce proposed legislation in the Senate. The purpose of the bill, as I understand, is to remove the inspection authority from the Department of Agriculture, which has a staff of nearly 800 veterinarians and has a splendid record of eradicating diseases among farm animals, and also a corps of inspectors experienced in enforcement work, and to transfer it to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which knows nothing whatever about the subject, or, in the even worse alternative, to a professionally accredited body, which is another way of turning the work over to the somewhat less than tender mercies of the medical profession.

The New York Times editorial to which I refer is entitled "The Care of Animals." I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the editorial points out that the Animal Health Division of the Department of Agriculture is the appropriate agency for enforcement. The Times states that it does not "see the justification" for this bill. Neither do I. The Times continues:

> But if the medical laboratories had enforced meaningful standards for the housing, exercise, and care of animals—

And they did not—

> it would never have been necessary to include laboratories in last year's legislation.

I agree with the New York Times that Congress should leave well enough alone. All that the Department of Agriculture needs is a more adequate appropriation than it received this year from the Committee on Appropriations. The administration asked for an amount barely adequate to do the work last year, and the Committee on Appropriations cut that request in half. I would hope that a more adequate appropriation could be authorized this year, even though we are fighting a war in Vietnam.

I concur in the view of the New York Times that, certainly, no action is desirable in the Senate until further hearings have been held by the Commitee on Commerce, whose members wrote the law and are familiar with its complex background. I feel reasonably certain that the Senators who are members of that committee, to whom I referred earlier, will be alert to defend the legislation they sponsored and pressed to enactment.

I hope very much that this legislation will, in the language of our noble allies, the West Germans, be "spurlos versenkt" for the rest of this session.

EXHIBIT 1

THE CARE OF ANIMALS

When Congress last year passed the law establishing Federal standards for the care of animals used in medical research, it provided for inspection and enforcement by the appropriate agency, the Animal Health Division of the Department of Agriculture. This division has a staff of nearly 800 veterinarians with a splendid record of eradicating diseases among farm animals and also has a corps of inspectors experienced in enforcement work.

We do not see the justification for the bill introduced by Senator Javits of New York and Representative Rogers of Florida which would transfer this work to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare or to "a professional accrediting body." HEW has no existing staff to handle this assignment. Delegating it to a professional accrediting body would simply hand the problem back to the medical fraternity. But if the medical laboratories had enforced meaningful standards for the housing, exercise, and care of animals—actual experiments are not covered by the law—then it would never have been necessary to include laboratories in last year's legislation.

Congress should leave well enough alone. All that the Department of Agriculture needs to proceed with enforcement of the law is a more adequate appropriation than it received this year. Certainly, no action is desirable in the Senate until there have been hearings by the Commerce Committee whose members wrote the law and are familiar with its complex background.

Mr. President, turning to another matter, not long ago I received from the Pennsylvania League for Consumer Protection——

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before he gets into another subject?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to my friend the Senator from Wisconsin.

AMENDMENT OF THE SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL ACT OF 1950

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2171) to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, so as to accord with certain decisions of the courts.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, earlier today, it has been called to my attention, an allegation was made by a Senator in the Press Gallery that there had been an agreement involving the senior Senator from Wisconsin that, under certain circumstances, there would be no lengthy talk on my part on the pending bill—that is, the Dirksen bill. That agreement was posited on the clear and declared understanding that there would be a statement from the Attorney General of the United States indicating that he would use this legislation, and use it in a way that would revitalize the Subversive Activities Control Board. It is my understanding that the distinguished minority leader has a letter from the Attorney General, but this is becoming a number one mystery. Nobody knows what is in the letter. The distinguished minority leader has the letter. He has not disclosed its contents, to the best of my knowledge, to anyone. He has indicated to the press and the Press Gallery that he has the letter, but certainly the fact that he has a letter from the Attorney General in no way complies with the understanding I had when I met with the minority leader that there would be a declaration by the Attorney General of the United States that he would find the so-called Dirksen proposal a proposal which would enable him to bring cases before the Subversive Activities Control Board.

The whole point of my argument is that the Dirksen bill will have no effect; that the Dirksen bill will not create an

active Subversive Activities Control Board.

Earlier today the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], a former Attorney General, said that even if he were happy to use the powers provided by the Dirksen bill for the Subversive Activities Control Board to have cases brought before it through him, he could not do it.

I apologize for asking the Senator to yield so long.

Mr. CLARK. I see the able minority leader has entered the Chamber.

May I ask my friend from Wisconsin whether he does not agree with me that if our beloved minority leader has a letter on the subject of this bill from the Attorney General of the United States, he should share the secret with us, because it seems to me what the Attorney General has to say would be pertinent, and I am sure that Members of the Senate should share knowledge of the contents of the letter.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Just before third reading.

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. For the third reading?

Mr. CLARK. No. I thought the Senator from Illinois was asking me to yield, because I have the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the Senator yield so we can have the third reading? Then I will read the letter.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I object.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, may I say to the Senator from Pennsylvania that is exactly the point. In trying to make a record on the floor, it would depend on whether we have word from the Attorney General—and I mean word, not just a letter which nobody knows anything about. If we are not going to get a revelation of it from the minority leader until the third reading, I fear that the third reading is going to be a long, long way off.

I do not see how any agreement is violated because I am in a position of trying to make as clear a record as I can, because we have no exposition of whether or not the Attorney General will be able to use this proposed legislation to bring cases before the Subversive Activities Control Board.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I will yield to the Senator from Illinois in a minute, but may I say to my good friend from Wisconsin that I have no doubt his recital of any alleged agreement is quite accurate. I was never party to any such agreement. I feel completely free to talk about this bill or anything else as long as I want, and, in the fine tradition of the Senate, of which the Senator from Illinois is such a proponent, I have been talking about dogs and cats for 20 minutes. I have a speech which will take me 15 or 20 minutes about the Pennsylvania League for Consumer Protection, about which I think I have every right to talk at the end of the day. After that I have an extensive speech involving the views of many learned men in the law dealing with the Subversive Activities Control Act. I cannot tell how long it will take.

Now I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, let us see who violated what. Last Wednesday, by a vote of 47 to 38, we had a clear majority in favor of this measure. Afterwards the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin and the distinguished majority leader walked into my office. Did the Senator or did he not?

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What did he say?

The Senator said, "Well, you have the votes. Now, if you will get a letter from the Attorney General and a section-by-section analysis, I guess we won't have very much talk and we can pass the bill."

I got the letter. We did make the report and the section-by-section analysis, and then yesterday the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin came to me and said, "We had a meeting this morning. We think this ought to go back to the Judiciary Committee."

I said, "What for?"

He said, "To hear the Attorney General."

I said, "I have his letter."

He said, "Well, Senator TYDINGS wants some constitutional lawyers."

He had an opportunity, a long time ago.

I said, "Don't kid me. You are trying to kill this thing. You tried, through the appropriation route, to take away the money."

I have not been around here all these years for nothing, and I was not born yesterday. I know the game of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. CLARK. In fact, the Senator from Illinois has played that game himself, many times.

Mr. DIRKSEN. You bet I have.

Mr. CLARK. And will again.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Will the Senator from Illinois yield? What the Senator said about the meeting Wednesday afternoon is accurate, but it is not complete. The Senator from Wisconsin indicated that it would not be enough simply to have a letter. Obviously, the Attorney General of the United States could say anything in a letter. The content of the letter has not been disclosed. I said that it would not be enough for him simply to say he would enforce the law; that would mean nothing.

The Senator from Wisconsin said he would like a letter indicating that the Attorney General of the United States would use the authority in this proposal to bring cases before the Subversive Activities Control Board.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What does the Senator think I have in my pocket?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Well, I do not know.

Mr. CLARK. We do not know. Why does not the Senator let us see it?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Wisconsin does not have extra sensory perception. The Senator from Wisconsin cannot look into the pocket of the Senator from Illinois. My eyesight is pretty good, but I cannot tell what is in that letter.

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

Mr. CLARK. I will be happy to yield, if the Senator will state what is in that letter.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator from Illinois has enough ESP to know that WAYNE MORSE will speak tomorrow; and whom will the Senators have on deck then?

I will make a deal with the Senator. I will read the letter into the RECORD right now, if the Senator from Wisconsin will agree that when we have read that letter, we will proceed to third reading on this bill.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Why, of course not. After all, as I say, the letter from the Attorney General may simply say that they intend to enforce the law the best they can, under the Constitution, which would not mean anything.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am content with the letter.

We know what the game is. The Senators are just going to keep on contending. But let me remind my friend from Wisconsin, this legislation can be tacked on to any bill, including an appropriation bill, and I intend to do it. The Senator is going to get licked on this deal, I say to him right now, whether he likes it or not.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, would the Senator take his seat?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, you can get into this, too. It is a free fight.

Mr. CLARK. No, I have the floor, and I am complying with the rules of the Senate by standing at my seat. I suggest that the Senator from Illinois extend to the Senator from Wisconsin the courtesy of doing likewise.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, may I say to the Senator from Illinois, all we want on this legislation is enlightenment and understanding. Many Senators have indicated they think it would be reasonable to have brief hearings, and a binding unanimous-consent agreement to vote thereafter on final passage on this bill, once we have had hearings, and elicited the kind of record that is necessary to know what we are doing, so that our eyes will be opened.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Plow the furrow, and we will plow it with you.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, does the Senator from Illinois wish me to yield further?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, my dear friend has that big book; it will take him 3 or 4 days to read that, and I do not wish to impede his progress. That looks like about 4,000 pages. Why can we not stay in session all night?

Mr. CLARK. It is very difficult for the Official Reporter to take what I say while I have the floor, if the Senator from Illinois is constantly interrupting.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, I am sorry.

Mr. CLARK. I accept the Senator's apology.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Should I beat a hasty retreat?

Mr. CLARK. That might be the orderly procedure to follow.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield for one-half moment?

Mr. CLARK. I will yield to my friend from New Hampshire for the rest of the day, if he wishes.

Mr. COTTON. I have a distinct recollection that I was present in the Senate some 2 years ago when a Senator undertook to invoke the rule that a Senator had to be standing in his own place, behind his own desk, when he was speaking; that at the time the Parliamentarian was unable to find such a rule, and that his decision was that there was no such rule.

I think that should be straightened out before the whip is cracked again, because it would seem to me that if we are going to insist on that, we had better make sure there is such a rule.

Mr. CLARK. I quite agree with the Senator from New Hampshire. I have been puzzled by this matter throughout the 11 years I have been in the Senate; because, like many another man, I have a tendency to move about on the Senate floor as I speak. I have often spoken from desks of other Senators. Sometimes I even cross the aisle to the Republican side.

Therefore, Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CLARK. What do the rules of the Senate provide with respect to a Senator speaking at all times from his own desk, and standing there? And does a Senator lose the floor if he should be seated? I would like the Parliamentarian to answer those two questions. Must a Senator stand behind his own desk when he addresses the Chair in a speech; and if he sits down, does he lose the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian that he knows of no rule requiring a Senator to address the Senate from his desk.

The rule does provide that in seeking recognition the Senator shall rise when he addresses the Chair; but it does not specify at what place the Senator must be standing.

Mr. CLARK. A further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President. I have seen other Senators do this, and on occasion, I guess I have strayed into error and done it myself: Is it appropriate for Senators to enter the well of the Chamber and turn around and address their fellow Senators while making a speech?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Parliamentarian advises the Presiding Officer that the rules are silent on that issue.

Mr. CLARK. A further inquiry. Is there not a provision in "Senate Procedure," authored by Messrs. Watkins and Riddick, which deals, if not with the rules, at least with the customs and manners of the Senate, and indicates that it is appropriate demeanor for a Senator to address this body only when standing behind his own desk?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Parliamentarian advises the Chair that he would have to explore this inquiry further, but he is not aware of any precedent which speaks to the issue as to which the Senator from Pennsylvania makes inquiry.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from New York, without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

NATO

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I call to the attention of the Senate a recrudescence of interest in Europe evidenced by the morning papers, which is most important to our country. I think our state of near obsession with Vietnam has cost us dearly in terms of U.S. interests in Europe. We face very great problems in 1969, with the danger that President de Gaulle may take France completely out of the NATO alliance.

Therefore, Mr. President, the attitude of the other 14 NATO members, including the United States, becomes extremely important. The essential strength of the free world, in terms of production and, indeed, in almost any terms, is marshaled in the Atlantic community.

This morning there came very welcome news that the 14 are laying out a blueprint for adapting NATO to the changing circumstances of the 1970's. It is significant to note that the initiative for this came from Mr. Pierre Harmel, the Foreign Minister of Belgium.

Among the new thrusts which NATO is to undertake—I could not agree more with the evaluation that they have made—that a very much more important role should be taken by the alliance in the relationships between Western and Eastern Europe. Thinking in terms of agreements on a regional basis would be a marked advance in this regard. Second is the interest of the Atlantic community in other parts of the world, such as the Middle East and Latin America, which have been previously excluded from the NATO deliberations.

Third is the burning interest which all of these countries have in science and technology, and in the economic integration of the free world. Also, the relationships of the industrialized nations, as a group, with the developing nations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

Mr. President, power abhors a vacuum, and unless the United States does constructive things, the narrow insularity which De Gaulle offers Europe may very well take over.

I do not believe that there can be any compromise with the basic principles which distinguish the concept which we have of a great mutual organization for advancement, development, and security in the NATO alliance, and the concept which President de Gaulle has of some kind of a Metternich-inspired, cabal, with the powers of Europe excluding and disregarding, as would an ostrich, all others.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this important article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

FOURTEEN ALLIES PROPOSE PLAN TO GIVE NATO A POLITICAL ROLE—MEMBERS AGREE ON A DRAFT THAT WOULD ALTER BASIC NATURE OF ALLIANCE—ONLY FRANCE ABSTAINS—NEW HEADQUARTERS COMPLEX TURNED OVER TO OFFICIALS IN BRUSSELS CEREMONY

(By Peter Grose)

WASHINGTON, October 16—Fourteen of the fifteen Western Allies—France did not participate—have drawn up a blueprint to alter the basic nature of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and reform the alliance to face new diplomatic tasks foreseen for the nineteen-seventies.

Leading policy-makers from the NATO capitals are proposing to convert what has been essentially a military alliance into a political unit capable of arriving at an Atlantic consensus on policies to be pursued in other parts of the world.

The proposals are offered as an alternative to disintegration of the alliance in a diplomatic climate vastly changed from the cold war days of 1949, when it was formed.

[In Brussels, the Belgian Government formally handed over the new headquarters of the alliance in ceremonies attended by representatives of the member nations. Page 18.]

PROPOSED CHANGES

Among the major points contained in the reform proposals are these:

The alliance should play a role in the effort to improve relations with the Communist countries of Eastern Europe. Bilateral contacts and agreements, such as that France and East Germany are seeking, are useful in reducing tensions, but should be coordinated within the alliance so that the Soviet Union cannot play one ally against another.

The Atlantic community, a result of the alliance, should take concerted policy stands on crises in other parts of the world such as the Middle East or Latin America. This would involve enlarging the policy role of the alliance Council, composed of permanent representatives of the 15 members. The Council is now confined to a responsibility for decisions affecting only the member states.

The alliance should have responsibility as a unit, and not just as individual governments, for coordinating traffic in science and technology across the Atlantic, for developing effective methods of arms control, including the sale of arms to other countries and finally for organizing military and economic aid to developing countries on a multilateral basis.

The result of the proposals would be to introduce a far greater degree of federalism into the Atlantic community than has so far existed.

Since President de Gaulle's policies have been opposed to the very notion of a federal Atlantic community, United States officials acknowledge that the proposals could provoke a new crisis when they are presented in December at the ministerial meeting in Brussels.

The study has been under preparation since last December and must be submitted for the approval of the NATO Council, the executive body of the alliance.

Last week delegates of several member nations met quietly for two days at a country house outside London to edit the draft proposals submitted by four subcommittees.

FINAL DRAFT DUE

Foy D. Kohler, Deputy Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs, was the senior United States representative in the drafting group.

At the end of this month, a special policy-making group, with Under Secretary Eugene V. Rostow as the United States member, is scheduled to meet and put the proposals in final form.

At this point, according to American officials, the Allies will try to adapt the plans to

meet some of France's objections and thus prevent rejection by President de Gaulle.

French officials attended many of the planning sessions that led to the completed drafts but apparently took little part in the discussions.

Earlier this month, when it became clear that the other Allies were intent on making concrete proposals for reform, Foreign Minister Maurice Couve de Murville warned the alliance members that France considered close political teamwork to be beyond the purview of the group.

Considering the sweeping nature of some of the proposals and the high degree of political coordination envisaged, United States officials and allied diplomats are not confident that France would accept the recommendations as they stand.

The other capitals will then be faced with the decision whether to proceed without France or to water down the proposal on political action to keep the alliance intact.

France decided last year to withdraw from the alliance's integrated military structure, the command headed by Gen. Lyman L. Lemnitzer. It was this step that led to the long-term planning now under way.

Officials in many allied capitals asked whether the alliance was worth maintaining at all in view of France's withdrawal and of the general assessment that there had been a lessening of the Soviet Union's threat to Western Europe—against which the alliance had been formed.

In this atmosphere at the end of the year, the Belgian Foreign Minister, Pierre Harmel, proposed a far-reaching study of the "future tasks of the alliance, as a factor for a durable peace."

The terms of the study committees were clearly defined to cover the political side and not the military, for which long-term planning was already under way by the alliance command.

POLL SHOWS ALLIANCE IS FAVORED

PARIS, October 16.—Most Frenchmen want to stay in the Atlantic alliance, according to a leading polling organization.

An overwhelmingly favorable attitude toward the alliance, even among Gaullist and Communist voters, was reported by the French Institute of Public Opinion in a survey conducted for the independent left-wing weekly Nouvel Observateur. The results of the poll will be published in the Wednesday issue.

According to Nouvel Observateur, the polling agency asked citizens how they thought they would vote in a referendum on the question of withdrawal from the alliance, if such a referendum were held today.

The results showed that 54 percent of those polled favored staying in and 12 per cent favored withdrawing. The remaining 34 per cent did not express an opinion.

Among Gaullist voters, the poll showed, 61 per cent were for the alliance and 11 per cent against. Among those who said they voted Communist, the vote was 44 per cent in favor to 30 per cent opposed. The Socialists were 66 to 14 per cent and the anti-Gaullist Center Democrats 75 to 7 for the alliance.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I call additional attention to the fact that a great delegation will be going this year from Congress to the North Atlantic Assembly—the successor term for the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference — which deals with these very matters on the parliamentary level.

I think that that delegation this year should have the considered interest of every Senator so that we may have as representative as possible a delegation, well briefed, and prepared to cope with what will be tomorrow, the central problems of our foreign policy.

These are fundamental questions of foreign policy—vitally touching the peace and security of the world.

I speak today inspired by news of the progress made on plans for the future of NATO and anxious that our colleagues should begin to give this subject the attention which it so richly deserves.

I thank my colleague, the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] very much for yielding.

RESOLUTION ON CONSUMER LEGISLATION

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I return to the communication I received from the Pennsylvania League for Consumer Protection, an organization which speaks with a highly respected voice in my State. This group has sent to me a resolution relating to Federal laws in the consumer field.

The resolution is, in effect, a checklist of important legislation which will be of interest to anyone concerned about consumer affairs at the Federal level. For that reason I commend it to my colleagues.

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

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

RESOLUTION 2–67

Resolution to the Pennsylvania congressional delegation from the Pennsylvania League for Consumer Protection

Whereas the Pennsylvania consumer and his family must be protected from deceptive and unethical practices and dangerous goods and services in the market-place, and

Whereas the Pennsylvania League for Consumer Protection takes a broad interest in behalf of all consumers as well as its 2½ million affiliated members, who compromise a significant segment of the buying public, and

Whereas to continue the never-ending effort to win a better life for the citizen-consumers of the Commonwealth, the Pennsylvania League for Consumer Protection advocates the adoption of legislation embodying the Consumer Bill-of-Rights, to wit: The right to be informed; The right to safety; The right to be heard; The right to choose; and

Whereas to seek more protection for consumers through legislation, administrative action, and consumer education: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we endorse, support and urge the passage of the following legislation by the members of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

The Wholesome Meat Act which calls for equal and mandatory inspection of all meat slaughtered and sold intra-state;

A Truth-in-Lending Law that will promptly require the disclosure of finance charges in meaningful terms of simple annual interest in connection with all extensions of credit;

The Consumer Credit Protection Act which will direct that lenders fully disclose all terms and conditions of credit transactions and establish maximum rates of interest and require the disclosure of rates in terms of simple annual interest in all advertising;

Amendments to the Flammable Fabrics Act which would increase consumer protection by extending the Act beyond wearing apparel to include all fabrics;

An Interstate Land Sales Disclosure Act to require unimproved lot developers to disclose all material facts necessary to potential buyers for an informed choice;

The Medical Restraint of Trade Act to prohibit physicians from profiting from the sale of products they prescribe;

A bill to establish a Department of Consumer Affairs in order to secure within the Federal Government effective representation of the interests of the consumers;

Amendments to the Clean Air Act to expand authority for research, establish regional air quality commissions and pollution emission standards;

Amendments to the Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act to require that all cigarette packages and advertisements disclose the tar and nicotine content of the tobacco as measured by a standard test;

Legislation requiring safety for all consumers in the products and services they purchase, including but not limited to, establishment of a National Commission on Products Safety to develop safety standards and develop fair and effective safeguards in household products; the National Gas Pipeline Safety Act to develop minimum safety standards for pipeline facilities; the Medical Device Safety Act to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to assure the safety, reliability, and effectiveness of medical devices; and a meaningful code of automobile safety standards; and be it further

Resolved, that we condemn the practices of unscrupulous businesses who charge exhorbitant and excessive prices for goods and services, especially in the economic distressed communities, and be it further

Resolved, that we reaffirm our support for full representation of the consumer in the highest councils of government and commend the President for again appointing a Consumer Advisory Council to work with his Special Assistant for Consumer Affairs, and be it further

Resolved, that the members and delegates of the Pennsylvania League for Consumer Protection in convention, duly assembled at the Penn Harris Hotel, Harrisburg, on the 20th day of September in the year 1967, urge each member of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives to seriously consider and promptly act upon these legislative matters when presented to them in an affirmative manner so that the constituent-consumers whom they represent will be more fully protected, and be it further

Resolved, that a copy of this resolution be transmitted to each member of the U.S. House of Representatives and U.S. Senate and to the President of the United States and his Special Assistant for Consumer Affairs.

Mr. CLARK. I should like to comment briefly on the proposals referred to in this resolution, all of which I support in principle, if not in precise detail.

First, the Wholesale Meat Act which calls for equal and mandatory inspection of all meat slaughtered and sold intrastate. I support this legislation.

Second, a truth-in-lending law that will promptly require the disclosure of all finance charges in meaningful terms of simple annual interest in connection with all extensions of credit.

Third, the Consumer Credit Protection Act which will direct that lenders fully disclose all terms and conditions of credit transactions and establish maximum rates of interest and require the disclo-

sure of rates in terms of simple annual interest in all advertising.

Fourth, amendments to the Flammable Fabrics Act which would increase consumer protection by extending the act beyond wearing apparel to include all fabrics.

I believe this legislation to be very much in the consumer interest. I support the legislation.

Fifth, an intrastate land sales disclosure act to require unimproved lot developers to disclose all material facts necessary to potential buyers for an informed choice.

It occurs to me that this legislation is as necessary to protect the unwary as are the various acts dealing with securities which were passed back in the thirties to require full disclosure with respect to the sale of stocks, bonds, and other intangible personal property. I would support this legislation.

Sixth, the medical restraint of trade act to prohibit physicians from profiting from the sale of products they prescribe.

Seventh, a bill to establish a Department of Consumer Affairs in order to secure within the Federal Government effective representation of the interests of the consumers.

I would believe that consumer affairs require some upgrading in the Federal hierarchy. However, I would like to give some further consideration as to whether a department at Cabinet level is actually either necessary or desirable.

Eighth, amendments to the Clean Air Act to expand authority for research, establish Regional Air Quality Commissions and pollution emission standards.

Ninth, amendments to the Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act to require that all cigarette packages and advertisements disclose the tar and nicotine content of the tobacco as measured by a standard test. I would support this legislation, but I would go further and require a statement on all advertising and on cigarette packages as well to the effect that smoking of cigarettes not only may be but in all likelihood is detrimental to health.

Tenth, legislation requiring safety for all consumers in the products and services they purchase, including but not limited to, establishment of a National Commission on Products Safety to develop safety standards and develop fair and effective safeguards in household products; the National Gas Pipeline Safety Act to develop minimum safety standards for pipeline facilities; the Medical Device Safety Act to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to assure the safety, reliability, and effectiveness of medical devices; and a meaningful code of automobile safety standards.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

WAR CRITICS TOLD ASIA AT STAKE IN VIETNAM

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, Mr. Crosby S. Noyes, in a column which appears in this afternoon's Washington Star, states, with reference to Chinese militancy and political expansionism, that in most cases where direct pressures have been exerted, American power directly or indirectly applied has been the deciding factor of successful resistance. Mr. Noyes states in this regard:

This was true, certainly, in Korea in the early 1950s. It was true of the Communist threat aimed at Taiwan and the Philippines during the same period. It was true in Malaysia, where British power was ultimately successful in overcoming a Communist-inspired "war of national liberation." It was true in Indonesia, where a forceful Communist takeover would almost certainly not have been averted except for the American presence in Vietnam.

It is true today in Laos, Thailand and Burma—all of which have Communist-led insurrections on their hands. It is, in fact, highly improbable that there would be any non-Communist governments in Southeast Asia today if American security guarantees—backed by American power—had been withdrawn from the area a decade ago.

Mr. Noyes goes on to say:

Without the counterbalancing force of American commitments, there would be no need for direct military conquest. A leader like Singapore's Lee Kwan Yew—who is certainly no "client" of the United States—admits publicly that the sudden withdrawal of American power would leave him with no alternative to an accommodation with Peking—on Peking's terms.

Without firm security guarantees there is no assurance that any other country—including Japan—would feel very differently.

Mr. Noyes also states:

The only thing which could pose a serious threat to the security of the United States today would be a drastic shift in the over-all balance of world power. Such a strategic shift in favor of a system essentially hostile to our own is something which this country cannot afford to permit, as long as it has the power to prevent it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the column by Mr. Noyes, entitled "War Critics Told Asia at Stake in Vietnam," which I consider to be a very, cogent, lucid, and timely column, be printed in the RECORD.

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

WAR CRITICS TOLD ASIA AT STAKE IN VIETNAM

(By Crosby S. Noyes)

Criticism of Secretary of State Dean Rusk's recent strong statement on Vietnam is just about what might have been expected. The liberals—assuming the term applies—have taken refuge in their own, private credibility gap. The reaction, in essence, is:

"This is all very well. We admire your eloquence and obvious conviction. But we simply don't believe you."

What the liberals disbelieve in particular is that there is any threat to American security in Asia, and especially in Vietnam, which justifies the price of the war there. Rusk has failed, they say, to prove his contention that China is bent on the conquest of Asia.

The liberals are equally unconvinced, apparently, by Rusk's argument that American power in Asia is an essential ingredient to the goal of establishing a stable peace in that part of the world.

This chronic disbelief is in itself incredible in the face of the evidence. It amounts to a bland denial of the fact that every country on the periphery of China—and a number of others besides—has felt the weight of Chinese militancy and political expansionism. It simply ignores the fact that in most cases where direct pressures have been exerted, American power, directly or indirectly applied, has been the deciding factor of successful resistance.

This was true, certainly, in Korea in the early 1950s. It was true of the Communist threat aimed at Taiwan and the Philippines during the same period. It was true in Malaysia, where British power was ultimately successful in overcoming a Communist-inspired "war of national liberation." It was true in Indonesia, where a forceful Communist take over would almost certainly not have been averted except for the American presence in Vietnam.

It is true today in Laos, Thailand and Burma—all of which have Communist-led insurrections on their hands. It is, in fact, highly improbable that there would be any non-Communist governments in Southeast Asia today if American security guarantees—backed by American power—had been withdrawn from the area a decade ago.

Nor is this purely a question of Chinese militancy, real as it is. The truth is that China is the preponderant military and political power in southern Asia.

Without the counterbalancing force of American commitments, there would be no need for direct military conquest. A leader like Singapore's Lee Kwan Yew—who is certainly no "client" of the United States—admits publicly that the sudden withdrawal of American power would leave him with no alternative to an accomodation with Peking—on Peking's terms.

Without firm security guarantees there is no assurance that any other country—including Japan—would feel very differently.

But even if all this were admitted, there is an impression that the liberals would still be unconvinced of the validity and the necessity of the American commitment to Asia. Where, they ask, is the treat to the United States whether Asia is dominated by communism or not?

Where indeed? The discussion has been considerably muddied by well-meaning but unconvincing talk of "strategic frontiers" and "front lines" of security that must not be breached.

In terms of global strategy, these concepts are hopelessly dated. The only thing which could pose a serious threat to the security of the United States today would be a drastic shift in the over-all balance of world power. Such a strategic shift in favor of a system essentially hostile to our own is something which this country cannot afford to permit, as long as it has the power to prevent it.

Power, furthermore, is not necessarily a matter of weapons or economic strength. It can be measured equally in terms of human resources, and these are what is at stake in Asia.

Many years ago the United States decided that it could not afford to let the economic potential of western Europe fall under Communist control. It has now decided that Asia's human resources—representing two-thirds of the human race—are equally well worth fighting for.

This, in essence, is what Rusk was saying last week. And whether the liberals believe it or not, this is what is really at stake in Vietnam.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

CLERGYMEN'S STAND ON VIETNAM

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a column written by Mr. David Lawrence, entitled "Clergymen's Stand on Vietnam Vary," which appears in today's Washington Star, be printed in the RECORD.

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

CLERGYMEN'S STAND ON VIETNAM VARY

(By David Lawrence)

Many people are beginning to say that clergymen and church organizations are driving away parishioners by talking too much about politics—national and international—about which they know very little, and by failing to teach the all-important lessons of ethics and morality so essential today in countries troubled by disorder and violence.

Dr. Eugene Carson Blake, general secretary of the World Council of Churches and formerly the head of the United Presbyterian Church of America, said on Sunday at St. Louis that the position of the United States in Vietnam is wrong for moral, strategic, diplomatic and sociological reasons. He said with respect to the Vietnam War: "It is wrong for a great and powerful nation to impose upon a small nation even a right policy for their own good."

Dr. Blake added that the claim of the United States that it is bound to fulfill a commitment to the government of South Vietnam is hypocritical and that he believes the Vietnamese are "fighting a war of independence and overwhelming force won't make them seek peace." He called for unconditional cessation of bombing by the United States.

While occupying a high post in the World Council of Churches, Dr. Blake claims, of course, to be speaking in conformity with a resolution adopted in August by the central committee of the World Council. His criticism of U.S. policy is, however, far more direct. The World Council—composed of representatives from virtually all denominations—recommended that the United States stop bombing, but declared that the North Vietnam government, "either in advance of or in response to the cessation of bombing, should indicate by word and deed its readiness to move toward negotiations."

Dr. Paul Ramsey, one of America's most respected Protestant theologians, has just been attracting attention by his criticism and voluble attacks on actions of other clergymen. He declares that both "liberal" and "evangelical" protestant leaders have been inclined in recent years to say too much on too many topics.

Dr. Ramsey points to a growing disposition on the part of church councils and denominational conventions to adopt resolutions on a variety of intricate national problems on which religious leaders, as such, have no particular competence to formulate policies. On the question of their offering "concrete political policies for the world's statesmen," he says:

"For ecumenical councils on church and society responsibly to proffer specific advice would require that the church have the services of an entire State Department."

Dr. Ramsey further asserts that many of the pronouncements are adopted by a relatively small number of churchmen after a minimum of serious debate, and that often these documents are drafted by anonymous staff members and presented to national assemblies under circumstances which provide rank-and-file delegates with little choice except to rubber-stamp them.

He points to the procedures of the Conference on Church and Society, sponsored by the World Council of Churches in Geneva last year, as a glaring example of this weakness. He recalls that, in only two weeks of deliberation, the 410 participants in the conference arrived at specific, detailed "conclusions" on no less than 118 complex public questions, ranging from the best way to make peace in Vietnam to the suppression of crime. Dr. Ramsey's experiences at the Geneva conference, where these resolutions were adopted, prompted him to write a recently published book entitled, "Who Speaks for the Church?"

The author, in calling on contemporary Christianity to clarify the church's message about the meaning of Christian life in the world today, criticized both the National Council of Churches and the World Council of Churches for wrong methods and wrong goals. It is being predicted among religious leaders that this very question will be raised in the study Conference on Church and Society, to be held by the National Council of Churches on Oct. 22–26 in Detroit, Mich. Up to now, it has been assumed by church leaders that the rank and file of Christians were backing the involvement of their organizations in governmental questions with a political background.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, pursuant to the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 18, 1967, at 12 noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 17, 1967:

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Rosa E. Whiddon, Newville, Ala., in place of F. M. Mathis, retired.

CALIFORNIA

Victor E. Legaspi, Calexico, Calif., in place of C. B. Hetherington, retired.

Margaret R. Patterson, Gazelle, Calif., in place of A. A. Cedros, retired.

Constance N. Schroer, Green Valley Lake, Calif., in place of A. F. Tassio, retired.

COLORADO

Richard I. Lyles, Pueblo, Colo., in place of C. H. Klipfel, deceased.

CONNECTICUT

Eleanor N. Elton, South Willington, Conn., in place of E. M. Macfarlane, deceased.

GEORGIA

William O. Cummings, Warthen, Ga., in place of V. H. Cummings, retired.

INDIANA

Ira R. Williams, Mellott, Ind., in place of I. M. Gallaher, retired.

IOWA

Robert R. Larson, Dows, Iowa, in place of E. A. Westlund, retired.

KANSAS

Shirley V. Keeler, Assaria, Kans., in place of G. N. Karstadt, retired.

Clyde R. Moore, Wellington, Kans., in place of E. B. Hyndman, retired.

KENTUCKY

Creed Damron, Robinson Creek, Ky., in place of C. B. Mitchell, retired.

LOUISIANA

Maxine H. Morrison, Albany, La., in place of O. A. Johnson, retired.

MICHIGAN

Eldon Dale Maatman, Hamilton, Mich., in place of Herman Nyhoff, retired.

MINNESOTA

Francis C. Bohnert, Rosemount, Minn., in place of E. G. Doyle, retired.

MISSOURI

Charles L. Lucas, Caledonia, Mo., in place of J. L. Haw, retired.

Marion E. Bird, Concordia, Mo., in place of C. A. Reed, resigned.

Fred W. Bargen, Mapaville, Mo., in place of O. M. Judd, deceased.

NEBRASKA

Frank J. Dietsch, Fordyce, Nebr., in place of E. M. Suing, retired.

Helen V. McChesney, Lebanon, Nebr., in place of C. C. Waterman, retired.

Gary L. Boese, Pickrell, Nebr., in place of R. L. Winkle, transferred.

NEW JERSEY

Everitt J. Monahan, Morris Plains, N.J., in place of J. D. McErlane, retired.

NEW YORK

Catherine C. Hallahan, Brasher Falls, N.Y., in place of H. P. Hallahan, deceased.

Louise A. Benjamin, Central Valley, N.Y., in place of Ernest Rose, retired.

Harry W. Johnson, Jamestown, N.Y., in place of R. W. Gould, retired.

Leon Korzeniewski, Morrisville, N.Y., in place of H. M. Curtis, retired.

Thomas F. Dady, New Woodstock, N. Y., in place of E. D. Judd, retired.

NORTH CAROLINA

Pauline L. Harton, Colon, N.C., in place of Z. L. Ross, retired.

Paul E. Peeler, Granite Quarry, N.C., in place of C. M. Peeler, retired.

Stanley W. Johnson, Hope Mills, N.C., in place of I. M. Stone, retired.

OKLAHOMA

Russel J. Alberty, Haskell, Okla., in place of J. F. Rankin, retired.

OREGON

Fred J. Hayes, Oakridge, Oreg., in place of M. B. Blair, retired.

PENNSYLVANIA

George E. Kintigh, Alverton, Pa., in place of M. M. Hixson, retired.

Domenic P. Ruggieri, Kennett Square, Pa., in place of J. F. Donahue, retired.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Ray M. Head, Salem, S.C., in place of Homer Griffith, retired.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Thomas W. MacKrell, Vale, S. Dak., in place of Eloise Holdren, retired.

TENNESSEE

Robert H. Scates, Henning, Tenn., in place of G. F. Barfield, retired.

TEXAS

Kenneth R. Hopkins, Crowley, Tex., in place of D. L. Stoker, Jr., retired.

Louis C. Nordt, Missouri City, Tex., in place of J. C. Posey, retired.

VIRGINIA

Kendall F. Bailey, Madison Heights, Va., in place of M. M. Crews, retired.

Joseph H. Clarke, Jr., Martinsville, Va., in place of J. R. Gregory, retired.

Russell R. S. Clem, Staunton, Va., in place of R. C. Woodrum, deceased.

WASHINGTON

David P. Watkins, Castle Rock, Wash., in place of H. F. Downey, retired.

Mary E. Thomas, Soap Lake, Wash., in place of H. L. Lopeman, removed.

WISCONSIN

Duane A. Helland, Boyd, Wis., in place of H. E. Wanish, retired.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Educational Participation in Communities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1967

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Education and Labor Committee, I have a responsibility to maintain an interest in all programs which can enrich and expand the traditional approaches to learning. My service on this committee, however, extends beyond the lines of responsibility. I am vitally concerned with education. If I may paraphrase the illustrious Jefferson, I too would caution: If a nation expects to be ignorant and free, it expects whatever has been and never shall be.

I have always been especially enthusiastic about programs which not only broaden the scope of education beyond the conventional approach of the academic but which allow the student to more fully realize that education is indeed his most powerful weapon in the fight against apathy, stagnation, and conditions of economic disadvantage. I am pleased to join several of my colleagues in calling attention to a unique California college program which is helping to promote a student focus upon urban problems. I refer to the EPIC program at California State College at Los Angeles.

The opening of classes this quarter at California State College at Los Angeles marks the first anniversary of EPIC—a project for educational participation in communities. Through EPIC, a demonstration—pilot—program partially funded under title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965, California State at Los Angeles students are contributing their time and abilities to serve and learn from the disadvantaged in the Los Angeles area. Last year, over 1,000 students at the college worked as volunteers in more than 100 community agencies. The students assumed a wide range of duties, such as counselor aids, tutors, group leaders, recreation leaders, teen club advisers, big brother-big sisters, child care consultants, teachers, and research assistants. This year, EPIC has reduced the number of agencies to 50 and placed even greater focus upon quality service and program development. The response of the community to the EPIC volunteer has helped to highlight the value of this program. Community agencies praise EPIC volunteers for their professional attitude, inventiveness, enthusiasm, and ability. They point out that the college student often brings to the agency new ideas and techniques and enables the agency to offer new services and programs. As one agency has written:

> Bouquets to Volunteers Betty Addleman, Linda Mahru, and Boyd Johnson, who are participating in the EPIC program at California State College at Los Angeles and whose talents have been made available to the Unit II Mental Health Clinic at Los Angeles County General Hospital.
>
> Robert B. Sampliner, M.D., Director of Mental Health, Unit II, states, "These students are adding rich resources in their own respective fields to the training we are giving them in group therapy. They are serving as co-therapists who will soon be handling a group in vocational rehabilitation under supervision."
>
> These students have given invaluable services to the patients at the hospital.[1]

The student, because he is one who is "making it" in society, can often offer hope and outside contact to someone who feels entrapped in an urban ghetto, or a disadvantaged economic situation. The students have also made an enthusiastic response to the program. Because California State at Los Angeles is an urban commuter college, its 21,000 students center most of their activities away from the compus. These students are often not enthusiastic about the traditional collegiate bonfires and pep rallies. But, like all of today's college generation, they are seriously concerned about current problems and their own role in society. They have a strong desire to improve both themselves and society, and to affect the directions of our Nation. EPIC has helped direct these student energies and concerns into constructive community activities. In so doing EPIC has made good use of their pent-up concerns for society, provoked intellectual stimulation, added a sense of student commitment, and provided countless hours of service to the community. As a result, interest in EPIC from other colleges and the community has never been higher.

The theme among many of today's college students is one of turn off, drop out, or you cannot fight the power structure. The EPIC program says to that same student, "tune in, get involved, you can affect the scene." The EPIC volunteer through his participation in a community service program, gains insights which coupled with the college's academic program can help him become, upon his completion of his college requirements, a more knowledgeable citizen and a more highly skilled professional.

[1] A letter from Mrs. Marjorie Jane Davis, Assistant Director, Volunteer Services, Los Angeles County General Hospital.

As a student, EPIC allows the individual to see the needs of his own community and the directions which his education and training must follow as he would have a positive effect on that scene.

And what about the community, one might ask? The community benefits from the tremendous energy, the challenging minds and the creative talents of the young student. The overworked, overcrowded, perhaps understaffed agency may just well need the vibrant breath of student participation. The struggling, small, independent community action program may receive just the additional staff it needs to broaden its scope and attract more young people in off the streets. The young person in trouble who might not relate to an agency authority might well be responsive to a student volunteer who is on hand, ready to serve and able to give him individual attention. I dare say that there is quite a tossup when one tries to answer the question, who gains the most, the community or the student? It seems to me that there is a pretty even balance.

I am especially delighted to learn that during the new school year EPIC volunteers will be working at the following agencies located in central and south central Los Angeles: The Avalon Youth Opportunity Center, the Imperial Court Community Development Project, the Los Angeles Youth Opportunity Center, the Pico Gardens Teen Post, the Willowbrook Avenue Community Development Project, the new Locke Senior High School, the South Central Youth Training and Employment Project, and the Southwest Tutorial Project, to name just a few. The disadvantaged economic circumstances of large numbers of the residents serviced by these agencies as well as in many instances their minority group status pose impending problems for immediate resolution. Where could better answers be obtained? What more dynamic forces could influence decisions? What greater talents could be used for counseling and planning than the college student attending Cal State, many of whom are themselves residents of this very community.

It seems to me that EPIC at California State is saying to the students:

> We can help you learn, we can help you get involved, but you must be dedicated to participating in your community through a positive service.

As a new EPIC director, Mrs. Vivian Gordon wrote me recently that:

> We feel that today's college student cannot afford to miss the EPIC opportunity. There are tremendous social changes taking place in our cities today. The student has a responsibility to know what is happening and to